Popul Res Policy Rev
DOI 10.1007/s11113-014-9347-4

# Employment and Occupational Mobility among Recently Arrived Immigrants: The Spanish Case 1997–2007

**Enrique Fernández-Macías · Rafael Grande · Alberto del Rey Poveda · José-Ignacio Antón**

Received: 26 December 2013 / Accepted: 1 October 2014


**Abstract** The objective of this paper is to analyse occupational mobility among immigrants in Spain in two distinct stages: (1) comparing the immigrants' first job in Spain with their profession in the country of origin and (2) comparing their current occupational status with the occupational status of the first job they held in Spain. We focus on immigrants who arrived in Spain during the "immigration boom" that took place between 1997 and 2007, using data from the 2007 National Survey on Immigration. For our analysis, we use occupational mobility tables and multi-variable models with occupational mobility as a dependent variable. Our results show that we can better understand the initial access of migrants to the Spanish labour market from the perspective of labour market segregation: for each gender, a particular sector/occupational level (construction and cleaning, respectively) played such a dominant role that it determined almost entirely the observed mobility pattern. We find some (upward) mobility opportunities after such initial strong segregation, which increased with length of residence; however, our results suggest that, even in this case, it is mostly limited to men and associated with the construction boom that finished abruptly in 2007.

E. Fernández-Macías
European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, Dublin, Ireland
e-mail: Enrique.Fernandez@eurofound.europa.eu

R. Grande (✉) · A. del Rey Poveda · J.-I. Antón
University of Salamanca, Salamanca, Spain
e-mail: rgrande@usal.es

A. del Rey Poveda
e-mail: adelrey@usal.es

J.-I. Antón
e-mail: janton@usal.es

Published online: 29 October 2014

**Keywords** Occupational mobility · Immigration · Spain · Gender · Labour market segmentation

## Introduction

Today, research on employment and occupational mobility means one of the main topics of interest within the area of immigration. In this paper, we focus on employment and occupational mobility in the immigrant population in Spain, considering immigrants' situation in their country of origin just before moving, at the moment of arrival and at the present time a few years later.

The first stage allows considering the importance of each immigrant's work experience prior to immigrating with respect to finding his or her first job in the host country. The second stage enables us to evaluate issues affecting occupational mobility for immigrants once they have settled in Spain. Our analysis focuses on the differences between men and women because of certain peculiar features of the Spanish labour market for immigrants: men's strong presence in the construction industry compared to the predominance of women as pink collar workers, especially in domestic service. Also, many women were housewives before immigration (without work experience outside the home) and joined the labour market after arriving in the host country.

We focus our analysis on immigrants who arrived in Spain during the "immigration boom" (1997–2007). The source of the data we utilize is the National Survey on Immigration 2007 (ENI-2007) of the Spanish Statistical Institute (INE). We use occupational mobility tables and multi-variable models, with occupational mobility as a dependent variable. We construct our own indicator for exploring occupational mobility based on the occupational scale International Socio-Economic Index (ISEI) and average wages for immigrants and native workers.

This paper unfolds in four parts after this introduction. In the second section, we review of the literature on occupational mobility of immigrants. The third section focuses on the importance of studying the case of recent immigration in Spain. In the fourth one, we explain in detail the data and methodology used in the research. As usual, the final section summarizes the main findings and conclusions of the paper.

## Theoretical Review: Determinants of Occupational Mobility of Immigrants

The literature on labour market integration of immigrants has focused more on the employment assimilation of immigrants and migrant-native gaps in several labour market outcomes and less on their occupational mobility. This is because the study of labour mobility requires longitudinal data.

Most research on occupational mobility of immigrants finds a "U-shaped" pattern. There is a decline in occupational status from the last job in origin to the first job on arrival, followed by a subsequent rise depending on the stay in the destination country. The literature associates the subsequent increase in destination with the initial decline from the origin to the destination: the steeper the decline, on average, the steeper the subsequent increase (Chiswick 1978a; Bauer and

Zimmermann 1999; Chiswick et al. 2005; Rooth and Ekberg 2006). In this section, we review the three main mechanisms proposed in the literature for explaining these patterns of occupational mobility of the immigrant population.

### Human Capital and Skill Transferability

Human capital theories have focused on what kind of influence the individual endowments of immigrants have on labour mobility: education, knowledge, formal and informal learning in the workplace, language skills, work experience, etc. Since the theory of assimilation has applied human capital theory to the study of international migration, it has assumed a limited transferability of human capital across countries because education and skills are to certain extent country-specific. Therefore, migration represents human capital depreciation. It is expected that the lower transferability will result in a larger loss of occupational status from the last job in the country of origin to the first job in destination, although the latter can provide a higher income (Chiswick et al. 2005).

Therefore, a low transferability of human capital partly explains the occupational disadvantage of immigrants at the moment of arrival (Chiswick 1978b). However, it is necessary to control for the last occupation of migrants in origin to know if there is negative selection (Borjas 1987) or, conversely, there is occupational degradation due to human capital transferability problems even if there is a positive selection (Chiswick 1999; Chiquiar and Hanson 2005; Redstone Akresh 2006).

Regarding the transferability of skills and educational levels, one should consider several facts. First, higher education levels are more difficult to transfer. Therefore, the depreciation between the last job occupational status in origin and the first job occupational status in destination will be greater for higher educational levels, but higher educational levels will experience faster upward labour mobility once settled in the host country (Chiswick et al. 2005; Duleep and Regets 1999). Second, the "U" pattern will be less pronounced for migrants from similar countries, for example, between developed countries. Third, the time of residence in the host society increases the human capital of immigrants specifically adapted to the requirements of the labour market in the destination country (Chiswick et al. 1997; Lam and Liu 2002; Weiss et al. 2003).

### Context of Reception

The sociological perspective has emphasized the context of reception for understanding the labour integration of immigrants (Portes and Böröcz 1989; Portes and Rumbaut 1990). The context of reception refers to structural and institutional aspects of labour markets, government immigration policy (control flow and social services) and the influence of the ethnic community and networks.

The theory of labour market segmentation stresses demand for immigrant labour is intrinsic to the economic structures of modern post-industrial societies because of the existence of a dual labour market (Piore 1975, 1979). The high demand for labour in the secondary segment creates a need for foreign workers, while natives are more likely to work in the primary market (Piore 1975, 1979; Gordon et al.

1982; Constant and Massey 2005). Immigrants would constitute a reserve army of labour, keeping down the wages in the secondary labour market. The frequently observed insertion of migrants within specific occupational niches (or "immigrant jobs"), as a result of social network effects as well as sheer discrimination or difficulties for insertion in "mainstream" occupations (Massey et al. 1987) reinforces the association between labour market segmentation and immigration. Ethnic labour market segmentation and ethno-stratification are factors that limit the mobility of immigrants between sectors (horizontal mobility) and across occupational categories (vertical mobility). The influence of this structural dimension of the labour market would explain the lower degree of upward mobility of immigrants (Gordon 1995; Bauer and Zimmermann 1999; Kogan 2004).

From a social capital and social network perspective, the ethnic group and social networks of the immigrant are the key to understand his or her patterns of occupational mobility and labour market integration. Nevertheless, the type of impact varies according to different theorists: while some argue ethnic group cohesion, and a social network facilitates job hunting and mobility (Mullan 1989; Yamauchi and Tanabe 2008), others consider jobs found through networks tend to be of lower quality and limited to specific labour market entry niches, thus lowering wages (Goel and Lang 2010; Patel and Vella 2013) and limiting possibilities for mobility (Mahuteau and Junankar 2008; Vono and Vidal 2012). However, access to native networks increases the probability of immigrant employment, for example, through marriage to a native (Furtado and Theodoropoulos 2010).

### Reasons for Migration and Family Characteristics

The migration project defines the motives and objectives of the migratory movement, which also affects the labour trajectories in the host society. On the one hand, refugees and family reunification migrants typically have a greater decline in their occupational status from the last job in origin to the first job on arrival. However, later, there is a greater occupational and income improvement: the "U-shaped" pattern is deeper (Chiswick et al. 2005; Rooth and Ekberg 2006). Economic migrants, on the other hand, typically suffer less downward mobility at the time of arrival, but their subsequent upward mobility is slower. Income differences between countries of origin and destination exert push and pull effects. Blue-collar jobs in the receiving country may be preferable to white-collar jobs in origin, because given the earnings differential, they may offer a better quality of life and more opportunities (Redstone Akresh 2006). According to some research, the initial occupation of immigrants is the result of decisions guided by the goal of obtaining immediate economic gains for their family needs or for financing the trip, even at the cost of more job insecurity and low social status (Kossoudji and Cobb-Clark 2000; Kalter and Kogan 2002; Kogan 2004).

Finally, the literature also refers to the importance of household characteristics and migrants' temporary or permanent settlement. There are also significant differences in labour mobility between men and women. Some authors have shown that upward mobility is higher for men than for women (Sullivan 1984; Powers and Seltzer 1998). Intersectionality Theory argues that women face multiple and

overlapping disadvantages in terms of gender, ethnicity and social class (Parella 2003; Flippen 2013).

"Family migration decisions" (Mincer 1978), the "family investment model" (Long 1980) or "family rationality" (Baker and Benjamin 1997) might explain this variation in mobility patterns between men and women immigrants from different perspectives. After settling in the receiving country, the income of married immigrant women tends to decrease over time, and they have an increasing possibility of withdrawal from the labour market. This is because initially married women work harder than men to finance their husbands' investment in human capital or in time to search for a better job. Then, once the husband has found the better job, the wife typically reduces the time spent on formal employment, and more time is devoted to non-market activities (Mincer 1978; Long 1980; Duleep and Sanders 1993; Baker and Benjamin 1997; Duleep and Dowhan 2002).

## The Case of Recent Immigration in Spain

### Spanish Exceptionalism

The exceptionality of immigration in Spain lies in the profound change that took place in a very short time period: a society of emigration changed into a society of recent massive immigration (Muñoz de Bustillo and Antón 2010). This immigration boom coincided, not by chance, with an expansive economic cycle that resulted in a strong and sustained growth of the economy and employment. The high demand for employment occurred especially in low-skilled jobs, mainly in two sectors: the construction sector due to the spectacular real estate boom of that decade and the services sector fuelled by tourism and personal care linked to the incorporation of women into the labour market and an increasing ageing of the native population in Spain (Carrasco et al. 2008).

The interest of the Spanish case derives from this exceptionalism. First of all, it allows analysing the patterns of occupational mobility in a labour market which absorbed a large amount of foreign labour in very few years. Compared to countries with longer traditions of immigration, the Spanish case allows studying the occupational mobility of immigrants in a context where previously there was no ethnic division of the market or established ethnic enclaves. Secondly, we can determine the effect of an expansive economic cycle based on low-skilled jobs and low productivity on the occupational mobility of immigrants. The high labour demand, which made possible what was known as the "Spanish immigrant's dream", helps us to understand the effect of this economic model on the occupational mobility of immigrants. Thirdly, the study period allows us to approach the relationship between occupational mobility and integration of the immigrant population in the first years after arrival in the host country.

