Segmented Occupational Mobility: The Case of Non-EU Immigrants in Spain

Movilidad ocupacional segmentada: el caso de los inmigrantes no comunitarios en España

María Aysa-Lastra and Lorenzo Cachón

Key words

Occupational Mobility
• International Migration
• Foreign Workers
• Labor Market Segmentation
• Economic Integration of Immigrants

Abstract

Literature regarding immigrant economic integration tends to highlight a U-shaped economic mobility pattern. Our article challenges this argument based on labor market segmentation theories and an occupational mobility analysis made from a "class structure" perspective. Data from the 2007 National Immigrant Survey in Spain was used to create mobility tables indicating immigrants' occupational mobility fluidity from their last employment in their country of origin to their first employment in Spain (n = 7,280), and from their first employment in Spain to their current employment (n = 4,031), estimating odds ratios in order to examine the relative mobility. Two labor market segments were identified as having frequent occupational mobility within them and limited mobility outside of them. Our analysis suggests the existence of a *segmented* U-shaped pattern of immigrant occupational mobility.

Palabras clave

Movilidad ocupacional
• Migración internacional
• Trabajadores extranjeros
• Segmentación del mercado de trabajo
• Integración económica de los emigrantes

Resumen

La literatura sobre la integración económica de los inmigrantes ha destacado la existencia de un patrón de movilidad en forma de «U». En este artículo discutimos esta argumentación partiendo de las teorías de la segmentación del mercado de trabajo y del análisis de la movilidad desde la perspectiva de la «estructura de clase». Se analizan los datos de la Encuesta Nacional de Inmigrantes de 2007 para elaborar tablas de movilidad ocupacional de los inmigrantes entre su última ocupación en origen a la primera ocupación en destino (n = 7.280), y desde la primera a la última ocupación en España (n = 4.031), estimando razones de probabilidad para estudiar la movilidad relativa. Se han identificado dos segmentos del mercado laboral dentro de los cuales la fluidez ocupacional es frecuente y fuera de los cuales es limitada. Nuestro análisis sugiere la existencia de un patrón de movilidad ocupacional *segmentada* de los inmigrantes en forma de «U».

Citation

María Aysa-Lastra: Florida International University | aysam@fiu.edu
Lorenzo Cachón: Universidad Complutense de Madrid | lcachon@cps.ucm.es

Introduction

Ever since Thomas and Znaniecki's *Polish Peasant in Europe and America* study (2004 [1918]), literature has frequently examined social and occupational mobility and the related concept of migrant geographic mobility. The majority of these studies are based on the underlying logic of the "organization-disorganization-reorganization" cycle developed by Thomas and reformulated by other authors from the Chicago School. Such is the case with Chiswick's seminal works (1977; 1978) on a U- shaped pattern of immigrant occupational mobility in immigrant's incorporation into the labor market of their destination country. A considerable portion of the literature was developed in the wake of Chiswick, creating notable comparative advances. However, other alternative perspectives have been widely ignored in this area. First, the omission of labor market segmentation theories. The absence of these theories in this field is particulary surprising given the pervasive references to immigrants' geographic, occupational, and social segregation in host-country societies. Second are the results of social mobility sociology, in particular, "social fluidity" approaches, analyzed from the related costs of mobility. This is of particular relevance when considering that migrations are, in themselves, social mobility processes.

The objective of this article is to examine occupational mobility in non-European Union immigrants in Spain, both at their initial time of migration, comparing their last employment in their country of origin with their first employment in Spain and their most recent employment in Spain at the time of the survey. We will examine this typically downward mobility of the first moment followed by the upward "counter-mobility" of the second, demonstrating that it occurs almost exclusively *within* a segment (primary or secondary) of the labor market. Immigrant data collected retrospectively from the 2007 National Immigrant Survey was used.

The Spanish case study has been incorporated into recent migration literature. This is logical since the "immigrant Spain" phenomenon (Cachón 2002) is relatively recent. It is only since the first decade of the 21st century that immigration has become a massive phenomenon: immigrants grew from 2.9% of Spain's population in 2000, to 12.3% in 2011. Over this time, Spain has become the member state of the European Union (EU) with the largest proportion of foreigners living within its territory (with the exception of four small countries). Over the decade 1997-2007, employment in Spain grew at an extraordinary pace: average annual growth over these ten years was 5%, with employment among the immigrant population growing at an average annual rate of 147%. However, the labor market continues to be highly sensitive to the economic cycle, having high temporary employment taxes, low wages and with some 28% of the population being engaged in four activity areas: agriculture, construction, the hotel industry and domestic services (Aysa-Lastra and Cachón 2012).

This article is structured into five sections, in addition to this introduction. Section 2 offers a brief review of the main focuses and results of the study of immigrant occupational mobility in the aftermath of Chiswick; section 3 presents the theoretical approaches on which we have based this study as well as our research hypotheses; section 4 offers the data source and methodology used; the 5th section presents the results of the absolute and relative mobility rates; and finally, the 6th section offers conclusions and a discussion of the results in relation to the proposed hypotheses.

The study of immigrant occupational mobility in the aftermath of Chiswick

In the late 1970s, B. R. Chiswick published a series of studies announcing "some appa-

rently universal patterns". In these studies, he presented what would later be referred to as a U-shaped pattern of earnings and employment occurring in the immigrant assimilation process, due to the "effect of Americanization" (Chiswick 1978). In 1977, he compared immigrant employment from 1965 and 1970; and in 1978, he examined salary evolution for white male immigrants. The conclusions made led to the publishing of a third article (1979) titled "The Economic Progress of Immigrants". These early texts suggested the existence of "a single, relatively simple model [that] can explain [immigrant's] progress regardless of ethnic group": although the immigrants initially had lower wages than their equivalent US counterparts (approximately 10% lower after residing in the United States for five years), later their incomes grew rapidly and after 13 years, the incomes for both groups were similar; once the immigrants resided in the United States for at least 20 years, their average salaries were approximately 6% higher than those of the US natives. Later, having data regarding the last employment of the immigrants in their country of origin, a comparison of this employment with the first in the destination country and with the current employment allowed for the confirmed of the U-shaped occupational pattern. Chiswick *et al.* (2005) went on to create this model for the immigrant experience in Australia.

Chiswick identified two principal determining factors in immigrant economic progress: transferability and self-selection. The greatest initial difficulties in finding employment for immigrants in the United States were attributed to the fact more likely than not, foreign human capital, in the form of the immigrant employee, has a less than perfect transferability to the US labor market (Chiswick *et al.* 1997). These difficulties in transferability of certain qualifications are compensated for by the immigrants with the acquisition and improvement of language skills and by improving their knowledge of the customs and functioning of the labor market. Further, immigrants make new training investments that are relevant to their employment in their new destination (Chiswick 1978). The second determinant, self-selection, is a standard proposition in economic literature used to explain immigrant economic success: economic migrants are typically described as being more capable, ambitious, aggressive and entrepreneurial than similar individuals opting to remain in their country of origin (Chiswick 1999). This line of reasoning is considered from the supply side, however, when analyzed from the demand perspective (selection and visa processing policies) the result is similar (Chiswick 2008). Self-selection presents significant variations in the "apparently universal pattern" based on immigration motivation and other circumstances including country of origin, racial or ethnic group, level of education and employment qualifications level in the country of origin (Chiswick 1978, 1979, 2008).

This literature has demonstrated that initial occupational mobility is, above all, a downward mobility followed by a limited upward "counter-mobility" process (Weiss *et al.* 2003; Redstone 2006 and 2008). This initial downward mobility has been explained by problems of qualifications transferability (Chiswick *et al.* 2005); by a greater or lesser degree of economic, cultural or linguistic proximity between country of origin and country of destination which may ease or hinder this transferability (Redstone 2006); or by deficiencies in migrants' initial human capital, as it has been shown that current immigrant flows are less qualified than they were in the past (Borjas 1995; 1999).

The study of immigration in Spain has been recently included in this discussion. It is not yet possible to definitively evaluate the second transition of Chiswick's "U" pattern, as a short amount of time that has passed since the massive immigration wave in Spain of the decade prior to 2007. Initial research studies on the immigrant situation in the

Spanish labor market suggest that immigrants are at a disadvantage (Cachón 1995; 1998 IOÉ Collective; Carrasco 1999; Sole 2001; Parella 2003). Research has also shown: that immigrants tend to be placed in employment positions with low qualifications, as compared to natives (Amuedo and De la Rica 2009; Bernardi et al. 2011); this occupational segregation is the fundamental explanation for the immigrant salary disadvantage (Simón et al. 2008); immigrants tend to be over-qualified (educationally) and tend to hold temporary jobs (Fernández and Ortega 2008); immigrants do not attain the employment status and/or salary level of native workers having comparable human capital (Amuedo and De la Rica 2007; Cachón 2009; Sanroma et al. 2009; Caparros and Navarro 2010; Stanek 2011; Martín et al. 2011); that although the wage differential is significantly reduced over the first 5-6 years, this differential never completely disappears (Izquierdo et al. 2009); labor niches (Veira et al. 2011) repeat in the case of some collectives such as the Polish (Stanek 2011); and that immigrants are much more mobile than native workers (Alcobendas and Rodríguez 2009). Using Social Security records, a significant upward mobility has also been found when following the work trajectory of immigrants in Spain (Martín *et al* 2011), although it does not reach the same level as that of natives (Alcobendas and Rodríguez 2009), or their previous level in their countries of origin (Izquierdo *et al.* 2009).

The 2007 National Immigrant Survey has allowed for the comparison of many other international hypotheses for the Spanish case. Diverse studies have demonstrated how immigrants in Spain suffer a notably downward occupational mobility trend upon incorporating themselves into the labor market, which is followed by a partial "countermobility" (Cachón 2009; 2010 IOÉ Collective, Stanek and Veira 2009, Simón et al. 2010). These studies have demonstrated the relevance of educational level and place of origin

to immigrant mobility in Spain (Caparros and Navarro 2010) and how the human capital acquired in Spain has a higher marginal profitability than that accumulated in the country of origin (Sanroma *et al.* 2009). Stanek and Veira (2009) analyzed occupational descent as a result of emigration into Spain, accentuating gender, human capital and the social networks. Similar behavior was demonstrated by Caparros and Navarro (2010), accentuating educational levels and immigrant places of origin. Simon *at al.* (2010) considered a large set of explanatory factors in order to study occupational trajectory between country of origin, first employment and current employment in Spain.