Since 2008, the serious effects of the economic crisis have put an end to the "prodigious decade" of immigration to Spain, causing an abrupt transformation of the context of employment of immigrants and discouraging new arrivals.

### The Literature about Occupational Mobility in the Case of the Recent Wave of Immigration to Spain

Despite a vast amount of the literature on immigration in Spain, there are few studies on occupational mobility because Spanish immigration is a recent phenomenon, and there is a lack of longitudinal data. There is some evidence on occupational segregation of immigrants in Spain, according to which immigrants are inserted in low-skilled and low-paid jobs (Domingo and Gil-Alonso 2007; Fernández and Ortega 2008; Rodríguez-Planas 2012; Stanek and Veira 2012). Labour market integration patterns are very different between male and female immigrants (Vidal et al. 2009; Del Río and Alonso-Villar 2012; Grande and del Rey 2012).

There are a few studies analysing the labour mobility taking place between the occupation in the country of origin before migration and the occupation found in Spain. Basically there are three studies, all of them using the ENI 2007 survey: (1) Caparrós and Navarro (2010) focus their analysis on the relative change in occupational status, finding a "U-shaped" pattern, but asymmetric by educational level because of imperfections in the transfer of human capital by region of origin. Immigrants with more education suffer a steeper decline in their first occupational level in Spain compared to the origin, but their latter chances of upward mobility are higher. (2) Simón et al. (2014) used the ISEI index by occupational category to evaluate changes in occupational status, also finding a "U-shaped" pattern, where immigrants with higher levels of education and those from developing countries suffer a greater initial decline and then more pronounced ascending patterns; also, women experience more downward mobility initially and have greater chances to move upward over time. (3) Vono and Vidal (2012) only study the mobility between employment before migrating and the first job in Spain, focusing their analysis on the negative influence of social networks as a way of finding the first job for mobility.

However, these studies have some important limitations we try to address in this paper. First, they look at mobility from a purely quantitative perspective, by estimating the impact of migration on an occupational score or on the probability of upward or downward mobility. In this paper, we look at mobility from a categorical perspective, taking into account not only the extent and direction of mobility but also the particular categories of origin and destination (using mobility tables). Second, they ignore the immigrants who were dedicated to non-market activities in their country of origin or after their arrival in Spain, particularly, female unpaid domestic workers in their country of origin that joined the formal labour market after immigrating. In this paper, we include this possibility within our mobility framework which allows for a better understanding of certain gender-specific patterns.

## Data and Methods

The analysis performed here is based on the micro-data of the Spanish National Survey on Migrants (ENI), carried out by the Spanish Statistical Institute in 2007 with the aim of characterizing the migrant population living in Spain. The sample of

this survey is representative of all residents in Spanish households who were born in other countries, aged 16 and more, and living in Spain at the time of the survey (November 2006 to February 2007).

The full sample of the ENI covers roughly 15,500 individuals (see Reher and Requena 2009). Since the aim of this research to study the patterns of mobility before and after migrating, we selected a subsample of 6,238 cases who were between 25 and 55 years old at the time of migration, and who arrived in Spain between 1997 and 2007. Our key variable of interest is the occupational and labour status of migrants, at three different points in time: before migrating, after arriving in Spain, and at the time of the interview. Although these data have an obvious longitudinal aspect, it is only a reconstruction made by the interviewee herself at the time of the interview. Therefore, the data remain cross sectional, even if we focus on how occupational and labour status changed throughout the migration process. This involves methodological problems, which we can satisfactorily solve in some cases but not in others, which means that we should be cautious in our interpretations, and further research is encouraged. First, the use of retrospective variables means that our results are likely to suffer from some imprecision (increasing with the distance of the event recollected) and information bias (we tend to reconstruct our past according to our present psychological state and needs). Second, on top of such information bias, we are likely to suffer from a selection bias because the survey can only cover the immigrants that came to Spain and stayed until 2007, whereas all those that came but went back after some time are entirely missing. It was important to keep in mind both possible sources of bias when performing and interpreting our analysis, but they should not be overstated. The above-mentioned restriction of the sample should minimize the recollection bias (though not eliminate it, of course), since the longest possible period being reconstructed by respondents is 10 years, and the very limited extent of return migration for the period studied in Spain (Reher et al. 2011) means that the second problem should not be too relevant. As an approximation to a phenomenon studied only to a very limited extent in Spain (and elsewhere), we believe our approach in this paper is useful.

Since our key variable of interest is the occupational level, it is worth presenting it in some detail. The survey used for this paper codes occupation at the two-digit level of the *Classificación Nacional de Ocupaciones* (CNO), the Spanish version of the International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO). This variable, used for classifying respondents according to their jobs at the time of the survey, their last job before migrating, and their first after arriving, has 20 categories which are shown in Table 1. Such a level of detail is unnecessary for our purposes, so we recode occupation into five categories corresponding to three broad occupational levels and two broad sectors of activity. To make such a reclassification, we use three criteria, also shown in Table 1: the ISEI code that corresponds to each ISCO category; the average wages of migrants in those categories according to the survey used in this paper and the average wages of all Spanish workers in the same categories according to the Structure of Earnings Survey of 2006.[1]

[1] ISEI is an international classification of occupational status (for more details see Ganzeboom and Treiman 1996).

As shown in Table 1, the 5-category occupational codes we generate try to put together occupations with similar ranking positions for the three criteria (though not identical, since there are some discrepancies). 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. For instance, one could argue categories 6 (hotel and restaurant service workers), and 20 (other service workers) could also fit in the category of "lower services", since the required level of skills is not very high. Nevertheless, the ISEI ranking and the migrant wage ranking do justify including them in the middle category (though not so much the national wages ranking). These two are probably the most problematic categories: the others fit rather well in our 5-group classification scheme. The five categories of this occupational classification are, in our view, detailed enough to capture the broad mobility patterns associated with the processes of migration and integration into the Spanish labour market, and are the basis for our analysis in this paper. Nevertheless, as a precaution, we have cross-checked all our findings at this level of aggregation with more detailed mobility tables, including the full classification shown in Table 1 (these tables are available on request), confirming the robustness of our overall results.

The other key variable for our purposes is the employment status of the respondent, which is also measured before migrating and at the time of the survey. In the ENI survey, this variable originally has 7 categories, but we recode it into 4: employed, unemployed, studying or household duties. We merge this classification with the occupational designations to produce the 8 category classification used for analysing mobility. We classify each migrant before migrating and at the time of the interview as working as a professional or manager, working as a skilled industrial worker, working as a skilled service worker, working as an unskilled industrial worker, working as unskilled service worker, unemployed, studying or dedicated to household duties. What this means is that, in most of our analysis, we simultaneously study occupational and labour status mobility, which is somewhat atypical but which we believe is important to gain a better understanding of the specificities of the migration process. For instance, since many female migrants were exclusively devoted to household duties before migrating, they would be excluded from a standard mobility analysis (lacking an occupational code at the starting point), despite the fact that the transition from unpaid household duties to low-skilled service occupations (often, paid household duties) is the most frequent move for this group of migrants.

We construct the full 8-category for each respondent in two points of time, according to their answers: just before they left their country of origin and at the moment of completing the survey. For the intermediate moment (after arrival), we cannot construct the full equivalent classification but use a simplified taxonomy with 6 categories: 5 for the occupational level in the first job after arriving and one category for all those that had never worked. This intermediate moment, therefore, is not fully equivalent to the other two (which measure the occupational and labour status of each respondent at two clear-cut moments in time), since it concerns a non-specific moment of time that corresponds to the first job. Still, it is useful to take it

**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 | 1,747.0 | 35,505.3 | 259 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 3 | Upper occupations | 14 |
| 1 | Managers of public sector and big firms | 68 | 2,227.6 | 60,453.2 | 60 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | | |
| 2 | Managers of small firms | 51 | 1,868.3 | 38,661.7 | 94 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | | |
| 4 | Technicians and support professionals | 54 | 1,514.2 | 27,591.9 | 219 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 4 | | |
| 14 | Drivers | 32 | 1,352.6 | 19,677.7 | 112 | 2 | 10 | 5 | 8 | Middling industrial | 22 |
| 11 | Skilled manual workers—heavy industries | 34 | 1,224.7 | 23,685.1 | 143 | 3 | 7 | 6 | 5 | | |
| 12 | Skilled manual workers—light industries | 34 | 1,009.3 | 16,496.9 | 121 | 3 | 8 | 10 | 11 | | |
| 10 | Skilled manual workers—construction | 31 | 1,219.3 | 20,073.3 | 613 | 13 | 11 | 7 | 7 | | |
| 5 | Administrative staff | 45 | 1,045.8 | 18,991.1 | 181 | 4 | 5 | 9 | 9 | Middling services | 20 |
| 8 | Demonstrators and salespersons | 43 | 842.4 | 14,425.9 | 165 | 4 | 6 | 16 | 15 | | |
| 20 | Other service workers | 30 | 1,007.2 | 13,573.2 | 131 | 3 | 13 | 11 | 17 | | |
| 6 | Hostels and restaurant service workers | 32 | 920.5 | 14,389.6 | 444 | 10 | 9 | 14 | 16 | | |
| 13 | Operators and assemblers | 31 | 967.4 | 21,437.1 | 122 | 3 | 12 | 12 | 6 | Lower industrial | 18 |
| 18 | Unskilled manual workers—construction | 21 | 1,054.0 | 15,328.1 | 285 | 6 | 17 | 8 | 12 | | |
| 19 | Unskilled manual workers—industry | 23 | 921.5 | 15,328.1 | 151 | 3 | 16 | 13 | 13 | | |
| 9 | Skilled manual workers—agriculture | 23 | 882.9 | 18,052.7 | 64 | 1 | 15 | 15 | 10 | | |
| 17 | Unskilled manual workers—agriculture | 16 | 831.2 | 15,328.1 | 214 | 5 | 20 | 17 | 14 | | |
| 7 | Unskilled workers in the care sector | 25 | 798.9 | 13,573.2 | 260 | 6 | 14 | 18 | 18 | Lower services | 26 |
| 16 | Cleaning and other unskilled service workers | 16 | 734.0 | 13,573.2 | 265 | 6 | 19 | 19 | 19 | | |
| 15 | Domestic workers | 16 | 653.1 | 13,573.2 | 663 | 15 | 18 | 20 | 20 | | |
| | Total | 31.87 | 1,066.1 | | 4,566 | | | | | | |

*Source* Authors' analysis from ENI07

into account since it allows getting a better understanding of the process of labour market integration of migrants after their arrival in Spain.

For the actual measurement and analysis of the mobility patterns, we use two different approaches. First, following the traditional approach on this issue, we use mobility tables. That is, square contingency tables in which the columns represent the current situation of the respondent with respect to the 8-category classification presented earlier, and the rows represent her situation in the same classification before migrating. In fact, since we have an intermediate point in time (the first job after arrival) between the moment before migrating and the present, in most cases, we decompose this mobility table into a first analysis for the change between before migrating and after arriving and another exploration for the change between after arriving and at the time of the survey. These two intermediate tables are not actually square because the classifications used for classifying the respondents in the rows and columns are not identical, but -as previously argued- they provide useful information for studying their mobility trajectory since their arrival in Spain. The probabilities of transition between the different employment and occupational status in these mobility tables have been calculated with a multinomial logit regression model, which allows controlling for observable heterogeneity, including as covariates a set of individual socio-economic characteristics that can be associated to labour market outcomes.[2] In addition, including the year of arrival among the explanatory variables helps us to control for differences in unobservable characteristics between the different cohorts (unobservable cohort effects). Nevertheless, one should keep in mind that limiting the sample to those that migrated within a short time frame (1997–2007) and the fact that most of migrants moved in search of better economic opportunities (opposed to refugees, a majority in other countries, with very different outcomes) should minimize this problem; in fact, some recent studies do not find very significant differences between cohorts in the recent Spanish experience of migration (Fernández and Ortega 2008). Nevertheless, of course, the cross-sectional nature of the sample does not allow controlling for individual unobserved heterogeneity.

Secondly, we construct synthetic variables holding the mobility pattern for each individual, computed by comparing the state of the individual in the 8-point classification previously mentioned at two points in time. This way, we can classify each individual according to whether they remained in the same category or whether they experienced upward or downward occupational or status mobility. In this case, we use both binomial logit and multinomial logit models to control for the effect of third variables.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that all the analyses have been carried out using the software Stata 12 and considering the individual weighting factor provided with

[2] Overall, control variables include region of origin, educational attainment, year of arrival, age when migrated, recognized qualifications, length of time before first job in Spain, first job obtained through contacts, reasons for migration, family structure when migrated, marriage/partnership status when migrating, home ownership and region (Autonomous Community) of residence in Spain. We group migrants by region of origin into several categories taking into account the most relevant groups in Spain (see, for instance, among many others, Bover and Velilla 2005, and Muñoz de Bustillo and Antón 2010).

the ENI dataset in order to adjust for differential probabilities of selection according to the sampling frame.

## Results

### Step 1: From the Last Job before Migrating to the First Job in Spain

Table 2 shows the patterns of occupational mobility between the last job before migration and the first job after arriving in Spain, using a multinomial logistic regression model with several control variables. The coefficients are shown as probabilities at the mean of each of the control variables, so that one can interpret them as the *ceteris paribus* probability associated with each type of transition between the last job before migrating and the first job after arriving in Spain. For instance, men who had a job classified within "upper occupations" before migrating (basically, professional and technical high skilled jobs in industry and services) have a 16 % chance of remaining in that position after arriving in Spain, and therefore a 82 % chance of experiencing downward mobility associated with migration (the remainder is accounted for by a 2 % marginal probability of not working at all). Most of this downward mobility of the higher occupational groups before migrating (for men) goes to lower industrial occupations (31 %) and middling industrial occupations (29 %).

Thus, one can read the upper section of Table 2 as a standard mobility table, with the peculiarity of having controls (the full table of controls is available on request). The coefficients on the diagonal (highlighted in bold) show the degree of occupational immobility (in other words, the probability of remaining in the same occupational level after migrating), while the coefficients on the right-hand side of the diagonal show the probabilities of downward mobility, and the coefficients on the left-hand side show the probabilities of upward mobility. All results are shown separately for men and women, with the last row in the table showing the differential probability of ending up in each occupational category for each sex.

Even though the upper section of Table 2 is in fact a mobility table, the values within the cells do not look very much like those of a mobility table. In mobility tables, the modal destination for each category usually coincides with the origin: in other words, mobility tables are generally dominated by the probability of staying in the same category, with only a marginal percentage of cases changing category (although, of course, this depends very much on the time scale of the mobility analysis and other factors). In this case, it seems quite striking that the modal destination is the same independently of the origin, for both men and women. In the case of men, the most likely occupational level of migrants after arriving is lower industrial occupations, independently of the occupational level the migrant had before leaving (the single exception being those who had middling industrial occupations before migrating, who are more likely to retain the same position than to fall to the lower industrial category). In the case of women, the modal destination is lower service occupations for women coming from all occupational levels, with a probability close to 50 % or higher in most cases.

**Table 2** Occupational mobility table: from the last job before migrating to the first job in Spain

| | First occupation after arriving in Spain | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Men | | | | | | Women | | | | | |
| | Upper occupations | Middling industrial | Middling services | Lower industrial | Lower services | Never worked | Upper occupations | Middling industrial | Middling services | Lower industrial | Lower services | Never worked |
| Occupation and labour status before migrating | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Upper occupations | **0.16** | 0.29 | 0.18 | 0.31 | 0.05 | 0.02 | **0.12** | 0.03 | 0.18 | 0.06 | 0.53 | 0.08 |
| Middling industrial | 0.05 | **0.44** | 0.11 | 0.34 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.07 | **0.06** | 0.18 | 0.08 | 0.53 | 0.09 |
| Middling services | 0.06 | 0.22 | **0.24** | 0.44 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.01 | **0.22** | 0.07 | 0.55 | 0.10 |
| Lower industrial | 0.08 | 0.22 | 0.13 | **0.53** | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.24 | **0.09** | 0.48 | 0.10 |
| Lower services | 0.12 | 0.09 | 0.05 | 0.66 | **0.08** | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.16 | 0.03 | **0.70** | 0.07 |
| Unemployed | 0.07 | 0.32 | 0.18 | 0.39 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.22 | 0.11 | 0.50 | 0.11 |
| Study | 0.12 | 0.22 | 0.16 | 0.38 | 0.07 | 0.05 | 0.17 | 0.01 | 0.20 | 0.07 | 0.45 | 0.10 |
| Household duties | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.65 | 0.32 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.03 | 0.16 | 0.10 | 0.54 | 0.12 |
| Probability associated with each gender in a (not shown) model with all the sample | 0.11 | 0.27 | 0.17 | 0.36 | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.08 | 0.03 | 0.18 | 0.10 | 0.54 | 0.07 |

Each cell shows the average predicted probability (using a multinomial logit model) of observations in the sample controlling for region of origin, educational attainment, year of arrival, age when migrated, recognized qualifications, length of time before first job in Spain, first job obtained through contacts, reasons for migration, family structure when migrated, marriage/partnership status when migrating, home ownership and region (Autonomous Community) of residence when arriving to Spain. The detailed results of multinominal logit models are available from the authors upon request

*Source* Authors' analysis from ENI07

These findings suggest that the extent of occupational segregation for migrants at the time of arrival is so overwhelming that it makes the whole concept of mobility nearly irrelevant in this case. The usual objective of mobility analysis is to evaluate whether there is immobility or mobility over a particular period of and what kind of mobility there is. In this case, we can well say there is neither mobility nor immobility, but a single entry point to the Spanish labour market for each gender, which has to be taken up by most migrants in their process of integration. In the case of immigrant women, this entry point is lower service occupations, which account for more than half of all first jobs for female migrants in Spain (despite the fact that this occupational category accounted for less than 10 % of the last occupation of the same women before migrating). For male migrants, this entry point is the lower industrial occupations which account for nearly 40 % of all first jobs for male migrants in Spain (in fact, this occupational category accounted for less than 10 % of the last occupation of the same men before migrating).

For both men and women, the middling occupational level associated with their respective entry point also shows relatively high probabilities overall (although much smaller than for the lower occupational levels). This is clearer for male migrants, for whom there is a significant probability of finding a first job in the middling industrial occupations (27 % compared to 36 % on average for low industrial occupations).[3] For women, the probability of finding a first job in middling service occupations is also higher than average, although much smaller than the probability associated with low service occupations (18 % compared to 54 % on average).[4] The probability of finding a job in the highest occupational level is very low for both genders (around 1 in 10 overall, despite this category representing nearly 24 % of the jobs before migrating for our sample of migrants), as is the probability of men working in service occupations (middling or low) or women working in industrial occupations (middling or low).

Furthermore, it is worth noting some important gender differences regarding the transition from non-employment in the country of origin to employment in the host country. This phenomenon is more relevant among migrant women than among their male counterparts because of the significant incorporation of women from unpaid housework to paid work in Spain. In fact, over 10 % of all migrant women in our sample experience this track. The explanation has to do with the progressive incorporation of native women in post-industrial societies to the labour market jointly with the existence of an ageing population demanding for labour in the care services. In other words, the context of reception has clearly favoured the feminization of migration flows and their incorporation to market activities. These secondary market niches are occupied largely by foreign-born women shaping a

[3] This argument is reinforced by looking at the specific occupations within each level shown in Table 1. In the case of women, 60 % of those that find a first job in low service occupations are household cleaners, and a further 25 % are household care workers. In other words, those two occupations alone account for more than 40 % of the first jobs of the overall sample of female migrants. In the case of men, 50 % of those first jobs in low industrial occupations are in agriculture and 35 %, in construction.

[4] The largest occupation within this category is service workers in hotels, restaurants and catering, which accounts for 50 %.

process of "care drain" between developing countries and developed countries (Bettio et al. 2006; Farré et al. 2011).

For this first step in the migration process, which corresponds to the first landing in the Spanish labour market, it seems quite clear that the most fitting theoretical framework is the one that emphasizes the context of reception, that is, the fact that immigrants have to integrate into strongly segmented labour markets and often into very specific occupational niches. The human capital approach would predict a generalized fall in occupational level because of skill and experience transferability problems, but, as argued above, the data suggest that very specific occupational levels (and even specific occupational niches) overwhelmingly dominate the first access to the Spanish labour market irrespective of the human capital endowments of migrants, something at odds with what such theory predicts. The strong differences in the entry point occupations for male and female migrants further reinforce the segmentation interpretation, since, again, it has nothing to do with human capital transferability problems and everything to do with occupational segregation (in this case, by gender, supporting Intersectionality Theory).

In order to discuss the effect of other variables on the degree of occupational mobility in this first step, we have combined the information of the last occupation before migrating and first occupation after arriving in Spain into a single variable reflecting the initial change in labour or occupational status associated with migration. Therefore, we have several possible outcomes of labour status or occupational change: from no employment to employment, from employment to no employment, downward mobility from the top (from upper occupations before migrating to middling or lower occupations in the first job in Spain), downward mobility from the middle, upward mobility from the middle and upward mobility from the bottom. Tables 3, 4 and 5 shows the results of set of binomial and multinomial logit models used for evaluating the association between this mobility outcome variable and different explanatory factors.[5] In all cases, the reference category (not shown) is the corresponding immobility (i.e. not change) in whatever status we are talking about. For instance, the probability that male immigrants with primary education or less will experience downward mobility from upper occupations as a result of migration is 78 % (and consequently, the probability of keeping the same occupational level is 22 %).