The dominant theoretical orientation underlying the studies regarding occupational mobility of immigrants created in the wake of Chiswick is that of the "social hierarchy" (Erikson and Goldthorpe 1993). Most of these studies consider mobility to be produced across a hierarchical occupational scale with immigrants moving between the distinct occupations. It is the same implicit assumption as that of the functionalist theories of stratification (Grusky 1994). Therefore, there is a preference for studying the evolution of immigrant salaries, an easily moldable continuous variable whose results are clearly interpreted. Moreover, when analyzing occupations researchers frecuency use prestige or status scales. The "limits" in these scales are formal, artificial and displaceable, offering a continuous and automatically hierarchical nature. These are graduated approaches. It may be taken for granted, as in the neoclassic approach to the labor market, that individuals move across this entire social scale (occupational/salary). These studies analyzed the determining factors behind salary or occupational achievement with the support of the theoretical perspective of human capital (Becker 1993[1964]). At times, explanatory hypotheses are formulated, linked to other theoretical assumptions such as those of social capital or labor market segmenta-

tion, but only for analytical purposes, to assist in results comprehension.

THEORETICAL FOUNDATION AND RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

Our discussion regarding the Chiswick argument is based on the selective reading of two approaches that offer alternative concepts to analyze economic (occupational) integration of immigrants: the theories of labor market segmentation and the offerings of social mobility sociology, in particular, regarding the concept of "social fluidity".

Although it may be traced back to the idea of segmentation from the classics of economics, theories of labor market segmentation began being formulated as such in the 1950s. Dunlop (1957) spoke of "wage contours" and "job clusters", with this last group being composed of specific occupations. The works of Piore and his colleagues on the one hand, and those of Edward and his colleagues (1975) on the other hand, strengthened this analytical approach in the 1970s. The basic initial idea, formulated by Doeringer and Piore (1985[1971]), is that the labor market is divided into two distinct segments, referred to as *primary* and *secondary*. The primary segment includes work positions of relatively elevated salaries, good working conditions, promotion possibilities, more regulated procedures and more employment stability. On the other hand, secondary segment positions have the opposite characteristics. While there is a potential controversy regarding the number of segments making up the labor market, what is important is not how many segments actually exist, but the fact that there are labor market "discontinuities" with barriers between the segments (Berger and Piore 1980). These discontinuities reveal segments of distinct functioning principles (training, promotion, wage determination processes, etc.) and different employer and employee behavior

traits (Villa 1990). But it is also important to determine whether or not there is mobility between these segments and if there are patterns to this mobility. It has been determined that these segments have intense circulation *within* them and limited circulation *between* them. If the existence of a relative lack of mobility between the segments can be determined, then another particularly solid characteristic may be added to the "classist" nature of the labor market segmentation theory based on this line of argumentation. Defining the segments based on the fact that there is no significant mobility between them is not a redundancy or a circular argument. This "lack of circulation" is, precisely, one of the features of the segments/classes: a segment "closure".

Current labor market segmentation theories continue to offer relevant concepts for the understanding of social phenomenon and, over recent years, there has been a renewed interest in these concepts, as demonstrated by the anthology edited by Reich (2008) *Segmented Labor Markets and Labor Mobility*.

The labor market segmentation theories suggest that some groups of individuals get "trapped" in secondary sector jobs early on in their careers, among other reasons, because they have been socialized in a specific "moral" (Edward 1979; Sabel 1986). Immigrants form one of the most susceptible collectives, having a greater potential to wind up in this situation. But this "confinement" must be examined and explained (Granovetter 1994). Few researchers have analyzed immigrant mobility between occupational segments. Rosenberg (1981) demonstrated that immigrants who begin working in the secondary segment had fewer chances of moving into the primary segment than did white workers controling for human capital variables that failed to explain this behavior. Dickens and Lang (1985) suggested that the results of their research offered strong support for two of the primary foundations of

the labor market segmentation theories: there are two distinct segments of the labor market having different wage determination mechanisms and non-economic barriers exist between them. Upon analyzing the immigrant situation in Austria, Fassmann (1997) suggested that real world observations show that native and foreign workers and their job positions are heterogeneous, being situated in different labor segments having distinct and separate allocation mechanisms and structures.

Analysis of social mobility has been a main question in social stratification sociology as it confirms a primary assumption: that mobility *should* exist. However, faced with this assumption, it may be said that the fundamental discovery in the studies of social mobility, is *in*variance, instability, social reproduction (Cachón 1989). Therefore, this perspective must be radically repositioned to "focus, not on the explanations of social change via class relations, but rather on understanding the processes that underlie the profound resistance to change that such relations offer" (Goldthorpe and Marshall 1997: 61-2).

It may be said that this line of argumentation has led to the "discovery" that social *in*variance over the course of five stages. The first stage is that of the pioneering work conducted by Sorokin (1959[1859]) and his finding that social stratification is an endogenous factor of social mobility. The second includes the hypothesis offered by Lipset and Zetterberg (1959: 90), suggesting that "mobility patterns in Western industrialized societies are determined by the occupational structure" and since this tends to be similar among industrial societies, mobility patterns also tend to be similar. The third stage is a new "provisional hypothesis" offered by Featherman, Jones and Hauser (FJH) (1975: 340) establishing that "the genotypic pattern in terms of mobility (mobility of movement) in industrial societies with a market economy and a nuclear family system is basically the same. The phenotypic mobility pattern (ob-

served mobility) differs according to the rate of change in the occupational structure". The fourth stage includes a set of theoretical, analytical and methodological contributions from diverse authors including Miller (who referred to the structural change of "fluidity"), Goldthorpe (who distinguished between "phenotype" and "genotype" and introduced the concept of "desirability"), Girod (1971) (who introduced the "counter-mobility" concept, in reference to the movement in which the original position is recovered) and Hauser and colleagues (who discussed an "endogenous regimen of mobility"). The hypothesis of FJH has been included among these instruments in the fifth stage, along with the works of Goldthorpe *et al.* (Goldthorpe 1980, 2010; Erikson and Goldthorpe 1993) in their discussion of a "constant fluidity model": there is a degree of temporary constancy and a similarity between countries in relative rates of intergenerational class mobility.

Goldthorpe (2010) summarized the current theoretical arguments regarding social mobility in two aspects: first, the absolute rates of intergenerational class mobility, wich have a considerable variation across time result from exogenous "structural effects", or the evolution of the class structure; second evolved the relative rates seem to be characterized by a surprising degree of *in*variance: that is, by a temporary instability and a substantive transnational similarity. These "endogenous mobility regimens" or "fluidity" seem to determine processes that are mostly systematic and independent of context; in other words, they operate in a similar manner across a wide variety of societies, having numerous social regularities. Based on these approaches, the number of studies on social mobility has increased considerably in recent years.

Classic works in this field such as those of Lipset and Zetterberg (1959) and Blau and Duncan (1967) highlighted the importance of analyzing immigration within a social mobility research program and advanced some of the key concepts that would

be reformulated over a decade later by economists such as Chiswick. For example, Blau and Duncan (1967:256-257) suggested that "migrants in general, have more successful careers than other men", and concluded that their results are "consistent with the interpretation that migration is a selective process of individuals who are predisposed for professional success". In addition, they offered a hypothesis: migration is an advantageous experience improving an individual's occupational skills. However, this line of research did not influence general research on social mobility or the work of Chiswick. This discontinuity may explain why methodological sociology innovations were not included in the study of immigrant occupational mobility. Sociologists have embarked on a successful yet parallel course: analysis of the trajectories of second and third generation immigrants (Portes 2012; Telles and Ortiz 2011).

Our article examines occupational mobility of first generation immigrants. We revise the U-shaped pattern proposed by Chiswick and suggest the existence of a *segmented* U-shaped mobility pattern for these immigrants. Therefore, we begin from a "class structure" perspective (Erikson and Goldthorpe 1993) that assumes that there are ruptures between distinct numbers of "discrete" sets of social echelons in which individuals occupy positions. This approach requires the classification of individuals into mutually exclusive and comprehensive categories. The brief summary of labor market segmentation theories and social mobility sociology that we presented suggests the existence of a lack of mobility between labor market segments, as well as a lack of fluidity between classes. It also allows us to demonstrate that labor integration within each of these segments is different and that the determining factors of the initial downward occupational mobility are different for each labor market segment, as well as determinants associated with the limited mobility between segments.

In examining immigrant occupational mobility, we are not conducting a study of "social mobility", as we are not analyzing "social classes" (Erikson *et. al* 2012). We are not driven by a Durkheimian perspective to discover "micro-classes" in occupational categories (Grusky 2005); rather, we use a dual approach Weberian perspective (Breen 2005): we examine "occupational aggregates" (using a one-digit level of the International Standard Classification of Occupations) to study occupational change, and we use "exchange cluster" criteria to construct the labor market segments.

Our analysis is not, however, limited to a mere study of occupational mobility opposing the results of Chiswick and other authors. As in labor market segmentation theories, we base our work on the assumption that the labor market functions in a segmented manner and that there are segments having distinct features, both from the supply and the demand perspective. One persistent problem in this area is the difficulty in defining these labor segments (Rosenberg 1980; Boston 1990). It is possible to distinguish between two (or more) occupational group segments (primary and secondary; manual and non-manual, in occupational terms) in function of some of their characteristics. But we have proceeded in a different manner in order to define the segments as discrete spaces in terms of mobility. We do not group the occupations *a priori,* in function of indicators such as salary or prestige, but rather, we define the segments in accordance with occupational fluidity limits based on empirical data. The definition of the segments, on this basis, is not a redundancy because a lack of mobility linked to the market barriers is a fundamental characteristic of the segments: they are closed social spaces. What Weber (1969[1922]:142) discussed in reference to social classes is applicable to the labor market segments: "*Social class* refers to the entirety of the class situations *between* which a personal exchange in the succession of ge-

nerations is easy and occurs frequently". Paraphrasing Weber, we can say that in general, a labor segment is a "cluster of occupations" having some common characteristics including the easy and frequent personal exchange of occupational positions. Our empirical test resolves any uncertainty regarding limits between the occupational clusters, as it allows for the data to set the segment limits. If segment limits coincide with those identified in the labor market segmentation theories, then the segment limits are defining limited spaces in which the agents develop their mobility strategies. But for this, the segment limits must extend beyond some aspect of the labor market segmentation theories that do not consider the importance of mobility or lack of mobility between the primary and secondary segments, as labor market theories choose to emphasize functioning mechanisms, rules and results (Villa 1990). On the contrary to this argument, we suggest the importance of considering these mobility processes (greater or fewer) between segments as a structural characteristic of the segmented labor market. As Blau and Duncan (1967:60) suggested, "a persistent pattern of disproportionate low movements between occupational groups is all that is needed to suggest a class limit".