It is important to keep in mind when discussing this table that, if our interpretation of the previous table is correct, the standard mobility approach does not fit the case we are studying very well because the whole transition matrix is dominated by a few destination cells, owing to the strong effect of occupational segregation. Still, this approach is necessary in order to be able to evaluate the potential effect of third variables and briefly discuss some of the hypotheses reviewed in the specialized literature.

[5] The mobility analysis presented in Tables 3, 4 and 5 does not comprise all possible combinations of categories of origin and destination used earlier in Table 2, since such number of categories would have made the table extremely large (6 possible destinations for each 8 initial categories yield a total of 48 possible transitions). We merge some of the categories to make the table manageable while retaining the most important types of transitions.

**Table 3** Changes in labour market status from the last job before migrating to the first job in Spain

| | | Labour market activity | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Men | | | | | | Women | | | | | |
| | | Non-employment to employment | | | Employment to non-employment | | | Non-employment to employment | | | Employment to non-employment | | |
| | | PP | AME | SE | PP | AME | SE | PP | AME | SE | PP | AME | SE |
| Origin | EU15/developed economies | 0.25 | Ref | | 0.02 | Ref | | 0.26 | Ref | | 0.05 | Ref | |
| | Eastern Europe | 0.17 | −0.08 | 0.06 | 0.01 | −0.01 | 0.01* | 0.27 | 0.01 | 0.06 | 0.03 | −0.02 | 0.01 |
| | Latin America and The Caribbean | 0.18 | −0.07 | 0.05 | 0.01 | −0.01 | 0.01 | 0.30 | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.03 | −0.02 | 0.01** |
| | Africa | 0.20 | −0.05 | 0.06 | 0.00 | −0.02 | 0.01** | 0.24 | −0.02 | 0.07 | 0.04 | −0.01 | 0.02 |
| | Asia and Oceania | 0.33 | 0.07 | 0.10 | 0.00 | −0.02 | 0.01*** | 0.36 | 0.10 | 0.12 | 0.08 | 0.02 | 0.03 |
| Educational attainment | Primary or less | 0.17 | −0.04 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.01*** | 0.34 | 0.07 | 0.03** | 0.02 | −0.02 | 0.01* |
| | Secondary | 0.21 | Ref | | 0.01 | Ref | | 0.28 | Ref | | 0.04 | Ref | |
| | Tertiary | 0.16 | −0.05 | 0.03* | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.24 | −0.04 | 0.03 | 0.06 | 0.03 | 0.01*** |
| Recognized qualifications | No | 0.19 | Ref | | 0.01 | Ref | | 0.29 | Ref | | 0.04 | Ref | |
| | Yes | 0.17 | −0.03 | 0.06 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.23 | −0.05 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.02 | 0.02 |
| First job through contacts | No | 0.18 | Ref | | 0.03 | Ref | | 0.25 | Ref | | 0.06 | Ref | |
| | Yes | 0.20 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.00 | −0.03 | 0.01*** | 0.31 | 0.06 | 0.03** | 0.00 | −0.06 | 0.01*** |
| Reasons for migrating | Not economic | 0.10 | Ref | | 0.01 | Ref | | 0.17 | Ref | | 0.04 | Ref | |
| | Economic | 0.22 | 0.12 | 0.02*** | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.00** | 0.35 | 0.18 | 0.03*** | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.01 |
| | Not family | 0.19 | Ref | | 0.01 | Ref | | 0.29 | Ref | | 0.03 | Ref | |
| | Family | 0.19 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.26 | −0.03 | 0.03 | 0.05 | 0.01 | 0.01 |

**Table 3** continued

| | | Labour market activity | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Men | | | | | | Women | | | | | |
| | | Non-employment to employment | | | Employment to non-employment | | | Non-employment to employment | | | Employment to non-employment | | |
| | | PP | AME | SE | PP | AME | SE | PP | AME | SE | PP | AME | SE |
| Marriage status when migrated | Single | 0.22 | 0.06 | 0.03** | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.23 | −0.10 | 0.04*** | 0.04 | −0.01 | 0.01 |
| | Married migrated alone | 0.16 | Ref | | 0.01 | Ref | | 0.34 | Ref | | 0.05 | Ref | |
| | Married migrated with spouse | 0.16 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.36 | 0.03 | 0.05 | 0.03 | −0.02 | 0.01* |
| Probability associated with gender in a (not shown) model with all the sample | | 0.18 | Ref | | 0.01 | Ref | | 0.30 | 0.12 | 0.02*** | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.01*** |

PPs correspond to the average probabilities (using binary logit models) of all the observations in the sample, only changing the value of the variable of interest and controlling for region of origin, educational attainment, year of arrival, age when migrated, recognized qualifications, length of time before first job in Spain, first job obtained through contacts, reasons for migration, family structure when migrated, marriage/partnership status when migrating, home ownership and region of residence (Autonomous Community) when arrived to Spain

In the case of AME, the estimated coefficient represents the average change in the predicted probability computed using all the observations of the sample with the model using binary logit models

The detailed results of binary logit models and the PPs and AMESs of the rest of covariates are available from the authors upon request

*PP* predicted probability, *AME* average marginal effects, *SE* heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors

*** Significant at 1 % level, ** significant at 5 % level, * significant at 10 % level

*Source* Authors' analysis from ENI07

**Table 4** Changes in labour market status from the last job before migrating to the first job in Spain

| | | Occupational mobility of men | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | From upper to middling or lower | | | From middling to lower | | | From middling to upper | | | From lower to middling or upper | | |
| | | PP | AME | SE | PP | AME | SE | PP | AME | SE | PP | AME | SE |
| Origin | EU15/developed economies | | | | 0.21 | Ref | Ref | 0.09 | Ref | | 0.27 | Ref | |
| | Eastern Europe | | | | 0.45 | 0.24 | 0.09*** | 0.01 | −0.08 | 0.03** | 0.38 | 0.11 | 0.12 |
| | Latin America and The Caribbean | | | | 0.38 | 0.16 | 0.08* | 0.04 | −0.06 | 0.03* | 0.44 | 0.17 | 0.11 |
| | Africa | | | | 0.56 | 0.34 | 0.10*** | 0.01 | −0.08 | 0.03*** | 0.19 | −0.08 | 0.12 |
| | Asia and Oceania | | | | 0.28 | 0.06 | 0.12 | 0.00 | −0.09 | 0.03*** | 0.36 | 0.09 | 0.22 |
| Educational attainment | Primary or less | 0.78 | 0.11 | 0.12 | 0.44 | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.00 | −0.02 | 0.01*** | 0.31 | −0.05 | 0.07 |
| | Secondary | 0.67 | Ref | | 0.41 | Ref | | 0.02 | Ref | | 0.36 | | |
| | Tertiary | 0.60 | −0.07 | 0.05 | 0.41 | 0.01 | 0.07 | 0.10 | 0.08 | 0.02*** | 0.45 | 0.10 | 0.10 |
| Recognized qualifications | No | 0.65 | Ref | | 0.42 | Ref | | 0.03 | Ref | | 0.35 | | |
| | Yes | 0.61 | −0.04 | 0.07 | 0.24 | −0.18 | 0.09** | 0.09 | 0.06 | 0.04* | 0.49 | 0.14 | 0.19 |
| First job through contacts | No | 0.55 | Ref | | 0.35 | Ref | | 0.04 | Ref | | 0.43 | | |
| | Yes | 0.74 | 0.19 | 0.05*** | 0.44 | 0.08 | 0.04** | 0.02 | −0.02 | 0.01** | 0.32 | −0.11 | 0.07 |
| Reasons for migrating | Not economic | 0.56 | Ref | | 0.38 | Ref | | 0.04 | Ref | | 0.37 | | |
| | Economic | 0.73 | 0.17 | 0.05*** | 0.42 | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.03 | −0.01 | 0.01 | 0.34 | −0.03 | 0.08 |
| | Not family | 0.64 | Ref | | 0.41 | Ref | | 0.03 | Ref | | 0.36 | | |
| | Family | 0.70 | 0.07 | 0.04 | 0.48 | 0.08 | 0.06 | 0.02 | −0.01 | 0.01 | 0.23 | −0.13 | 0.10 |
| Marriage status when migrated | Single | 0.62 | −0.16 | 0.06*** | 0.39 | −0.06 | 0.05 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.01** | 0.41 | 0.12 | 0.09 |
| | Married—migrated alone | 0.77 | Ref | | 0.45 | Ref | | 0.01 | Ref | | 0.29 | | |
| | Married—migrated with spouse | 0.61 | −0.16 | 0.07** | 0.44 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.02** | 0.26 | −0.03 | 0.09 |

**Table 4** continued

| | Occupational mobility of men | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | From upper to middling or lower | | | From middling to lower | | | From middling to upper | | | From lower to middling or upper | | |
| | PP | AME | SE | PP | AME | SE | PP | AME | SE | PP | AME | SE |
| Probability associated with gender in a (not shown) model with all the sample | 0.68 | Ref | | 0.39 | Ref | | 0.04 | Ref | | 0.38 | Ref | |

PPs correspond to the average probabilities (using binary logit models and a multinominal logit model in the case of mobility from middling jobs to elsewhere) of all the observations in the sample, only changing the value of the variable of interest and controlling for region of origin, educational attainment, year of arrival, age when migrated, recognized qualifications, length of time before first job in Spain, first job obtained through contacts, reasons for migration, family structure when migrated, marriage/partnership status when migrating home ownership and region of residence (Autonomous Community) when arrived to Spain

In the case of AME, the estimated coefficient represents the average change in the predicted probability computed using all the observations of the sample with the model using binary logit models (or a multinomial logit model when appropriate)

Because there are too few observations in some cells that makes impossible to estimate all the parameters in the logit models, in the analysis of mobility from upper to middling and lower, we have to exclude the region or origin and, in the analysis of mobility from lower to middling or upper, home ownership

The detailed results of econometric models and the PPs and AMEs are available from the authors upon request

*PP* predicted probability, *AME* average marginal effects, *SE* heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors

*** Significant at 1 % level, ** significant at 5 % level, * significant at 10 % level

*Source* Authors' analysis from ENI07

**Table 5** Changes in labour market status from the last job before migrating to the first job in Spain

| | | Occupational mobility of women | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | From upper to middling or lower | | | From middling to lower | | | From middling to upper | | | From lower to middling or upper | | |
| | | PP | AME | SE | PP | AME | SE | PP | AME | SE | PP | AME | SE |
| Origins | EU15/developed economies | 0.37 | Ref | | 0.41 | Ref | | 0.15 | Ref | | 0.25 | | |
| | Eastern Europe | 0.81 | 0.43 | 0.07*** | 0.69 | 0.28 | 0.10*** | 0.02 | −0.13 | 0.05** | 0.17 | −0.09 | 0.12 |
| | Latin America and The Caribbean | 0.79 | 0.41 | 0.07*** | 0.66 | 0.25 | 0.09*** | 0.04 | −0.11 | 0.06** | 0.17 | −0.08 | 0.11 |
| | Africa | 0.71 | 0.34 | 0.08*** | 0.58 | 0.17 | 0.12 | 0.00 | −0.15 | 0.05*** | 0.21 | −0.04 | 0.12 |
| | Asia and Oceania | 0.63 | 0.26 | 0.16 | 0.33 | −0.08 | 0.17 | 0.00 | −0.15 | 0.05*** | 0.30 | 0.05 | 0.28 |
| Educational attainment | Primary or less | 0.90 | 0.13 | 0.04*** | 0.69 | 0.02 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.12 | −0.10 | 0.04** |
| | Secondary | 0.77 | Ref | | 0.67 | Ref | | 0.02 | Ref | | 0.21 | | |
| | Tertiary | 0.70 | −0.06 | 0.03* | 0.51 | −0.16 | 0.05*** | 0.10 | 0.08 | 0.03*** | 0.33 | 0.11 | 0.08 |
| Recognized qualifications | No | 0.73 | Ref | | 0.64 | Ref | | 0.04 | Ref | | 0.17 | | |
| | Yes | 0.74 | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.64 | 0.00 | 0.08 | 0.03 | −0.02 | 0.02 | 0.92 | 0.75 | 0.10*** |
| First job through contacts | No | 0.63 | Ref | | 0.56 | Ref | | 0.04 | Ref | | 0.20 | | |
| | Yes | 0.81 | 0.18 | 0.03*** | 0.69 | 0.13 | 0.04*** | 0.05 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.17 | −0.02 | 0.05 |
| Reasons for migrating | Not economic | 0.67 | Ref | | 0.54 | Ref | | 0.07 | Ref | | 0.27 | | |
| | Economic | 0.82 | 0.15 | 0.03*** | 0.70 | 0.17 | 0.04*** | 0.02 | −0.04 | 0.03 | 0.15 | −0.12 | 0.05** |
| | Not family | 0.70 | Ref | | 0.65 | Ref | | 0.04 | Ref | | 0.16 | | |
| | Family | 0.82 | 0.12 | 0.03*** | 0.63 | −0.02 | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.23 | 0.07 | 0.05 |
| Marriage status when migrated | Single | 0.74 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.63 | −0.16 | 0.05*** | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.01*** | 0.20 | 0.05 | 0.06 |
| | Married—migrated alone | 0.74 | Ref | | 0.79 | Ref | | 0.00 | Ref | | 0.14 | | |
| | Married—migrated with spouse | 0.70 | −0.05 | 0.07 | 0.63 | −0.16 | 0.06** | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.01* | 0.17 | 0.02 | 0.06 |

**Table 5** continued

| | Occupational mobility of women | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | From upper to middling or lower | | | From middling to lower | | | From middling to upper | | | From lower to middling or upper | | |
| | PP | AME | SE | PP | AME | SE | PP | AME | SE | PP | AME | SE |
| Probability associated with gender in a (not shown) model with all the sample | 0.70 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.69 | 0.30 | 0.03*** | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.17 | −0.21 | 0.04*** |

PPs correspond to the average probabilities (using binary logit models and a multinominal logit model in the case of mobility from middling jobs to elsewhere) of all the observations in the sample, only changing the value of the variable of interest and controlling for region of origin, educational attainment, year of arrival, age when migrated, recognized qualifications, length of time before first job in Spain, first job obtained through contacts, reasons for migration, family structure when migrated, marriage/partnership status when migrating home ownership and region of residence (Autonomous Community) when arrived to Spain

In the case of AME, the estimated coefficient represents the average change in the predicted probability computed using all the observations of the sample with the model using binary logit models (or a multinomial logit model when appropriate)

Because there are too few observations in some cells that makes impossible to estimate all the parameters in the logit models, in the analysis of mobility from lower to middling or upper, we have to exclude home ownership and to group the region of residence Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics (NUTS) 1, which implies 7 large regions

The detailed results of econometric models and the PPs and AMEs are available from the authors upon request

*PP* predicted probability, *AME* average marginal effects, *SE* heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors

*** Significant at 1 % level, ** significant at 5 % level, * significant at 10 % level

*Source* Authors' analysis from ENI07

We have already argued that the segmentation approach fits our data better than the human capital framework, and this table provides some more evidence in that respect. The level of educational attainment has little effect on the overall mobility patterns, except in the case of downward mobility of women, which is significantly reduced by the educational level. The formal recognition of qualifications does not seem to have an important effect either (it only marginally reduces the probability of downward mobility from the middle and increases the probability of upward from the bottom, but the latter effect is only really important in the case of female migrants). On top of the patterns of mobility themselves which we have already discussed, Tables 3, 4 and 5 reinforces the argument of occupational niches for migrants by showing that those who found their first job through contacts are considerably more likely to have experienced downward mobility and less likely to have experienced upward mobility as a result of the first step of the migration process.

With respect to the arguments about the importance of the reasons for migration, our evidence is mixed. On the one hand, the much higher downward mobility (and less upward mobility) of female migrants would fit the arguments of this approach and the existence of multiple and overlapping disadvantages in terms of gender. On the other hand, however, economic migrants experience more downward mobility (the impact is bigger than in the case of family-related migration, which also increases downward mobility but less strongly). Regarding other variables in Tables 3, 4 and 5 (included mostly for controlling purposes), we can highlight a higher upward and lower downward mobility probability for EU15 immigrants than the rest (the results are particularly bad for those of African origin).[6] A last interesting thing to note is that the better the family settlement at the time of migration (migrating with the spouse if married) is associated with a lower probability of downward mobility, possibly because it is an indicator of integration in the host country.

### Step 2: From the First Job in Spain to the Current Job

The next table (Table 6) shows the change in labour status and occupational level of migrants between their first job in Spain and their "current occupation" (at the time of the survey). By construction, the sample used for this table is obviously not identical to the previous one, because those who never worked in Spain are excluded (around 11 % of the cases, 5 % of men and 17 % of women).[7] In other

[6] The variable region of origin has mainly a control purpose. One should interpret the results associated to this variable with care, since it might be capturing unobservable time-varying factors extremely difficult to assess (even with panel data), such as cultural assimilation, progression in terms of language knowledge, etc. and the sample sizes for each group are not large. It is also worth mentioning that the largest differences by region of origin throughout the article correspond to gaps between EU15/developed countries and the rest of foreign-born workers (from developing countries).

[7] This means the probabilities of currently not being in employment are strongly underestimated in the table, since only those that are currently not employed but had at least one job after arriving in Spain are included in the model, a problem which is especially important for women. Although 17 % of female migrants overall are fully dedicated to household duties, the probability of women being in this category is only 8 % according to Table 2: this is because Table 2 refers to the probability of being in such category now for migrants that worked at least once in Spain.

words, the situation of immobility for those who have never worked in Spain is not captured in the table. Although it is important to take that into account when interpreting the table, it should not be a major problem since our main focus is occupational mobility (labour status mobility is only secondary here), and this exclusion helps in the interpretation of the results and facilitates the specification of the model.

The interpretation of Table 6 is basically the same as Table 2: each coefficient represents the probability of each occupational transition between the first job and the current job (or employment status), expressed in marginal probabilities at the mean of each of the control variables. If we look at the upper section of the table, we first notice that this looks more like a typical mobility table. The modal categories of each row are in the diagonal, indicating the highest probability for each category is to remain in the same occupational level at the two points in time, and there is not the same degree of dominance of a single outcome category as in the previous case. There are important differences by gender, however. For male migrants, the extent of stability in the initial occupational level in Spain is much higher than for women, since the coefficients in nearly all cases are around or above 0.5 (indicating a 50 % or more probability of remaining in the initial job), whereas for women such coefficients are below 0.5 in all but two cases (middling and lower service occupations). The probability of upward mobility for men is significant, in particular the possibility of moving up to middling industrial occupations from lower industrial occupations (the entry point to the Spanish labour market for most migrants, as argued above) and from middling service occupations. For women, the probability of upward mobility is quite low and restricted to a move to middling from lower service occupations. For men, there is some probability of downward mobility as well, particularly from upper occupations not only to middling service and lower industrial occupations, but also to unemployment. For women, the probability of downward mobility is much higher, particularly from middling service and industrial occupations to lower service occupations and from all but the lowest occupational level to unemployment.

These results seem to fit the arguments of human capital theory a bit better than the segmentation/segregation approach. After all, the former predicts, over time, the accumulation of human capital in the receiving society (for which there is obviously no transferability problem) facilitates the upward mobility of migrants and at least a partial recovery of the pre-migration occupational level, whereas the latter emphasizes immobility as a result of ethnic occupational segregation. Still, there are at least three arguments to support the relevance of the segmentation approach even for understanding the second step of migration.