We aim to re-examine the initial downward and subsequent upward pattern of the Chiswick "U" from this theoretical context. Our study will test two of the Chiswick *et al.* (2005) hypotheses on the Spanish case, but reformulated from a double dimension: the occupational mobility processes are produced *within* the primary and secondary segments and *rarely* occur outside of these segments; and the analysis will not be made with absolute rates showing total mobility, but rather, with relative rates allowing us to uncover the occupational "fluidity". Our two hypotheses are the following:

1. According to Chiswick *et al.* (2005), "immigrants experience a decrease in occupational status from the country of origin to their destination and a posterior increase over time in the destination", that is, the U-shaped occupational pattern remains, but both the initial downward occupational mobility (between employment in the origin and first employment in Spain) and the later partial upward counter-mobility (between first employment and current employment) of non-European Union immigrants is produced *within* two large occupational segments and practically only within them. That is, there is a *segmented U-shaped occupational pattern*. The relative mobility rates allow us to demonstrate a large degree of "fluidity" occurring *within* the segments that is limited *outside* of them in the two transitions.

2. The *segmented U-shaped occupational pattern* may present variations having regularities that may be explained by distinct factors. As a result of these "*regular variants*" the occupational trajectory between the first and second transition is not only a shallower or a deeper "U" (in Chiswick's language), but the regular variants also result in variations in fluidity patterns between the segments. Some of the relevant factors that may produce these "regular variants" and which may be analyzed using the ENI-2007 data, include personal characteristics such as gender, educational level (and skills in general), language, national and/or ethnic origin, legal conditions upon arrival and immigrant social capital.

If this approach proves to be correct, it implies a subtle nuance in Chiswick's arguments and a critique of the theories that defend continuous upward or downward mobility in the occupational scale. But it also may put into question two assumptions of the labor market segmentation theories: the omission of the importance of the lack of mobility in defining labor market social spaces; and the assignation of immigrants as a unique general set within the secondary labor market.

DATA AND METHODOLOGY

The *National Immigrant Survey* (ENI-2007) collected information regarding 15,465 individuals over the age of 16 who were born outside of Spain, and live in Spain or had the intention of doing so for over one year, and who were interviewed between November of 2006 and February of 2007. The sample is representative of individuals living in Spain and who were born in Ecuador, Morocco, Romania, and the following regions: Latin America, Africa (with the exception of South Africa), Asia (with the exception of Japan), North America (the United States and Canada) and Oceania, the EU-15 plus the European Economic Area (EEA) and Switzerland. The ENI-2007 contains data regarding immigrant characteristics and retrospective information regarding their last employment in their country of origin, and their first and last employments in Spain. For each of these employments, the survey collected information regarding the occupation, professional status, activity sector and work contract duration.

For our analysis, we have excluded those individuals who were born in the EU-15, the EEA and Switzerland, Spanish citizens by birth, individuals with no work experience in their country of origin and those with no work experience in Spain. Our sample consists of data on 7,280 non-EU immigrants in Spain. In order to study the occupational mobility of immigrants between their first and current employment position in Spain, we selected those individuals who were employed at the time of the survey and who responded that their current job (though not necessarily their occupation) was different from their first job in Spain (n=4,031). The characteristics of those immigrants having only one job since their time of arrival (n=3,249) were similar to those having various jobs.

Although many studies regarding immigration labor integration have used data from transversal studies, recently, new sources have facilitated access to longitudinal data

(Chiswick *et al.* 2005; Duleep and Regets 1997; Bauer and Zimmermann 1999; Adsera and Chiswick 2007; Aslund and Rooth 2007; Beenstock *et al*. 2010). In Spain, the ENI-2007 is the only national survey containing information on immigrant labor experiences across time in both Spain and countries of origin.

As affirmed by Simon *et al.* (2010), there are three possible sources of bias when using retrospective data from complete samples of transversal studies: changes in the composition of the immigrant flow across time (Borjas 1985, 1995); fluctuations in the economic cycle and in the characteristics of the immigrants entering the work force (Aslund and Rooth 2007); and return migration or transit to a third country (Constant and Massey 2003). Like in other studies (Reyneri and Fullin 2011), we have assumed that the characteristics not observed in the migrants did not change over time, and that return migration has not been a selective process until 2007, given that immigration in Spain began to grow in the late 1990s and continued doing so in 2007, driven by a growing sustained economy.

Variables

Our analysis focuses on occupational mobility between and within the labor market segments in two transition periods: from the last employment in the country of origin to the first employment in Spain and from the first employment in Spain to the current employment at the time of the survey. The ENI-2007 survey collected information regarding the occupation in each employment position. This information has been classified based on the International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO-88) in its version adapted for Spain (CNO-94). We used one-digit classification for this analysis[1]:

---

[1] In this English version, we list the one digit classification of occupations as in ISCO-88. Given that we only have data available for the civil population, we did not take category 0 (Armed Forces) into consideration.

1. Legislators, senior officials and managers
2. Professionals
3. Technicians and associate professionals
4. Clerks
5. Service works and shop and market saled workers
6. Skilled agricultural and fishery workers
7. Craft and related trades workers
8. Plant and machine operators and assemblers
9. Elementary occupations

Our argument is based on labor market segmentation theories and therefore we classified the occupations by segments. Instead of doing so a priori, which could be somewhat arbitrary, as suggested by Rosenberg (1980), we divided the segments where empirical data suggested that there were circulation limits. Our analysis of the odds ratios results in the identification of two occupational clusters, classified as primary and secondary segments. In the primary labor market we include the occupational groups from the first four categories (one to four) and in the secondary labor market we include the other five (five to nine). The fifth occupational group (Service workers) may be considered to be a "buffer zone" (Parkin 1978).

In order to better understand immigrant mobility in a segmented labor market, our analysis includes measurements of occupational fluidity based on human capital variations, Spanish language usage, immigration experience, social capital, gender and previous employment characteristics that were used in prior research studies (Chiswick *et al.* 2005; Redstone 2006, Stanek and Viera 2009; Caparros and Navarro 2010). These variables are measured as of the moment of the immigrant's arrival in Spain (for the study of the first transition) and at the time of the survey (for the second transition).

Methodology

In order to compare the hypotheses regarding segmented occupational mobility, our analysis offers estimates on general mobility, mobility in labor market segments and mobility in absolute and relative terms. We study absolute and relative occupational mobility with weighted distribution sets and odds ratios, respectively for the two transitions (Tables 1, 2, 4 and 5). Odds ratio estimation has become standard practice in the analysis mobility tables, because it "show the relative odds of an individual in two different categories of origin being found in one rather than another of two different categories of destination" (Erikson and Goldthorpe 1993:55). Odds ratios allow us to observe relative effects, because they express the *net* association pattern between the origin and destination categories, that is, "the pattern of association considered net of the effects of marginal distribution of these categories" (ibid.: 56). An odds ratio that is not equal to 1 indicates that the row and column variables are not independent; therefore, it offers a measurement of association without effects derived from the marginal distributions of the variables. The odds ratios capture this net association because they are not sensitive to marginal distributions (Bishop, Fienberg and Holland 1975). Furthermore, due to their property of multiplicative invariance, the odds ratio logarithm is the same independent of the sample size and is equally valid for designs of retrospective, prospective and transversal sampling (Agresti 1990). Another important advantage of the relative rates, in terms of odds ratios, is that these ratios constitute log-linear model elements.

One important implication is that the mobility tables may share similar mobility schemes despite the fact that they differ in their marginal distributions and that their absolute mobility rates are therefore different. In our case, the relative mobility tables represent an indicator of the net associa-

tion between the last occupation in the country of origin and the first in Spain without the effects of the occupational distribution of the immigrants in their countries of origin and in Spain (first transition), and for those who have had more than one job in Spain, from the first to the most recent employment without the marginal effects of the occupational distribution of this population at both moments (second transition).

In order to incorporate Erikson and Goldthorpe's "social fluidity" analysis (1993), we have estimated the odds ratios for the mobility table in accordance with Agresti (1990:18)[2,3]:

$$\alpha_{ij} = \frac{n_{ij}\, n_{55}}{n_{5j}\, n_{i5}}$$

where:

α_{ij} is the odds ratio for the cell *ij* in the mobility table

n_{ij} is the number of individuals with employment *i* in their country of origin and *j* in their destination

n_{55} is the number of individuals with employment in category 5 (Restaurant, personnel, protection and sales service workers, which serves as our reference category) in their country of origin and destination

n_{5j} is the number of individuals in category 5 in their country of origin and in category *j* in their destination

n_{i5} is the number of individuals in category *i* in their country of origin and in category 5 in their destination

For the odds ratio estimates, we selected category 5 as the reference category since it may be considered a "buffer zone" between the labor market segments (Parkin 1978).

After analyzing the absolute and relative mobility patterns from our data, we proceeded to define the labor market segments in two groups, primary and secondary, and to show estimates of the relative mobility measures of the two transitions for relevant variables. The odds ratios from Table 3 illustrate how the possibility of being in the first segment instead of the second differs between individuals based on whether their previous employment was in the first or the second segment.

The variables associated with immigrant occupational mobility are grouped together based on the following vectors: human capital (educational level, educational certificates and credentials and language knowledge), immigration experience (region of origin, arrival period, nationality or immigration status, reason for migrating and settlement intentions), social capital (whether or not they found their first job through their social networks) and gender.

RESULTS

Results suggest regularities in the behavior of non-EU immigrant occupational mobility in Spain in the two transitions, allowing for comparison of the previously stated hypotheses. First, next section shows the results of the absolute occupational mobility for both transitions; this section highlights some irregularities in behavior that suggest the existence of barriers between the segments and shows distinct patterns of absolute mobility for several variables. Second, we address the segmentation upon examination

---

[2] Odds ratios were also estimated using log-linear models (Hout 1983) and global odds ratios (Heagerty and Zeger 1996). All results were consistent. Estimates were presented using methods developed by Agresti (1990) as these are the most frequently used in the analysis of social mobility and are the easiest to interpret.

[3] We detected several boxes having no observations. Since a mobility table has no structural zeros, following the adjustment proposed by Goodman (1979) we added 0.01 observations to all of the boxes in calculating our odds ratios.

of, for the two transitions, the patterns fo-llowed by the relative mobility, measured using odds ratios; the results highlight regu-larities that suggest a segmented occupatio-nal fluidity pattern in each of the transitions; we will also show how this segmented pat-tern is repeated with some specific features for diverse variables.