First, although there is some degree of upward mobility after arriving in Spain, there is a dominant pattern of immobility in the initial occupational level (overall, around two thirds of migrants remain in the same occupational level as in the first job in Spain). Second, the extent of upward mobility is only significant in the case of male migrants, whereas for women, it is not only low but also counterbalanced by a similar or even higher extent of downward mobility during this second step of migration. And third, if we look at the specific jobs which present the opportunities for upward mobility for male migrants over their first 10 years, we can see they

**Table 6** Occupational mobility table ceteris paribus: from the last job before migrating to the first job in Spain

| | | Current occupation or labour market activity (2007) | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Men | | | | | | | |
| | | Upper occupations | Middling industrial | Middling services | Lower industrial | Lower services | Unemployed | Studying | Household duties |
| First occupation after arriving in Spain | Upper occupations | **0.53** | 0.06 | 0.1 | 0.13 | 0 | 0.16 | 0 | 0 |
| | Middling industrial | 0.03 | **0.75** | 0.07 | 0.06 | 0.01 | 0.06 | 0.01 | 0.01 |
| | Middling services | 0.06 | 0.17 | **0.53** | 0.1 | 0.01 | 0.11 | 0.01 | 0.01 |
| | Lower industrial | 0.04 | 0.27 | 0.09 | **0.47** | 0.03 | 0.09 | 0.02 | 0.01 |
| | Lower services | 0.08 | 0.1 | 0.11 | 0.13 | **0.41** | 0.13 | 0.04 | 0 |
| Probability associated with each gender in a (not shown) model with all | | 0.13 | 0.28 | 0.19 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.09 | 0.01 | 0 |
| | | Women | | | | | | | |
| | | Upper occupations | Middling industrial | Middling services | Lower industrial | Lower services | Unemployed | Studyimg | Household duties |
| First occupation after arriving in Spain | Upper occupations | **0.41** | 0.02 | 0.08 | 0.03 | 0.06 | 0.24 | 0.05 | 0.1 |
| | Middling industrial | 0.03 | **0.26** | 0.2 | 0.12 | 0.18 | 0.14 | 0.01 | 0.07 |
| | Middling services | 0.06 | 0.03 | **0.53** | 0.02 | 0.11 | 0.13 | 0.03 | 0.1 |
| | Lower industrial | 0.06 | 0.04 | 0.18 | **0.26** | 0.19 | 0.14 | 0.02 | 0.12 |
| | Lower services | 0.04 | 0.01 | 0.16 | 0.04 | **0.61** | 0.07 | 0.01 | 0.06 |
| Probability associated with each gender in a (not shown) model with all | | 0.11 | 0.08 | 0.22 | 0.11 | 0.25 | 0.12 | 0.02 | 0.08 |

Each cell show the average predicted probability (using a multinomial logit model) of observations in the sample controlling for region of origin, educational attainment, year of arrival, age when migrated, recognized qualifications, length of time before first job in Spain, first job obtained through contacts, reasons for migration, family structure when migrated, marriage/partnership status when migrating, home ownership and region of residence (Autonomous Community) at the time of the interview

The detailed results of multinominal logit models are available from the authors upon request

*Source* Authors' analysis from ENI07

actually fit the segmentation theory as well, since the upward mobility trajectory is almost totally limited to skilled and semi-skilled jobs in the construction sector being taken up by male migrants who earlier worked as low-skilled construction workers or low-skilled agricultural workers.[8]

Finally, Tables 7, 8 and 9 shows the impact of third variables in a similar way as Table 6. Gender is a variable with a significant impact. Firstly, women are more likely to suffer downward mobility from the middle and less likely to move upwards from the bottom. This finding confirms the interaction between at least two sources of disadvantages for migrant women, gender and the foreign-born condition, in line with Intersectionality Theory and previous studies for Spain (Antón et al. 2012). This issue is associated to the role of some female job niches in the service sector, particularly, domestic work and care services, very relevant even for migrants that have been living in Spain for a number of years. Second, migrant women are significantly more likely to move from employment to non-employment when time of residence in Spain increases, a fact linked to the higher chances of moving from paid employment to house work at certain point of their stay, as shown in Table 6. These findings point to the relevance of family migration decisions and the family investment model, with some women prioritizing their families over their professional careers, and activity decisions often constrained by patriarchal norms and family models pervasive in their countries of origin.

The effect of other variables should also be noted. Educational level has a positive impact on the probability of upward mobility from the bottom and reduces the likelihood of downward mobility for both men and women. Having formally recognized qualifications in Spain has a significant impact on the possibilities for upward mobility for women, whereas this impact is not significant for men. Having obtained the first job through contacts does not seem to change significantly the chances of mobility in this second step, although it does seem to increase the probability of leaving employment for women. Also, getting Spanish citizenship, an indicator of integration present in the specialized literature and very related to the immigration policy of the host country results in a significantly higher probability of leaving employment among women. Another result to highlight is that men who migrated for family reasons seem to experience more downward and less upward mobility. Overall, the results from the control variables do not significantly change our interpretation.

## Conclusions and Discussion

The process of migrating from one society to another represents itself mobility. Most obviously, geographic mobility: but in most cases, occupational mobility as well. Previous literature has shown that, in the short term, the very process of migration tends to be associated with a steep decline in occupational level, which is only recovered partially over time, as the immigrant integrates more fully into the labour market and manages to obtain some recognition for her previous skills and experience.

[8] These findings are consistent with some recent papers on patterns of assimilation in Spain, which find wage and occupational assimilation are both limited (Izquierdo et al. 2009; Rodríguez-Planas 2012).

**Table 7** Changes in occupational status from the first job in Spain to the job in 2007

| | | Change in labour market activity | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Men | | | Women | | |
| | | Employment to non-employment | | | Employment to non-employment | | |
| | | PP | AME | SE | PP | AME | SE |
| Origin | EU15/developed economies | 0.10 | Ref | | 0.17 | Ref | |
| | Eastern Europe | 0.12 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.17 | 0.00 | 0.03 |
| | Latin America and The Caribbean | 0.09 | −0.01 | 0.02 | 0.14 | −0.03 | 0.03 |
| | Africa | 0.14 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.23 | 0.06 | 0.04 |
| | Asia and Oceania | 0.08 | −0.02 | 0.04 | 0.22 | 0.05 | 0.08 |
| Spanish nationality | No | 0.11 | Ref | | 0.15 | Ref | |
| | Yes | 0.10 | −0.01 | 0.03 | 0.23 | 0.08 | 0.03** |
| Educational attainment | Primary or less | 0.13 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.14 | −0.01 | 0.02 |
| | Secondary | 0.10 | Ref | | 0.16 | Ref | |
| | Tertiary | 0.10 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.17 | 0.01 | 0.02 |
| Recognized qualifications | No | 0.11 | Ref | | 0.16 | Ref | |
| | Yes | 0.09 | −0.01 | 0.04 | 0.19 | 0.03 | 0.04 |
| First job through contacts | No | 0.09 | Ref | | 0.12 | Ref | |
| | Yes | 0.11 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.18 | 0.06 | 0.02*** |
| Reasons for migrating | Not economic | 0.13 | Ref | | 0.16 | Ref | |
| | Economic | 0.10 | −0.03 | 0.02 | 0.15 | −0.01 | 0.02 |
| | Not family | 0.10 | Ref | | 0.16 | Ref | |
| | Family | 0.14 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.15 | −0.01 | 0.02 |
| Marriage status when migrated | Single | 0.12 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.17 | 0.02 | 0.02 |
| | Married—migrated alone | 0.11 | Ref | | 0.15 | Ref | |
| | Married—migrated with spouse | 0.09 | −0.02 | 0.02 | 0.16 | 0.00 | 0.02 |

**Table 7** continued

| | Change in labour market activity | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Men | | | Women | | |
| | Employment to non-employment | | | Employment to non-employment | | |
| | PP | AME | SE | PP | AME | SE |
| Probability associated with gender in a (not shown) model with all the sample | 0.10 | Ref | | 0.16 | 0.06 | 0.01*** |

PPs correspond to the average probabilities (using binary logit models) of all the observations in the sample, only changing the value of the variable of interest and controlling for region of origin, having Spanish nationality, educational attainment, year of arrival, age when migrated, recognized qualifications, length of time before first job in Spain, first job obtained through contacts, reasons for migration, family structure when migrated, marriage/partnership status when migrating, home ownership and region of residence (Autonomous Community) at the time of the interview

In the case of AME, the estimated coefficient represents the average change in the predicted probability computed using all the observations of the sample with the model using binary logit models

The detailed results of binary logit models and the PPs and AMESs of the rest of covariates are available from the authors upon request

*PP* predicted probability, *AME* average marginal effects, *SE* heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors

*** Significant at 1 % level, ** significant at 5 % level, * significant at 10 % level

*Source* Authors' analysis from ENI07

**Table 8** Changes in occupational status from the first job in Spain to the job in 2007

| | | Occupational mobility of men | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | From upper to middling or lower | | | From middling to lower | | | From middling to upper | | | From lower to middling or upper | | |
| | | PP | AME | SE | PP | AME | SE | PP | AME | SE | PP | AME | SE |
| Origin | EU15/developed economies | | | | 0.06 | Ref | | 0.04 | Ref | | 0.05 | Ref | |
| | Eastern Europe | | | | 0.07 | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.02 | −0.02 | 0.02 | 0.44 | 0.39 | 0.05*** |
| | Latin America and The Caribbean | | | | 0.07 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.35 | 0.30 | 0.04*** |
| | Africa | | | | 0.09 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.20 | 0.15 | 0.04*** |
| | Asia and Oceania | | | | 0.09 | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.09 | 0.06 | 0.05 | 0.45 | 0.40 | 0.12*** |
| Spanish nationality | No | 0.10 | Ref | | 0.08 | Ref | | 0.04 | Ref | | 0.32 | Ref | |
| | Yes | 0.11 | 0.01 | 0.07 | 0.04 | −0.03 | 0.02 | 0.05 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.51 | 0.19 | 0.08** |
| Educational attainment | Primary or less | 0.11 | Ref | | 0.05 | −0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | −0.01 | 0.01 | 0.26 | −0.10 | 0.04** |
| | Secondary | 0.15 | −0.05 | 0.07 | 0.07 | Ref | | 0.03 | Ref | | 0.36 | Ref | |
| | Tertiary | 0.05 | −0.10 | 0.06* | 0.12 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.07 | 0.04 | 0.02** | 0.38 | 0.02 | 0.06 |
| Recognised qualifications | No | 0.10 | Ref | | 0.08 | Ref | | 0.03 | Ref | | 0.33 | Ref | |
| | Yes | 0.09 | −0.01 | 0.07 | 0.03 | −0.04 | 0.03 | 0.10 | 0.07 | 0.05 | 0.17 | −0.16 | 0.08** |
| First job through contacts | No | 0.06 | Ref | | 0.07 | Ref | | 0.05 | Ref | | 0.34 | Ref | |
| | Yes | 0.17 | 0.12 | 0.05** | 0.07 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.03 | −0.02 | 0.02 | 0.33 | −0.01 | 0.04 |
| Reasons for migrating | Not economic | 0.06 | Ref | | 0.04 | Ref | | 0.05 | Ref | | 0.34 | Ref | |
| | Economic | 0.16 | 0.09 | 0.04** | 0.09 | 0.05 | 0.02*** | 0.03 | −0.01 | 0.01 | 0.33 | −0.01 | 0.06 |
| | Not family | 0.10 | −0.04 | 0.07 | 0.07 | Ref | | 0.04 | Ref | | 0.35 | Ref | |
| | Family | 0.07 | Ref | | 0.14 | 0.08 | 0.04* | 0.02 | −0.03 | 0.01*** | 0.20 | −0.14 | 0.05*** |
| Marriage status when migrated | Single | 0.08 | −0.01 | 0.05 | 0.10 | 0.05 | 0.03* | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.32 | −0.02 | 0.05 |
| | Married—migrated alone | 0.10 | Ref | | 0.05 | Ref | | 0.04 | Ref | | 0.34 | Ref | |
| | Married—migrated with spouse | 0.18 | 0.08 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.06 | 0.03* | 0.02 | −0.02 | 0.01 | 0.31 | −0.03 | 0.06 |

**Table 8** continued

| | Occupational mobility of men | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | From upper to middling or lower | | | From middling to lower | | | From middling to upper | | | From lower to middling or upper | | |
| | PP | AME | SE | PP | AME | SE | PP | AME | SE | PP | AME | SE |
| Probability associated with gender in a (not shown) model with all the sample | 0.11 | Ref | | 0.07 | Ref | | 0.04 | Ref | | 0.36 | Ref | |

PPs correspond to the average probabilities (using binary logit models and a multinominal logit model in the case of mobility from middling jobs to elsewhere) of all the observations in the sample, only changing the value of the variable of interest and controlling for region of origin, having Spanish nationality, educational attainment, year of arrival, age when migrated, recognized qualifications, length of time before first job in Spain, first job obtained through contacts, reasons for migration, family structure when migrated, marriage/partnership status when migrating home ownership and region of residence (Autonomous Community) at the time of the interview

In the case of AME, the estimated coefficient represents the average change in the predicted probability computed using all the observations of the sample with the model using binary logit models (or a multinomial logit model when appropriate)

In the first model (upper to middling or lower), we have to exclude region of origin and to group the region of residence according to the NUTS 1 (and jointly considering the NUTS 1 "Center" and "Madrid", having, thus, 6 regions) because there are too few observations in some cells, which makes impossible to estimate all the parameters in the logit models

The detailed results of econometric models and the PPs and AMEs are available from the authors upon request

*PP* predicted probability, *AME* average marginal effects, *SE* heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors

*** Significant at 1 % level, ** significant at 5 % level, * significant at 10 % level

*Source* Authors' analysis from ENI07

**Table 9** Changes in occupational status from the first job in Spain to the job in 2007

| | | Occupational mobility of women | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | From upper to middling or lower | | | From middling to lower | | | From middling to upper | | | From lower to middling or upper | | |
| | | PP | AME | SE | PP | AME | SE | PP | AME | SE | PP | AME | SE |
| Origin | EU15/developed economies | 0.01 | Ref | | 0.05 | Ref | | 0.23 | Ref | | 0.26 | Ref | |
| | Eastern Europe | 0.15 | 0.14 | 0.06 | 0.17 | 0.13 | 0.04*** | 0.06 | −0.13 | 0.05*** | 0.17 | −0.09 | 0.07 |
| | Latin America and The Caribbean | 0.16 | 0.15 | 0.04*** | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.03*** | 0.06 | −0.10 | 0.05** | 0.18 | −0.08 | 0.07 |
| | Africa | 0.06 | 0.05 | 0.10 | 0.13 | 0.10 | 0.05* | 0.01 | −0.14 | 0.05*** | 0.07 | −0.18 | 0.07** |
| | Asia and Oceania | 0.37 | 0.36 | 0.15 | 0.00 | −0.03 | 0.02 | 0.34 | 0.13 | 0.12 | 0.39 | 0.13 | 0.14 |
| Spanish nationality | No | 0.10 | Ref | | 0.12 | Ref | | 0.08 | Ref | | 0.17 | Ref | |
| | Yes | 0.05 | −0.04 | 0.04 | 0.10 | 0.07 | 0.05 | 0.07 | −0.01 | 0.03 | 0.26 | 0.09 | 0.04** |
| Educational attainment | Primary or less | | | | 0.13 | −0.01 | 0.04 | 0.02 | −0.01 | 0.02 | 0.11 | −0.06 | 0.03** |
| | Secondary | 0.15 | Ref | | 0.17 | Ref | | 0.04 | Ref | | 0.18 | Ref | |
| | Tertiary | 0.05 | −0.10 | 0.05** | 0.04 | −0.07 | 0.03*** | 0.16 | 0.11 | 0.03*** | 0.24 | 0.06 | 0.03** |
| Recognised qualifications | No | 0.08 | Ref | | 0.12 | Ref | | 0.07 | Ref | | 0.17 | Ref | |
| | Yes | 0.10 | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0.14 | −0.02 | 0.05 | 0.13 | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.32 | 0.15 | 0.07** |
| First job through contacts | No | 0.11 | Ref | | 0.10 | Ref | | 0.07 | Ref | | 0.19 | Ref | |
| | Yes | 0.06 | −0.04 | 0.03 | 0.13 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.09 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.17 | −0.03 | 0.02 |
| Reasons for migrating | Not economic | 0.08 | Ref | | 0.10 | Ref | | 0.09 | Ref | | | 0.22 | Ref |
| | Economic | 0.11 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.13 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.06 | −0.03 | 0.02 | 0.16 | −0.06 | 0.03** |
| | Not family | 0.07 | Ref | | 0.10 | Ref | | 0.10 | Ref | | 0.18 | Ref | |
| | Family | 0.15 | 0.08 | 0.05 | 0.16 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.05 | −0.03 | 0.02* | 0.16 | −0.02 | 0.03 |
| Marriage status when migrated | Single | 0.10 | 0.06 | 0.05 | 0.12 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.07 | −0.01 | | 0.15 | −0.02 | 0.03 |
| | Married—migrated alone | 0.05 | Ref | | 0.11 | Ref | | 0.10 | Ref | | 0.17 | Ref | |
| | Married—migrated with spouse | 0.20 | 0.15 | 0.04*** | 0.13 | 0.02 | 0.04 | 0.05 | −0.04 | 0.02* | 0.22 | 0.05 | 0.03 |

**Table 9** continued

| | Occupational mobility of women | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | From upper to middling or lower | | | From middling to lower | | | From middling to upper | | | From lower to middling or upper | | |
| | PP | AME | SE | PP | AME | SE | PP | AME | SE | PP | AME | SE |
| Probability associated with gender in a (not shown) model with all the sample | 0.08 | −0.02 | 0.03 | 0.14 | 0.07 | 0.02*** | 0.06 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.16 | −0.20 | 0.02*** |

PPs correspond to the average probabilities (using binary logit models and a multinominal logit model in the case of mobility from middling jobs to elsewhere) of all the observations in the sample, only changing the value of the variable of interest and controlling for region of origin, having Spanish nationality, educational attainment, year of arrival, age when migrated, recognized qualifications, length of time before first job in Spain, first job obtained through contacts, reasons for migration, family structure when migrated, marriage/partnership status when migrating home ownership and region of residence (Autonomous Community) at the time of the interview

In the case of AME, the estimated coefficient represents the average change in the predicted probability computed using all the observations of the sample with the model using binary logit models (or a multinomial logit model when appropriate)

In the first model (from upper to middling or lower), we have to exclude the very few individuals with primary education in upper jobs and to group the region of residence according to the NUTS 1 (and jointly considering the NUTS 1 "Center" and "Madrid" and "South" and "Canary Islands", respectively having, thus, 5 regions) because there are too few observations in some cells, which makes impossible to estimate all the parameters in the logit models

The detailed results of econometric models and the PPs and AMEs are available from the authors upon request

*PP* predicted probability, *AME* average marginal effects, *SE* heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors

*** Significant at 1 % level, ** significant at 5 % level, * significant at 10 % level

*Source* Authors' analysis from ENI07

In this paper, we have used Spain as a significant case of a massive and very recent wave of labour immigration, associated with a long period of economic growth that ensured good job opportunities for migrants. Using data from a 2007 survey, drawing a subsample of immigrants representative of the surge that took place between 1997 and 2007, we have compared the labour status and occupational level of immigrants at three significant points of the migration process, which in principle should capture the U-shaped pattern identified in the literature: the last job (or labour status) before migrating, the first job after arriving in Spain and the current job (at the time of conducting the survey, which was in 2007). With these three points, we have been able to analyse the patterns of occupational mobility of migrants in two steps: first, the process of labour migration as such (from the last job in the country of origin to the first job in Spain); second, the process of labour market integration over a period of up to 10 years (from the first job in Spain to the current job).

One of the main innovations of this paper is the inclusion of unemployment and inactivity as categories in the models, compared, for instance, with the works of Vono and Vidal (2012) and Simón et al. (2014). This issue definitely matters when drawing the picture of migrant economic mobility in Spain, showing that the progression of foreign-born population in the Spanish labour market during their first decade of residence is very limited. Another contribution over the study of Vono and Vidal (2012), who focus only on the so-called first trajectories, has to do with the more comprehensive view offered here, considering both the first and subsequent occupational movements. We also consider the effect of some family variables excluded from the analysis of Simón et al. (2014). The results reveal a significant transition from women in off-market activities in the country of origin (mainly household duties) to paid employment in the host country. This represents for them an important and positive role change associated with migration, which has been rarely studied in the mobility literature but is especially important considering the feminization of migration in the last decades. After the initial entry in the labour market, we could also observe significantly higher chances of transition from employment to non-employment in the case of women, especially those living with a more stable family settlement, consistent with the literature about the "family migration decisions". This issue might deserve some attention from policy makers if the full incorporation of women, either migrant or native females, to the labour market represents an objective, leading to design of careful and targeted interventions favouring work–family reconciliation.

From our analysis of the first step in the migration process, we have concluded that the degree of occupational segregation in the initial access of immigrants to the Spanish labour market was so strong that the typical approach of mobility analysis does not apply very well. Both for male and female immigrants, a particular category of destination (low industrial occupations for men, low service occupations for women) dominated the table so strongly that it overshadowed the diagonal indicating stability of occupational level. Since such dominant destination categories were very low, one can say that very strong downward occupational mobility characterized the first step. However, again, speaking of mobility in this case seems a bit artificial: rather, it seems more fitting to claim that there was such a degree of occupational segregation for immigrants that the majority of them had to

take jobs in the same low occupational categories independently of their occupational level before migrating. Different control variables such as education, region of origin or year of arrival may slightly reduce this effect in some cases, but with very few exceptions, it does not significantly alter this overall interpretation.

As identified in the literature, the second step (between the first job in Spain and the current one, a period of up to 10 years in our analysis) alleviates the sharp fall in occupational level associated with the first step of the migration process but, according to our results, only for men and only partially. The patterns of occupational change of immigrants over their first decade in Spain seem to fit a mobility analysis much better: the diagonal associated with occupational stability is the dominant category, with significant levels of both upward and downward mobility. The differences by gender in this period are also quite striking: whereas men experienced some possibilities for upward mobility, women still suffered significant levels of downward mobility as well as a relatively high likelihood of abandoning employment altogether. Nevertheless, even in the case of men, migrants faced limited possibilities for upward mobility (certainly much less significant than the downward mobility experienced in the first step of the migration process), usually restricted to skilled and semi-skilled job opportunities in the construction sector.