Absolute occupational mobility patterns: limitations of an open labor market

Tables 1 and 2 respectively show the absolu-te occupational mobility produced between the immigrants' last employment in their country of origin and their first employment in Spain (first transition) and that which is produced between this first employment in Spain and their current employment (second transition). Literature has repeatedly de-monstrated that immigrants have an initial downward mobility (occupational) that later recovers, at least in part, in an upward man-ner in a process that is referred to as counter-mobility. Data from the ENI-2007 confirms these findings for Spain.

In a table of occupational mobility, the absolute mobility rates are explained, abo-ve all, by exogenous factors that are "tho-se determining the 'forms' of the class structures (occupational), that is, their pro-portional sizes and the rates of increase or decrease for the different classes, and not those that determine the individual pro-pensities to maintain or change position within these structures" (Goldthorpe 2010:425). In our immigrant occupational mobility tables, key factors determining the 'forms' of the marginal distributions are found in "external" factors and those which situate the immigrants in these positions and not in immigrant propensities to main-tain or change their occupation. One of these is the Spanish labor market and the burden of the secondary sector jobs and their low salaries; another "external" factor is the "discriminatory institutional fra-

mework" (Cachón 2009). Here we refer to "structural" mobility. "Structural" mobility results from these external factors, which produce the marginal distribution of the data. Table 1 indicates that 32% worked in primary sector occupations in their country of origin and 68% in secondary sector oc-cupations; and that in their first employ-ment in Spain there was a radical change produced as only 11% worked in the pri-mary segment as opposed to 89% who were in the secondary. This already sug-gests a notable occupational descent su-ffered by immigrants in Spain at the initial moment of immigration. This occupational descent may be described as "structural". Table 2 shows that in the immigrant's cu-rrent employment, the occupational situa-tion has improved somewhat but is still not fully recovered to the distribution from the country of origin: those in the primary sec-tor increased from 8 to 14% while the se-condary group diminished from 92 to 86%.

If we are to broadly analyze immigrant mo-bility in the occupational positions, it can be said that the first employment occupation of the non-EU immigrants in Spain demonstra-tes that some 54% had occupational declines in comparison to their employment in their country of origin, compared to 14% who had increases and 33% who remained in the same occupational group (Table 1). This initial des-cent was partially compensated for when analyzing the counter-mobility of the second transition: 34% of the immigrants ascended occupational groups, as compared to 17% who dropped and 49% who remained in the same group (Table 2). But upon further exami-nation of the patterns of absolute mobility in the tables, we can see that the significant ini-tial downward mobility was divided between a mobility between segments and a mobility within each of the segments: 24% went from primary segment occupations to the secon-dary segment and another 30% showed oc-cupational decreases but *within* the primary segment (2.2%) or the secondary segment

TABLE 1. *Absolute occupational mobility of non-EU immigrants between the last employment in origin and the first employment in Spain*

| | | First in Spain | | | | | | | | | | |
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	%	N
Last in country of origin	1	**0.6**	0.2	0.4	0.2	1.0	0.1	0.7	0.1	1.7	4.89	365
	2	0.1	**2.5**	0.5	0.6	2.1	0.1	0.6	0.3	3.2	10.11	752
	3	0.2	0.4	**1.3**	0.3	3.3	0.2	0.9	0.2	3.0	9.80	736
	4	0.1	0.2	0.2	**0.6**	2.5	0.1	0.5	0.2	3.2	7.51	597
	5	0.2	0.3	0.5	0.6	**7.3**	0.3	1.9	0.4	10.1	21.69	1,668
	6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	**0.3**	0.5	0.1	1.4	2.53	152
	7	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.0	2.2	0.4	**8.8**	0.7	7.7	20.20	1,295
	8	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.9	0.3	1.7	**1.0**	4.4	8.51	604
	9	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.1	2.0	0.4	1.4	0.5	**10.3**	14.77	1,111
	%	1.37	3.85	3.36	2.51	21.47	2.13	16.81	3.60	44.90	100	
	N	90	287	245	188	1,692	152	1.001	247	3,378		7,280

Source: Prepared from micro-data from the ENI-2007. Relative figures calculated from the weighted data

Note: Categories 1 to 9 correspond to the occupational groups at a one-digit level from the CNO-94 (see text).

(27.6%). The initial ascending mobility pattern is similar although with a lower volume of increases. This was not the case with the ascending counter-mobility of the second transition 8% went from secondary segment occupations to primary ones, as compared to 28% who had occupational changes *within* the secondary segment and another 1.4% *within* the primary segment.

We should note the role of the "buffer zone" (Parkin 1978) consisting of occupational group 5 (Service workers and shop and market sales workers); it is, the limiting group at the base of the occupational groups for the primary segment in the first transition and at the height of the secondary groups in the second transition, and therefore it serves as our reference category.

Table 3 compares the absolute and relative mobility of the most significant variables for the two transitions. In order to facilitate the comparison, results were passed from a 9x9 table to be analyzed in a 2x2 table, grou-

ping the occupations in two identified labor market segments. Table 3 shows those that remained in the primary and secondary segment over the two moments (columns 2, 3, 8 and 9), those that descended from the primary to the secondary (columns 4 and 10) and those that rose from the secondary to the primary (columns 5 and 11). The overall data shows that in the first transition, some 9% of the non-EU immigrants remain in the primary segment, 64% remain in the secondary and the remainder includes 25% that descended from the primary to the secondary and 2.5% that rose from the secondary to the primary. In the second moment there is an improved stabilization in the secondary segment (84% of the cases) and the ascent from the secondary to the primary segment is somewhat greater than the descent from primary to secondary (an 8% rise as opposed to a 2.4% drop). These are the same general patterns of upward and downward mobility in the two transitions as those shown in Tables 1 and 2.

TABLE 2. *Absolute occupational mobility of non-EU immigrants between their first employment in Spain and their current employment*

		Current in Spain										
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	%	N
First in Spain	1	**0.4**	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.71	26
	2	0.4	**1.9**	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.2	2.90	121
	3	0.3	0.2	**1.0**	0.2	0.6	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.2	2.75	114
	4	0.2	0.1	0.3	**0.6**	0.3	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.1	1.81	78
	5	1.0	0.4	1.2	1.1	**9.1**	0.2	1.8	0.9	6.0	21.58	939
	6	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.4	**0.5**	0.9	0.1	0.7	2.68	104
	7	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.2	1.0	0.1	**10.3**	0.9	2.4	15.45	521
	8	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.4	0.0	0.8	**1.5**	0.5	3.62	131
	9	0.4	0.3	0.8	1.4	8.1	0.8	9.1	4.1	**23.5**	48.51	1,997
	%	3.10	3.14	3.79	3.79	19.84	1.60	23.34	8.00	33.41	100	
	N	119	139	170	158	821	58	866	316	1,384		4,031

Source: Prepared from micro-data from the ENI-2007. Relative figures calculated from the weighted data.

Note: Categories 1 to 9 correspond to the occupational groups at a one-digit level from the CNO-94 (see text).

The occupational segmented patterns of origin are reproduced in destination in both transitions and regularities are shown in the initial downward mobility and limited upward mobility in destination for all variables in Table 3. But they occur, with relevant variations that qualify the depth of the "U" and the recovery that occurs in the second transition. For example, the initial downward mobility of women and of those having a higher education level is greater, but the counter-mobility of these groups is also somewhat greater; the same occurs with those having certification degrees in their country of origin and with those whose maternal language is Spanish. As for regions of origin, Latin Americans suffer from the greatest initial decreases and they have the greatest subsequent increases; as for the moment of arrival in Spain, those arriving after 1998 had larger decreases in the first transition and they still have not recovered in the second (linked to the short amount of time that they have been in Spain). Being an EU citizen (immigrants not born in the EU but having nationality in one of the member states) or not introduces a notable difference in the absolute mobility patterns; and within the non-EU immigrants, those who are not documented do not differ greatly from those having documentation in the first transition but in the second they tend to remain in secondary segment occupations. Patterns based on economic activity sectors (in the first employment or in the current employment) are of great interest: construction, agriculture and manufacturing are the three sectors where the occupational segments are most often repeated from those held in the country of origin. Domestic service is another sector that is filled with immigrants, but in this case, it results in considerable downward mobility. These sectors, along with the hotel industry, have the greatest level of repetition in the second transition. And they also have the greatest number of immigrants in Spain. In the second transition, the upward occupational mobility pro-

duced in the service sectors (with the exception of the hotel industry and domestic services) is relevant.

Although the absolute mobility of immigrants is very much influenced by the marginal structure in the country of origin and destination, it should be noted that there are corresponding regularities, broadly speaking, with the Chiswick concepts, but with limited effects on the second transition. This may be the result of characteristics of the Spanish labor market as well as the short amount of time since arrival in Spain for the majority of the immigrants; there are also curves of differing depths for some variables (such as women and highest education level). But there is a certain "closure" within the segments that can also be seen at this level of absolute mobility.

Relative occupational mobility patterns: fluidity within the segments and the closure between them

Only the analysis of the "endogenous mobility regime" (Hauser 1978) allows us to test whether or not these behaviors occur, as suggested by the absolute mobility data. In order to do so, we must examine the mobility patterns of the individuals without the effects of the marginal occupational structure, that is, we must check the relative occupational mobility behavior based on the odds ratios (and their logarithms). Analyzing these relative mobility probabilities or opportunities of the agents allows us to explore the occupational "fluidity" patterns (as introduced by Miller and utilized by Goldthorpe) within the segments and closed off outside of them.

The relative mobility data for the immigrant set (presented as natural logarithms of the odds ratios in tables 4 and 5) shows some relevant regularities. First, in the behavior of the diagonal boxes: in the two transitions they all have values above those of the rest of the rows and columns (except

for cells from line 9 that are linked to the results of 6 and 8), demonstrating that the probability of reproduction in each group is significantly higher than any other option; further, within each segment, the values of the odds ratios tend to be higher in the highest groups in the two transitions, as if tending to repeat the "onion" effect that Hauser (1978) referred to, but within the segments. It is also noteworthy that the odds ratios nearer to the diagonal (that is, those demonstrating the exchange between adjoining occupational groups) tend to be higher than the others.

Secondly, if the boxes are analyzed outside of this diagonal, the majority of them have logarithms that are greater than 0 within the segments and much less than 0 outside of them (with some exceptions in the former in the first transition, related to the very low upward fluidity, and in the latter in the second transition). This demonstrates that the two transitions produce considerable fluidity within the segments and very little fluidity outside of them. These results allow us to present the occupational group clusters aggregated into two segments in the labor market: primary and secondary.

Thirdly, the data shows that there is a primarily downward fluidity in the first transition and a primarily upward fluidity in the second. But more importantly for our argument, this upward and downward fluidity is produced *within* the segments and is very limited *between* them. In the first transition (Table 4), the average of the odds ratio logarithms reflecting downward mobility within the first sector is 1.2 and within the second sector it is 1.4 while that of the descent between an occupational group of the primary segment to the secondary is only 0.2. An upward fluidity is also found in this initial phase and the average of the logarithms is 1.5 within the secondary, 0.6 within the primary and it is -0.7 between the secondary and the primary. This primarily downward pattern is reversed in the second transition

TABLE 3. *Absolute and relative mobility of non-EU immigrants between and within the labor market segments according to relevant variables*

Variable	First transition (origin-first employment)				Odds ratios	Second transición (first-current)				Odds ratios
	Absolute mobility (%)					Absolute mobility (%)				
	P→P	S→S	P→S	S→P		P→P	S→S	P→S	S→P	
Column number	2	3	4	5	6	8	9	10	11	12
Total (n)	---	---	---	182	---	250	---	89	336	---
(%)	8.63	63.85	25.03	2.50	8.79	5.74	83.76	2.43	8.08	24.51
Demographic characteristics										
Gender										
Male	8.17	72.87	16.22	2.74	13.40	5.26	85.96	2.67	6.11	27.75
Female	8.86	54.44	34.22	2.48	5.69	6.49	80.28	2.05	11.2	22.75
Human Capital										
Education										
No education or Elementary	1.13	89.24	8.70	0.93	12.51	0.57	95.99	0.82	2.62	25.54
Secondary Education	3.16	77.37	16.83	2.64	5.49	0.78	92.59	1.68	4.95	8.65
University	7.15	62.83	27.03	2.99	5.57	2.85	86.15	2.73	8.27	10.88
Advanced studies	28.10	20.73	46.71	4.47	2.79	23	55.36	4.41	17.2	16.83
Certified studies and studies in Spain										
Uncertified	6.01	78.74	12.67	2.59	14.43	1.04	94.79	1.63	2.54	23.66
Certified from country of origin	9.55	59.04	28.77	2.65	7.40	4.55	85.19	2.17	8.09	22.04
Certifications accredited in Spain	---	---	---	---	---	29.00	40.25	5.53	25.20	8.39
Certified by Spanish institution	---	---	---	---	---	18.60	59.49	6.38	15.50	11.20
Fluent in Spanish										
Maternal language										
Spanish	10.71	56.17	30.40	2.72	7.26	7.56	78.71	3.40	10.30	21.11
Other	6.11	74.37	16.99	2.53	10.58	---	---	---	---	---
Fluency	---	---	---	---	---	4.78	86.66	1.82	6.74	33.67
Partial fluency	---	---	---	---	---	0.37	98.27	0	1.36	403.43
Not fluent	---	---	---	---	---	2.19	91.84	0	5.97	70.40
Migration experience										
Region of origin										
Europe, non-EU	4.71	75.83	17.55	1.91	10.64	1.89	92.25	1.10	4.76	33.33
Morocco	2.44	88.01	7.91	1.64	16.56	1.77	92.63	0.67	4.93	49.69
Africa, not Morocco	5.25	72.99	20.05	1.70	11.22	2.24	90.78	1.17	5.81	29.99

TABLE 3. *Absolute and relative mobility of non-EU immigrants between and within the labor market segments according to relevant variable (continuation)*

Latin America	10.52	56.15	30.51	2.82	6.86	7.67	78.76	3.43	10.10	17.36
Other countries	20.70	50.58	21.72	7.00	6.89	15.5	71.43	2.74	10.40	38.86
Arrival period										
Prior to 1998	17.98	57.83	19.39	4.80	11.17	16.00	68.62	2.77	12.60	31.49
Between 1998 and 2000	6.67	63.14	27.84	2.36	6.41	4.29	84.39	1.71	9.61	22.03
Between 2001 and 2003	6.63	67.29	24.24	1.84	9.99	2.98	88.19	2.80	6.03	15.56
After 2004	5.92	68.71	22.86	2.51	7.09	3.57	88.50	2.24	5.69	24.77
Nationality and immigration status										
EU citizens	20.55	49.63	24.83	4.99	8.23	16.20	66.96	3.40	13.40	23.85
Permanent residents and documented	8.16	67.33	21.49	3.02	8.48	3.12	87.51	2.25	7.11	17.10
Undocumented immigrants	3.64	70.64	24.18	1.54	6.88	0.21	94.75	1.60	3.44	3.53
Reasons for migration										
Employment	8.42	74.15	15.14	2.29	18.03	4.74	88.51	1.83	4.92	46.63
Other reasons	8.47	63.45	25.39	2.69	7.87	5.91	82.93	2.53	8.63	22.45
Work contract prior to travel										
With work contract	16.00	60.54	21.45	2.01	22.47	8.85	81.42	2.45	7.28	40.40
Without work contract	6.92	65.99	24.33	2.75	6.81	5.15	84.20	2.42	8.23	21.75
Social capital										
Finding first job in Spain through:										
Family or friends	4.97	69.23	23.90	1.90	7.55	3.33	87.24	2.31	7.12	17.64
Other channels	16.74	55.20	23.72	4.34	8.97	11.80	75.01	2.72	10.50	31.05
Labor market										
Previous employment sector										
Agriculture, Fishing, etc.	0.40	86.65	12.88	0.08	34.32	0.39	98.29	1.08	0.24	61.25
Manufacturing and energy	8.92	70.29	18.83	1.95	17.08	6.08	87.32	2.16	4.45	54.12
Construction	1.28	82.63	14.94	1.15	6.17	0.82	93.51	2.08	3.59	17.34
Sales	11.94	57.11	25.12	5.83	4.65	6.66	71.39	4.16	17.80	6.47
Hotel industry	3.68	58.24	36.97	1.11	5.23	2.64	87.96	3.34	6.05	14.36
Transportation and communications	23.17	47.83	18.94	10.06	5.82	7.12	64.94	5.81	22.10	6.93
Financial activities and real estate	23.82	47.54	23.30	5.34	9.09	17.4	66.12	0.51	16.00	84.82
Household employees	0.32	58.28	41.22	0.18	2.48	0	99.01	0.99	0	75.57
Other services	42.34	26.57	20.71	10.38	5.23	25.1	53.23	2.92	18.8	18.96

Source: Prepared from micro-data from the ENI-2007. Relative figures calculated from the weighted data.

Note: P= Primary Segment; S= Secondary Segment.

TABLE 4.   *Relative occupational mobility (natural logarithms of the odds ratios) of non-EU immigrants between their last employment in country of origin and first employment in Spain (Reference category: 5)*

		First employment in Spain								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Last employment in country of origin	1	**2.8**	1.4	1.4	0.7	-	0.6	0.7	1.0	0.1
	2	0.6	**3.4**	1.5	1.5	-	0.3	0.2	0.8	0.2
	3	0.9	0.9	**1.7**	0.8	-	0.4	0.2	0.5	-0.2
	4	0.4	0.3	0.3	**1.4**	-	-0.7	-0.4	0.3	-0.1
	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	6	-3.8	0.3	-0.2	-0.1	-	**3.4**	1.8	1.2	1.3
	7	-0.6	0.7	0.1	-1.0	-	1.9	**2.7**	2.0	1.1
	8	0.5	-5.7	0.3	0.5	-	1.9	1.9	**2.9**	1.2
	9	-0.2	-0.4	-1.1	-0.4	-	1.3	0.8	1.3	**1.1**

Source: Prepared from micro-data from the ENI-2007. Relative figures calculated from the weighted data.

Note: Categories 1 to 9 correspond to the occupational groups at a one-digit level from the CNO-94 (see text).

(Table 5). Here the average of the upward logarithms within the two segments is 2.4 while the upward mobility between the primary and the secondary is only 0.5. At this transition, there is also a correlative downward fluidity: the average within the primary segment is 2.0 and within the secondary it is 1.9 but it is 0.0 between the primary and the secondary. This data suggests that there is considerable fluidity within the segments; it also suggests that the downward or upward fluidity is not only produced only during the first and the second transition, respectively. Further, the intense fluidity produced between occupational groups 1 and 2, in particular, in the second transition, suggests the existence of a "superior primary" sub-segment, as has been characterized in literature as well (Piore 1983), in terms of circulation.

Fourthly, the odds ratios from Table 3 (on a 2x2 table that groups the occupations into two clusters, columns 6 and 12) shows the differences produced in these patterns based on distinct variables and allows for comparison with the second hypothesis. The initial segmented downward mobility does not occur in the same manner for all immigrants and the counter-mobility of the second transition does not have the same dimension for all. The relative mobility confirms what the absolute mobility data already suggested: a greater initial downward flow and a posterior upward flow for women and those having advanced education. It is also the case for those having Spanish as their maternal language, who are immigrants from Latin America. The same occurs with those who migrate for reasons that are distinct from the search for employment and for those who were assisted by family or friends in finding their first employment. Those who are not EU-citizens had a greater fluidity (downward) in the first transition and if they are undocumented, this downward fluidity continues in the second transition: it is in this second transition when the state of being undocumented creates a major difference. The increased fluidity in the two analyzed moments occurs between immigrants working in service sectors, particu-

TABLE 5. *Relative occupational mobility (natural logarithms of the odds ratios) of non-EU immigrants between their first employment in Spain and their current employment (Reference category: 5)*

		Last employment in Spain								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
First employment in Spain	1	**3.8**	2.8	2.0	1.7	-	-0.8	1.6	2.1	-5.3
	2	3.3	**5.8**	2.6	1.4	-	-1.5	-0.2	1.4	0.0
	3	2.2	2.5	**2.8**	1.3	-	2.0	0.5	1.8	-0.4
	4	2.1	2.3	2.0	**2.7**	-	-2.3	0.2	1.5	-0.6
	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	6	0.3	-3.6	0.9	1.0	-	**5.3**	3.1	2.4	1.5
	7	1.2	1.6	-0.5	0.3	-	3.3	**3.9**	2.5	1.1
	8	1.9	2.1	1.1	1.5	-	2.4	2.6	**3.8**	0.8
	9	-0.4	0.2	-0.2	0.3	-	2.6	1.8	1.8	**1.5**

Source: Prepared from micro-data from the ENI-2007. Relative figures calculated from the weighted data.

Note: Categories 1 to 9 correspond to the occupational groups at a one-digit level from the CNO-94 (see text).

larly for those working in domestic services in the first transition (the downward) but not in the second.