Not only does the latter factor show that even the trajectories of upward mobility entail some degree of ethnic segregation, but it also casts reasonable doubts about the long-term sustainability of such upward mobility chances for migrants in Spain. The year in which the survey used in this paper was conducted coincided with the crest of the wave of the construction boom in Spain, which may have presented good opportunities for migrants but which had extremely shaky foundations, as later developments proved. In the following years, employment in construction collapsed to 50 % of the peak in 2007. We can only speculate about the impact of this economic earthquake on the opportunities for employment and occupational mobility for migrants, but they are most likely to have been very significant and of course negative. In this respect, it is worth mentioning that the crisis has been hitting particularly hard those sectors where migrant males are over-represented, like construction and some services and industries offering low-skilled jobs. This has meant that the economic turmoil has hurt foreign-born women much less than their male counterparts (Muñoz de Bustillo and Antón 2011). As a consequence, many women have become the main source of household income, which can have important implications in family structures and organization.

**Acknowledgments** The authors thank constructive comments from four anonymous referees and the editor Stephanie Bohon and Rafael Grande, Alberto del Rey and José-Ignacio Antón gratefully acknowledge research funding from the Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness (Research Project CSO2010-16413).

## References

Antón,. J. I., Muñoz de Bustillo, R., & Carrera, M. (2012). Raining stones? Female immigrants in the Spanish labour market. *Estudios de Economía, 39*(1), 53–86.

Baker, M., & Benjamin, D. (1997). The role of the family in immigrants' labor-market activity: An evaluation of alternative explanations. *American Economic Review, 87*(4), 705–727.

Bauer, T., & Zimmermann, K. F. (1999) Occupational mobility of ethnic migrants, IZA Discussion Paper, 58.

Bettio, F., Simmonazi, A. M., & Villa, P. (2006). Change in care regimes and female migration: The 'care drain' in the Mediterranean. *Journal of European Social Policy, 16*(3), 271–285.

Borjas,. G. J. (1987). Self-selection and the earnings of immigrants. *American Economic Review, 77*(4), 531–553.

Bover, O., & Velilla, P. (2005). Migrations in Spain: Historical background and current trends. In K. Zimmermann (Ed.), *European migration: What do we know?* (pp. 389–414). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Caparrós, A., & Navarro, M. L. (2010). Movilidad ocupacional de los inmigrantes en España. *Investigaciones de Economía de la Educación, 5*, 873–890.

Carrasco, R., Jimeno, J. F., & Ortega, A. C. (2008). The effect of immigration on the labor market performance of native-born workers: Some evidence for Spain. *Journal of Population Economics, 21*(3), 627–648.

Chiquiar, D., & Hanson, G. H. (2005). International migration, self-selection, and the distribution of wages: Evidence from Mexico and the United States. *Journal of Political Economy, 113*(2), 239–281.

Chiswick, B. R. (1978a). A longitudinal analysis of the occupational mobility of immigrants. In B. Dennis (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 30th annual winter meeting, Industrial Relations Research Association* (pp. 20–27). Madison, WI: IRRA.

Chiswick, B. R. (1978b). The effect of Americanization on the earnings of foreign-born men. *Journal of Political Economy, 86*(5), 897–921.

Chiswick, B. R. (1999). Are immigrants favorably self-selected? *American Economic Review, 89*(2), 181–185.

Chiswick, B. R., Cohen, Y., & Zach, T. (1997). The labor market status of immigrants: Effects of the unemployment rate at arrival and duration of residence. *Industrial & Labour Relations Review, 50*(2), 289–303.

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

Constant, A., & Massey, D. (2005). Labor market segmentation and the earnings of German guestworkers. *Population Research and Policy Review, 24*(5), 483–512.

Del Río, C., & Alonso-Villar, O. (2012). Occupational segregation of immigrant women in Spain. *Feminist Economics, 18*(2), 91–123.

Domingo, A., & Gil-Alonso, F. (2007). Immigration and changing labor force structure in the Southern European Union. *Population (English Edition), 62*(4), 709–727.

Duleep, H., & Dowhan, D. J. (2002). *Revisiting the family investment model with longitudinal data the earnings growth of immigrant and U.S.-born women*. Bonn: IZA.

Duleep, H. O., & Regets, M. C. (1999). Immigrants and human-capital investment. *American Economic Review, 89*(2), 186–191.

Duleep, H. O., & Sanders, S. (1993). The decision to work by married immigrant women. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 46*(4), 677–690.

Farré, L., González, L., & Ortega, F. (2011). Immigration, family responsibilities and the labor supply of skilled native women. *B.E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy, 11*(1), 1–48.

Fernández, C., & Ortega, C. (2008). Labor market assimilation of immigrants in Spain: Employment at the expense of bad job-matches? *Spanish Economic Review, 10*(2), 83–107.

Flippen, C. A. (2013). Intersectionality at work: Determinants of labor supply among immigrant Hispanic women. Paper presented in Population Association of American 2013 annual meeting program, April 11–13, New Orleans, LA.

Furtado, D., & Theodoropoulos, N. (2010). Why does intermarriage increase immigrant employment? The role of networks. *B.E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy, 10*(1), 1–33.

Ganzeboom, H. B., & Treiman, D. J. (1996). Internationally comparable measures of occupational status for the 1988 International Standard Classification of Occupations. *Social Science Research, 25*(3), 201–239.

Goel, D., & Lang, K. (2010). Social ties and the job search of recent immigrants, NBER Working Paper, 15186.

Gordon, I. (1995). Migration in a segmented labor market. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, 20*(2), 139–155.

Gordon, D. M., Edwards, R., & Reich, M. (1982). *Segmented work, divided workers: The historical transformation of labor in the United States*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Grande, R., & Del Rey, A. (2012). Remesas, proyectos migratorios y relaciones familiares. El caso de los latinoamericanos y los Caribeños en España. *Papeles de Población, 18*(74), 237–272.
Izquierdo, M., Lacuesta, A., & Vegas, R. (2009). Assimilation of immigrants in Spain: A longitudinal analysis. *Labour Economics, 16*(6), 669–678.
Kalter, F., & Kogan, I. (2002). *Ethnic inequalities at labour market entry in Belgium and Spain*. Mannheim: MZES.
Kogan, I. (2004). Last hired, first fired? The unemployment dynamics of male immigrants in Germany. *European Sociological Review, 20*(5), 445–461.
Kossoudji, S. A., & Cobb-Clark, D. A. (2000). IRCA's impact on the occupational concentration and mobility of newly-legalized Mexican men. *Journal of Population Economics, 13*(1), 81–98.
Lam, K., & Liu, P. (2002). Earnings divergence of immigrants. *Journal of Labor Economics, 20*(1), 86–104.
Long, J. E. (1980). The effect of Americanization on earnings: Some evidence for women. *Journal of Political Economy, 88*(3), 620–629.
Mahuteau, S., & Junankar, P. N. (2008). Do migrants get good jobs in Australia? The role of ethnic networks in job search. *Economic Record, 84*(Supl. 1), S115–S130.
Massey, D., Alarcón, R., Durand, J., & González, H. (1987). *Return to Aztlan: The social process of international migration from Western Mexico*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Mincer, J. (1978). Family migration decisions. *Journal of Political Economy, 86*(5), 749–773.
Mullan, B. P. (1989). The impact of social networks on the occupational status of migrants. *International Migration, 27*(1), 69–86.
Muñoz de Bustillo, R., & Antón, J. I. (2010). De la España que emigra a la España que acoge: contexto, dimensión y características de la migración latinoamericana en España. *América Latina Hoy, 55*, 15–39.
Muñoz de Bustillo, R., & Antón, J. I. (2011). From the highest employment growth to the deepest fall: Economic crisis and labour inequalities in Spain. In D. Vaughan-Whitehead (Ed.), *Work inequalities in the crisis. Evidence from Europe* (pp. 393–444). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
Parella, S. (2003). *Mujer, inmigrante y trabajadora: la triple discriminación*. Barcelona: Anthropos.
Patel, K., & Vella, F. (2013). Immigrant networks and their implications for occupational choice and wages. *Review of Economics and Statistics, 95*(4), 1249–1277.
Piore, M. J. (1975). Notes for a theory of labor market stratification. In R. C. Edwards, M. Reich, & D. M. Gordon (Eds.), *Labor market segmentation* (pp. 125–149). Lexington: Lexington Books.
Piore, M. J. (1979). *Birds of passage: Migrant labor and industrial societies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Portes, A., & Borocz, J. (1989). Contemporary immigration: Theoretical perspectives on its determinants and modes of incorporation. *International Migration Review, 23*(3), 606–630.
Portes, A., & Rumbaut, R. G. (1990). *Immigrant America: A portrait*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Powers, M. G., & Seltzer, W. (1998). Occupational status and mobility among undocumented immigrants by gender. *International Migration Review, 32*(1), 21–55.
Redstone Akresh, I. (2006). Occupational mobility among legal immigrants to the United States. *International Migration Review, 40*(4), 854–884.
Reher, D., & Requena, M. (2009). The National Immigrant Survey of Spain. A new data source for migration studies in Europe. *Demographic Research, 20*(12), 253–278.
Reher, D. S., Requena, M., & Sanz, A. (2011). ¿España en la encrucijada?: consideraciones sobre el cambio de ciclo migratorio. *Revista Internacional de Sociología, 69*(1), 9–44.
Rodríguez-Planas, N. (2012). Wage and occupational assimilation by skill level: Migration policy lessons from Spain. *IZA Journal of European Labor Studies*, *1*(8).
Rooth, D., & Ekberg, J. (2006). Occupational mobility for immigrants in Sweden. *International Migration, 44*(2), 57–77.
Simón, H., Ramos, R., & Sanromá, E. (2014). Immigrant occupational mobility: Longitudinal evidence for Spain. *European Journal of Population, 30*(2), 223–255.
Stanek, M., & Veira, A. (2012). Ethnic niching in a segmented labour market: Evidence from Spain. *Migration Letters, 9*(3), 249–262.
Sullivan, T. A. (1984). The occupational prestige of women immigrants: A comparison of Cubans and Mexicans. *International Migration Review, 18*(4), 1045–1062.

Vidal, E., Domingo, A., & Gil-Alonso, F. (2009). The non-EU-25 female population in Spain: A factor analysis of labour market integration at regional level. In M. Kuhn & C. Ochsen (Eds.), *Labour markets and demographic change* (pp. 211–234). Rostock: Demografisher Wandel, Hintergrunde und Herausforderungen, VS Verlag.

Vono, D., & Vidal, E. (2012). The impact of informal networks on labour mobility: Immigrants' first job in Spain. *Migration Letters, 9*(3), 237–247.

Weiss, Y., Sauer, R. M., & Gotlibovski, M. (2003). Immigration, search, and loss of skill. *Journal of Labour Economics, 21*(3), 557–591.

Yamauchi, F., & Tanabe, S. (2008). Nonmarket networks among migrants: Evidence from metropolitan Bangkok, Thailand. *Journal of Population Economics, 21*(3), 649–664.