CONCLUSIONS

This article highlights the importance of the study of the segmented labor market in first generation immigrants, based on the teachings of social mobility sociology, in the same manner in which the studies of Portes *et al.*, for example, looked at "segmented assimilation" for the second generation (Stepick y Stepick 2010). For this, we have highlighted the study of occupational fluidity occurring in the two labor transitions of immigrants in Spain, demonstrating the notable fluidity produced *within* the primary and secondary segments of the labor market and the very slight fluidity produced *outside* of them in both transitions. This allows us to expand upon the approaches regarding Chiswick's U-shaped pattern and to introduce the idea of a segmented U-shaped pattern.

Data from the ENI-2007 regarding absolute mobility of immigrants in Spain shows that there is a "structural" occupational mobility that is downward in the first transition and only slightly upward in the second transition. But this situation, which is seen from the marginal distributions of country of origin and destination, is reproduced upon examination of immigrant mobility between occupational positions: in the first transition there is a clearly downward mobility and in the second, a slightly upward counter-mobility. All of this corresponds with the literature created in the aftermath of Chiswick. But even at the level of absolute mobility, it can be observed that mobility processes are produced, above all, *within* the segments and are very scarce *between* them. Examination of relative mobility allows for clarification: the surface appearance of the absolute data reveals an "endogenous mobility regimen" that points to solid patterns of occupational non-fluidity outside of the segments.

The occupational fluidity demonstrated in the relative mobility data, measured in odds

ratios and presented in the form of natural logarithms, suggests three clear regularities: 1) The flows are, above all, the fluidity produced *within* the primary and secondary segments with very limited fluidity produced *between* them; 2) Both the downward mobility in the first transition and the upward counter-mobility in the second transition are produced *within* the segments and both are scarcely found *outside* of them. These characteristics allow us to confirm the existence of a segmented U-shaped occupational mobility pattern in the evolution of the occupational positions of non-EU immigrants in Spain, having a significant *fluidity* within the segments and a notable *closure* between them. It is also possible to see that 3) this general fluidity pattern within and the closure towards the outside is reproduced in all of the considered variables, yet many of them show a segmented U-shaped occupational mobility pattern that is more or less pronounced or superficial.

These results demonstrate that "there is thus an immediate disjunction between what we observe (odds ratio describing the association between origins and destinations) and what the theories speaks of (that part of the association that arises in a particular way)" (Breen 2004:391). For this, we believe that, in accordance to one of the our hypotheses, it is necessary to say that the immigrant occupational mobility pattern in Spain responds to a segmented U-shape occupational mobility pattern. This is not to imply that the barriers separating the primary and secondary segments are impermeable. Because, as Erikson and Goldthorpe (1993: 396-7) remember quoting Lieberson, "variation will be found even when powerful forces are operating. But a different way of thinking about the matter is required… So the issue is not to avoid statistical variability, but to use properly by distinguishing its shallow applications from those where there are profoundly important regularities".

The data also allows us to confirm the existence of "regular variations" of this general model. For example, the difference between males and females (the latter having a more pronounced "U" shape, with a greater downward occupational flow in the first transition and greater counter-mobility in the second and distinct fluidity patterns between segments with a greater presence of the primary in the second transition). Distinct human capital variables have also shown their relevance in explaining distinct U-shaped behaviors, particularly in increased educational level and its importance in maintaining more educated immigrants in the primary market. Some variables of the migration experience have also been found to have considerable importance: the national origin of the immigrants produces significant differences in entrance into the primary or secondary market and in assimilation patterns in the labor market in the destination country; immigrant motivation also has significant effects since if it is economic, immigrants have greater probabilities of showing a greater initial descent and less posterior counter-mobility and less fluidity than those who came for non-economic reasons; whether or not the immigrant has a authorized legal status is another variable producing the same negative effects on labor assimilation and relegation to the secondary market. Data highlights the ambivalent importance of social capital: family and friend networks help the recently arrived immigrant find quick employment, but this positive aspect is accompanied by an increase in the probability of an occupational descent that occurs both initially and later, as well as less occupational fluidity in the two transitions. The data broadly confirms the second hypothesis, although monographic studies will be necessary in order to analyze some of the more significant "regular variants".

From here, new research questions may be proposed regarding the importance of the

study of occupational mobility or the lack of immigrant social fluidity in industrial societies and the relevance of doing so from a perspective that highlights a segmented U-shaped pattern of occupational mobility and its "regular variants"; and it may be asked, for example, whether the determinants of the immigrant occupational positions play a different role in the distinct segments and in the two transitions (Aysa-Lastra and Cachón 2013).

References

Adsera, Alicia and Barry Chiswick (2007). "Are There Gender and Country of Origin Differences in Immigrant Market Outcomes across European Destinations?". *Journal of Population Economics*, 20(3): 495-526.

Agresti, Alan (1990). *Categorical Data Analysis*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Alcobendas, Miguel A. and Nuria Rodríguez (2009). "Immigrants' Assimilation Process in a Segmented Labor Market". *IZA Discussion Paper* 4394.

Amuedo, Catalina and Sara de la Rica (2007). "Labour Market Assimilation of Recent Immigrants in Spain". *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 45(2): 257-284.

— and —(2009). "Complements or Substitutes? Task Specialization by Gender and Nativity in Spain". *IZA Discussion Paper* 4348.

Aslund, Olof and Dan-Olof Rooth (2007). "Do When and Where Matter? Initial Labour Market Conditions and Immigrant Earnings". *The Economic Journal,* 117: 422-448.

Aysa-Lastra, María and Lorenzo Cachón (2012). "Latino Immigrant Employment during the Great Recession: A Comparison between the United States and Spain". *Norteamerica* 7(2): 7-45.

— and — (2013). "Determinantes de la movilidad ocupacional segmentada de los inmigrantes no comunitarios en España". *Revista Internacional de Sociología,* 71(2): 383-413.

Bauer, Thomas and Klaus Zimmerman (1999). "Occupational Mobility of Ethnic Immigrants". *IZA Discussion Paper* 58.

Becker, Gary S. (1993) [1964]. *Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis, with Special Reference to Education.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Beenstock, Michael; Barry Chiswick and Ari Patiel (2010). "Testing the Immigrant Assimilation Hypothesis with Longitudinal Data". *Review of Economics of the Household*, 8(1): 7-27.

Berger, Suzanne and Michael Piore (1980). *Dualism and Discontinuity in Industrial Societies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Bernardi, Fabrizio; Luis Garrido and Maria Miyar (2011). "The Recent Fast Upsurge of Immigrants in Spain and Their Employment Patterns and Occupational Attainment". *International Migration*, 49(1): 148-187.

Bishop, Yvonne V.; Stephen E. Fienberg y Paul Holland (1975). *Discrete Multivariate Analysis*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Blau, Peter M. and Otis Duncan (1967). *The American Occupational Structure.* New York: Wiley.

Borjas, George (1985). "Assimilation, Changes in Cohort Quality, and the Earnings of Immigrants". *Journal of Labor Economics*, 3(4): 463-489.

— (1995). "Assimilation and Changes in Cohort Quality Revisited: What Happened to Immigrant Earnings in the 1980s?". *Journal of Labor Economics*, 13(2): 201-245.

— (1999). "The Economic Analysis of Immigration". In: O. Ashenfelter y D. Card (eds.), *Handbook of Labor Economics*. (vol. 3A), Ámsterdam: Elsevier.

Boston, Thomas (1990). "Segmented Labor Markets: New Evidence from a Study of Four Race-Gender Groups". *Industrial and Labor Relations Review,* 44 (1): 99-115.

Breen, Richard (2004). *Social Mobility in Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

— (2005). "Foundations of a neo-Weberian class analysis". In: E.O. Wright (ed.), *Approaches to class Analysis.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 31-50.

Cachón, Lorenzo (1989). *¿Movilidad social o estructuras de clase? Elementos para una crítica de la sociología de la movilidad social*. Madrid: Siglo XXI-CIS.

— (1995). "Marco institucional de la discriminación y tipos de inmigrantes en el mercado de trabajo en España". *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas*, 69: 105-124.

— (2002). "La formación de la 'España inmigrante': mercado y ciudadanía". *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas*, 97: 95-126.

— (2009). *La "España inmigrante": marco discriminatorio, mercado de trabajo y políticas de integración.* Barcelona: Anthropos.

Caparrós, Antonio and María Luisa Navarro (2010). "Movilidad ocupacional de los inmigrantes en España". *Investigaciones de Economía de la Educación,* 5: 873-890.

Carrasco, Concepción (1999). *Mercados de trabajo: los inmigrantes económicos*. Madrid: IMSERSO.

Chiswick, Barry R. (1977). "A Longitudinal Analysis of the Occupational Mobility of Immigrants". In: B. D. Dennis (ed.), *Proceedings of the 30th Annual Winter Meetings, Industrial Relations Research Association.* Madison WI: IRRA.

— (1978). "The Effect of Americanization on the Earnings of Foreign-born Men". *The Journal of Political Economy,* 86(5): 897-921.

— (1979). "The Economic Progress of Immigrants: Some Apparently Universal Patterns". In: W. Fellner (dir.), *Contemporary Economic Problems 1979*. Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research.

— (1997). "The Economics of Immigrant Skill and Adjustment". *The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance*, 37 (Special Issue): 183-188.

— (1999). "Immigration Policy and Immigrant Quality. Are Immigrants Favorably Self-Selected?". *American Economic Review*, 89(2): 181-185.

— (2008). "Are Immigrants Favorable Self-selected? An Economic Analysis". In: C. B. Bretell and J. F. Hollifield (eds.), *Migration Theory: Talking across Disciplines* (2nd. ed.). New York: Routledge.

—; Yinon Cohen and Tzippi Zach (1997). "The Labor Market Status of Immigrants: Effects of the Unemployment Rate at Arrival and Duration of Residence". *Industrial and Labor Relations Review,* 50(2): 289-303.

—; Yew Lee and Paul W. Miller (2005). "A Longitudinal Analysis of Immigrant Occupational Mobility: A Test of the Immigrant Assimilation Hypothesis". *International Migration Review*, 39(2): 332-353.

— and Magnus Lofstrom (2010). "The Labor Market Adjustment of Immigrants". *Review of Economics of the Household*, 8(1): 1-5.

Colectivo IOÉ (1998). *Inmigración y trabajo. Trabajadores inmigrantes en el sector de la construcción*. Madrid: IMSERSO.

— (2010). "Las migraciones laborales hacia España". In: *Encuesta Nacional de Inmigrantes 2007: el mercado laboral y las redes sociales*. Madrid: MTIN.

Constant, Amelie and Douglas S. Massey (2003). "Self-selection, Earnings, and Out-migration: A Longitudinal Study of Immigrants to Germany". *Journal of Population Economics*, 16: 631-653.

Dickens, Williams T. and Kevin Lang (1985). "A Test of Dual Labor Market Theory". *American Economic Review,* 75: 792-805.

Doeringer, Pater B. and Michael J. Piore (1985). *Mercados internos de trabajo y análisis laboral*. Madrid: MTAS.

Duleep, Harriet O. and Mark C. Regets (1997). "The Decline in Immigrant Entry Earnings: Less Transferable Skills or Lower Ability?". *The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance*, 37: 189-208.

Dunlop, John T. (1957). "The Task of Contemporary Wage Theory". In: G. W. Taylor and F. C. Pierson (comps.), *New Concepts for Wage Determination*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Edward, Richard (1979). *Contested Terrain. The Transformation of the Workplace in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Basic Books.

—; Michael Reich and David M. Gordon (eds.) (1975): *Labor Market Segmentation*. Lexington, MA: Heath.

Erikson, Robert and John H. Goldthorpe (1993). *The Constant Flux: A Study of Class Mobility in Industrial Societies*. Oxford: Clarendon.

—, — and Martin Hällsten (2012). "No way back up from ratchering down? A critique of the 'microclass' approach to the analysis of social mobility, *Acta Sociológica,* 55(3): 211-229.

Fassmann, Heinz (1997). "Is the Austrian Labour Market Ethnically Segmented?". *European Journal of Population,* 13: 17-32.

Featherman, David L.; Frank L. Jones and Robert M. Hauser (1975). "Assumptions of Social Mobility Research in the U.S.: The Case of Occupational Status". *Social Science Research*, 4: 329-360.

Fernández, Cristina and Carolina Ortega (2008). "Labor Market Assimilation of Immigrants in

Spain: Employment at the Expense of Bad Job-Matches?". *Spanish Economic Review*, 10(2): 83-107.

Girod, Robert (1971). *Mobilité sociale. Faits établis et problèmes ouverts*. Ginebra: Droz.

Goldthorpe, John H. (1980). *Social Mobility and Class Structure in Modern Britain*. Oxford: Clarendon.

— (2010). *De la sociología*. Madrid: CIS.

— and George Marshall (1997). "The Promising Future of Class Analysis: A Response to Recent Critiques". In: G. Marshall, *Repositioning Class. Social Inequality in Industrial Societies*. London: SAGE.

Goodman, Leo A. (1979). "Simple Models for the Analysis of Association in Cross-Classifications Having Ordered Categories". *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 74(367): 537-552.

Granovetter, Mark (1994). "Toward a Sociological Theory of Income Differences". In: D. B. Grusky, *Social Stratification in Sociological Perspective. Class, Race & Gender*. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Grusky, David B. (1994). "The Contours of Social Stratification". In: D. B. Grusky, *Social Stratification in Sociological Perspective. Class, Race & Gender*. Boulder (CO): Westview.

— (2005). "Foundations of a neo-Durkheimian class analysis". In: E.O. Wright, *Approaches to class Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 51-81.

Hauser, Robert M. (1978). "A Structural Model of the Mobility Table". *Social Forces*, 56(3): 919-953.

Heagerty, Patrick J. and Scott L. Zeger (1996). "Marginal Regression Models for Clustered Ordinal Measurements". *Journal of the American Statistical Association,* 91(435): 1024-1036.

Hout, Michael (1983). *Mobility Tables*. Sage University Paper series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences. Series 07-031. Beverly Hills & London: Sage Publications.

Izquierdo, Mario; Aitor Lacuesta and Raquel Vegas (2009). "Assimilation of Immigrants in Spain: A Longitudinal Analysis". *Labour Economics,* 16(6): 669-678.

Lipset, Seymour M. and Hans L. Zetterberg (1959). "La movilidad social en las sociedades industriales". In: R. Bendix and S. M. Lipset, *Movilidad social en la sociedad industrial*. Buenos Aires: Eudeba.

Martín, Antonio; Pablo López and Óscar Molina (2011). "Movilidad ascendente de la inmigración en España: ¿asimilación o segmentación ocupacional?". *Papers*, 96(4): 1311-1338.

Massey, Douglas S. and Aysa-Lastra, María (2011). "Social Capital and International Migration from Latin America". *International Journal of Population Research*, Article ID 834145.

McAllister, Ian (1995). "Occupational Mobility among Immigrants: The Impact of Migration on Economic Success in Australia". *International Migration Review*, 29(2): 441-468.

Miller, Stephen I. (1980). "The Calculation of Mobility Rates as Applied to Boudon's Models". *Sociologia Internationalis*, 18(1-2): 35-47.

OECD (2001). "The Employment of Foreigners: Outlook and Issues in OECD Countries". In: OECD, *Employment Outlook 2001*. Paris: OECD.

Parella, Sonia (2003). *Mujer, inmigrante y trabajadora: la triple discriminación*. Barcelona: Anthropos.

Parkin, Frank (1978). *Orden político y desigualdades de clase*. Madrid: Debate.

Piore, Michael (1983). "Notas para una teoría de la estratificación del mercado de trabajo". In: L. Toharia, *El mercado de trabajo: Teorías y aplicaciones*. Madrid: Alianza.

— (1979). *Birds of Passage: Migrant Labour and Industrial Societies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Portes, Alejandro (2012). *Sociología económica de las migraciones internacionales*. Barcelona: Anthropos.

Redstone, Ilana (2006). "Occupational Mobility among Legal Immigrants to the United States". *International Migration Review*, 40(4): 854-884.

— (2008). "Occupational Trajectories of Legal US Immigrants: Downgrading and Recovery". *Population and Development Review*, 34(3): 435-456.

Reich, Michael (ed.) (2008). *Segmented Labor Markets and Labor Mobility*. Cheltenham & Northampton: Edward Elgar.

Reyneri, Emilio and Giovanna Fullin (2011). "Labour Market Penalties of New Immigrants in New and Old Receiving West European Countries". *International Migration*, 49(1): 32-57.

Rosenberg, Sam (1980). "Male Occupational Standing and the Dual Labor Market". *Industrial Relations*, 19(1): 34-49.

Rosenberg, Sam (1981). "Occupational Mobility and Short Cycles". In: F. Wilkinson, *The Dynamics of Labour Market Segmentation*. London: Academic Press.

Sabel, Charles (1986). *Trabajo y política. La división del trabajo en la industria*. Madrid: MTSS.

Sanromá, Esteban; Raúl Ramos and Hipólito Simón (2009). "Los salarios de los inmigrantes en el mercado de trabajo español. ¿Importa el origen del capital humano?". Document de Treball*, Xarxa de Refèrencia en Economía Aplicada,* 4.

Simón, Hipólito; Ramón Ramos and Esteban Sanromá (2010). "Movilidad ocupacional de los inmigrantes en una economía de bajas cualificaciones. El caso de España". Document de Treball, *Xarxa de Refèrencia en Economía Aplicada,* 6.

—; Esteban Sanromá and Ramón Ramos (2008). "Labour Segregation and Immigrant and Native-born Wage Distributions in Spain: An Analysis Using Matched Employer-Employee Data". *Spanish Economic Review*, 10(2):135-168.

Solé, Carlota (coord.) (2001). *El impacto de la inmigración en la economía y la sociedad receptora*. Barcelona: Anthropos.

Sorokin, Pitrim [1859] (1959). *Social and Cultural Mobility*. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.

Stanek, Mikolaj (2011). "Nichos étnicos y movilidad socio-ocupacional. El caso del colectivo polaco en Madrid". *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas*, 135: 69-88.

Stanek, Mikolaj and Alberto Veira (2009). "Occupational Transitions and Social Mobility at Migration to Spain". Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Documento de Trabajo GEPS 4/2009 (III).

Stepick, Alex and Carl D. Stepick (2010). "The complexities and conclusions of segmented assimilation". *Ethnic and Racial Studies,* 33(7): 1149-1167.

Telles, Edward, E. and Vilma Ortiz (2011). *Generaciones excluidas: mexicano-estadounidenses, asimilación y raza.* Madrid: CIS.

Thomas, William I. and Florian Znaniecki (2004) [1918]. *El campesino polaco en Europa y en América*. Madrid: CIS.

Veira, Alberto; Stanek, Mikolaj and Lorenzo Cachón (2011). **"Los determinantes de concentración ét-**nica en el mercado laboral español". *Revista Internacional de Sociología,* 69: 219-242.

Villa, Paula (1990). *La estructuración de los mercados de trabajo*. Madrid: MTAS.

Weber, Max (1969) [1922]: *Economía y sociedad. Esbozo de sociología comprensiva*. México: FCE.

Weiss, Yoram; Robert M. Sauer and Manachem Gotlibovski (2003). "Immigration, Search, and Loss of Skill". *Journal of Labor Economics*, 21(3): 557-592.

Movilidad ocupacional segmentada: el caso de los inmigrantes no comunitarios en España

Segmented Occupational Mobility: The Case of Non-EU Immigrants in Spain

María Aysa-Lastra y Lorenzo Cachón

Palabras clave

Movilidad ocupacional
• Trabajadores extranjeros
• Segmentación del mercado de trabajo
• Migración internacional
• Integración económica de los emigrantes

Key words

Occupational Mobility
• Foreign Workers
• Labor Market Segmentation
• International Migration
• Economic Integration of Immigrants

Resumen

La literatura sobre la integración económica de los inmigrantes ha destacado la existencia de un patrón de movilidad en forma de «U». En este artículo discutimos esta argumentación partiendo de las teorías de la segmentación del mercado de trabajo y del análisis de la movilidad desde la perspectiva de la «estructura de clase». Se analizan los datos de la Encuesta Nacional de Inmigrantes de 2007 para elaborar tablas de movilidad ocupacional de los inmigrantes entre su última ocupación en origen a la primera ocupación en destino (n = 7.280), y desde la primera a la última ocupación en España (n = 4.031), estimando razones de probabilidad para estudiar la movilidad relativa. Se han identificado dos segmentos del mercado laboral dentro de los cuales la fluidez ocupacional es frecuente y fuera de los cuales es limitada. Nuestro análisis sugiere la existencia de un patrón de movilidad ocupacional *segmentada* de los inmigrantes en forma de «U».

Abstract

Literature regarding immigrant economic integration tends to highlight a U-shaped economic mobility pattern. Our article challenges this argument based on labor market segmentation theories and an occupational mobility analysis made from a "class structure" perspective. Data from the 2007 National Immigrant Survey in Spain was used to create mobility tables indicating immigrant occupational mobility fluidity from their last employment in their country of origin to their first employment in Spain (n=7,280), and from their first employment in Spain to their current employment (n=4,031), estimating odds ratios in order to examine the relative mobility. Two labor market segments were identified as having frequent occupational mobility within them and limited mobility outside of them. Our analysis suggests the existence of a *segmented* U-shaped pattern of immigrant occupational mobility.

Cómo citar

La versión en inglés de este artículo puede consultarse en http://reis.cis.es y http://reis.metapress.com

María Aysa-Lastra: Florida International University | aysam@fiu.edu
Lorenzo Cachón: Universidad Complutense de Madrid | lcachon@cps.ucm.es

INTRODUCCIÓN

Desde el trabajo pionero de Thomas y Znaniecki (2004 [1918]) *El campesino polaco en Europa y en América*, la literatura ha abordado en reiteradas ocasiones el análisis de la movilidad social y ocupacional que lleva consigo la movilidad geográfica de los migrantes. En gran parte de las investigaciones subyace la lógica del ciclo «organización-desorganización-reorganización» formulado por Thomas y reformulado por otros autores de la Escuela de Chicago. Ese es el caso de los trabajos seminales de Chiswick (1977, 1978) sobre el patrón de movilidad ocupacional en forma de «U» que siguen los inmigrantes en su proceso de incorporación al mercado de trabajo del país de destino. Gran parte de la literatura se ha desarrollado en la estela de Chiswick, lo que ha facilitado notables avances comparativos. Sin embargo, en ese diálogo se han ignorado enfoques que pueden ofrecer una orientación alternativa. En primer lugar, las teorías de la segmentación del mercado de trabajo: esta omisión llama la atención si se recuerda que suele destacarse con frecuencia la situación de segregación (geográfica, laboral y social) en que viven los inmigrantes. En segundo lugar, los resultados de la sociología de la movilidad social, de modo especial los planteamientos sobre la «fluidez social» analizada desde las tasas relativas de movilidad. Sobre todo teniendo en cuenta que las migraciones son en sí mismas un proceso de movilidad social.

Nuestro artículo tiene por objeto examinar la movilidad ocupacional de los inmigrantes no comunitarios en España tanto en el momento inicial de la migración, comparando la ocupación que tenían en su país de origen, como con la primera y la última ocupación en España en el momento de la encuesta. Se examinará esta movilidad típicamente descendente en el primer momento y la «contra-movilidad» ascendente en el segundo, mostrando que se produce de modo prácticamente exclusivo *dentro* de un segmento (primario o secundario) del mercado de trabajo. Lo haremos a partir de la Encuesta Nacional de Inmigrantes 2007 que recoge datos retrospectivos de los inmigrantes.

El estudio del caso español se ha incorporado en los últimos años a la literatura sobre las migraciones. Es lógico que sea así dado que el fenómeno que ha creado la «España inmigrante» (Cachón, 2002) es reciente en términos comparativos. Es solo en la primera década del siglo XXI cuando la inmigración se convierte en un fenómeno masivo: los inmigrantes pasan del 2,9% de la población en España en 2000 al 12,3% en 2011. En este tiempo España ha pasado a ser el Estado miembro de la Unión Europea (UE) con una mayor proporción de extranjeros viviendo en su territorio (si se exceptúan cuatro pequeños países). Durante la década 1997-2007, el empleo en España creció a un ritmo extraordinario: más del 5% en media anual durante la década (y la población ocupada inmigrante lo hizo a un ritmo anual medio del 147%). Sin embargo, el mercado de trabajo seguía siendo un mercado muy sensible al ciclo económico, con altas tasas de empleo temporal, con bajos salarios y con el 28% de la población ocupada en cuatro ramas de actividad: agricultura, construcción, hostelería y servicio doméstico (Aysa-Lastra y Cachón, 2012).

El artículo se estructura en cinco epígrafes, aparte de la presente introducción. El segundo epígrafe hace un somero repaso de los principales enfoques y resultados en el estudio de la movilidad ocupacional de los inmigrantes en la estela de Chiswick; el tercer epígrafe expone los planteamientos teóricos de los que partimos y las hipótesis de investigación; el cuarto, la fuente de datos y los métodos que se van a utilizar; el quinto presenta los resultados de las tasas absolutas y relativas de movilidad; y en el último epígrafe se sintetizan las conclusiones y se discuten los resultados en relación con las hipótesis planteadas.

El estudio de la movilidad ocupacional de los inmigrantes en la estela de Chiswick

A finales de los años setenta, B. R. Chiswick publicó una serie de trabajos que anunciaban «una pauta aparentemente universal». En ellos exponía lo que más adelante llamará pauta en forma de «U» que siguen los inmigrantes como consecuencia del «efecto de americanización» de sus salarios y de sus ocupaciones en su proceso de asimilación (Chiswick, 1978). En 1977 comparó las ocupaciones de los inmigrantes en 1965 y 1970 y en 1978 examinó la evolución de los salarios de los inmigrantes varones blancos. La conclusión fue una descripción que dará título al tercer artículo de estos años (1979): «El progreso económico de los inmigrantes». Estos tempranos textos señalan la existencia de «un único y relativamente sencillo modelo que puede explicar su progreso independientemente de su grupo étnico»: aunque al principio los inmigrantes tienen ingresos inferiores a los estadounidenses equivalentes (en un 10% cuando llevan cinco años en Estados Unidos), luego sus ingresos crecen rápidamente y a los 13 años los ingresos de ambos grupos se equiparan; cuando los inmigrantes llevan veinte años en Estados Unidos, sus salarios medios son superiores a los de los nativos en un 6%. Más adelante, al disponer de datos de la última ocupación de los inmigrantes en su país de origen, la comparación de esta ocupación con la primera en el país de destino y con la ocupación «actual» permite reconstruir la pauta ocupacional en forma de «U». Así lo hacen Chiswick *et al.* (2005) para la experiencia de la inmigración australiana.

Chiswick identifica dos determinantes clave del progreso económico: transferibilidad y autoselección. Las mayores dificultades iniciales para encontrar empleo que tienen los inmigrantes en Estados Unidos son atribuidas a que probablemente el capital humano adquirido fuera solo imperfectamente transferible al mercado de trabajo estadounidense (Chiswick *et al.,* 1997). Estas dificultades de transferibilidad de ciertas cualificaciones son compensadas por los inmigrantes con la adquisición y mejora del idioma o con el conocimiento de las costumbres o el funcionamiento del mercado de trabajo. Además, los inmigrantes hacen inversiones en nueva formación que son relevantes para sus empleos en destino (Chiswick, 1978). El segundo de estos determinantes, la autoselección, es una de las proposiciones estándar de la literatura económica para explicar el éxito económico de los inmigrantes: los migrantes económicos son descritos en promedio como más capaces, ambiciosos, agresivos, emprendedores, que los individuos similares que optan por permanecer en su lugar de origen (Chiswick, 1999). Toda esta argumentación está realizada desde el lado de la oferta, pero si se analizara el de la demanda (políticas de selección y de visados), el resultado sería similar (Chiswick, 2008). Esta autoselección tiene variaciones significativas en aquella «pauta aparentemente universal» según sea la motivación del inmigrante y otras circunstancias como el país de origen o el grupo racial o étnico, y el nivel educativo y la mayor o menor cualificación de la ocupación en origen (Chiswick, 1978, 1979, 2008).

Esta literatura ha mostrado que la movilidad ocupacional inicial es, sobre todo, una movilidad descendente a la que sigue un proceso de «contra-movilidad» ascendente aunque sea limitada (Weiss *et al.,* 2003; Redstone, 2006 y 2008). Aquella movilidad descendente inicial se ha explicado por problemas de transferibilidad de cualificaciones (Chiswick *et al.,* 2005); por la mayor o menor «proximidad» económica, cultural o lingüística entre país de origen y de destino que facilita o dificulta esa transferibilidad (Redstone, 2006); o por deficiencias de capital humano inicial de los migrantes, ya que se apunta que los nuevos flujos de estos son menos cualificados que los anteriores (Borjas, 1995, 1999).

El estudio de la inmigración en España se ha incorporado recientemente a esta discusión. No es posible todavía evaluar definitivamente la segunda transición de la «U» de Chiswick por el corto periodo de tiempo transcurrido desde la inmigración masiva en España en la década anterior a 2007. Ya en las primeras investigaciones sobre la situación de los inmigrantes en el mercado de trabajo en España se señalaba que los inmigrantes tenían una situación de desventaja en el mercado laboral (Cachón, 1995; Colectivo IOÉ, 1998; Carrasco, 1999; Solé, 2001; Parella, 2003). También se ha señalado cómo los inmigrantes tienden a estar ubicados en ocupaciones de baja cualificación, complementarias a las de los nativos (Amuedo y De la Rica, 2010; Bernardi *et al.,* 2011); cómo esa segregación ocupacional es la explicación fundamental para comprender la desventaja salarial de los inmigrantes (Simón *et al.,* 2008); cómo sufren una sobreeducación y tienden a concentrarse en empleos temporales (Fernández y Ortega, 2008); cómo los inmigrantes no alcanzan un estatus ocupacional y/o salarial similar al de los trabajadores autóctonos con un capital humano comparable (Amuedo y De la Rica, 2007; Cachón, 2009; Sanromá *et al.,* 2009; Caparrós y Navarro, 2010; Stanek, 2011; Martín *et al.,* 2011); cómo, aunque reduzcan de modo significativo la diferencia salarial durante los primeros cinco o seis años, el diferencial nunca desaparece del todo (Izquierdo *et al.,* 2009); cómo los nichos laborales (Veira *et al.,* 2011) se reproducen en el caso de algunos colectivos como los polacos (Stanek, 2011) y cómo los inmigrantes son mucho más móviles que los autóctonos (Alcobendas y Rodríguez, 2009). A partir de los registros de la Seguridad Social, se ha señalado también la significativa movilidad ascendente que sigue la trayectoria laboral de los inmigrantes en España (Martín *et al.,* 2011), aunque no lleguen a alcanzar ni el nivel de los nativos (Alcobendas y Rodríguez, 2009), ni el nivel que tenían en sus países de origen (Izquierdo *et al.,* 2009).

La Encuesta Nacional de Inmigrantes de 2007 ha permitido contrastar muchas hipótesis de la literatura internacional para el caso español. Diversos estudios han mostrado cómo los inmigrantes en España sufren una notable movilidad ocupacional descendente al incorporarse al mercado laboral, seguida de una parcial «contramovilidad» (Cachón, 2009; Colectivo IOÉ, 2010; Stanek y Veira, 2009; Simón *et al.*, 2010). Estos estudios han señalado la relevancia del nivel educativo y la zona de origen para la movilidad de los inmigrantes en España (Caparrós y Navarro, 2010) y cómo el capital humano adquirido en España tiene una mayor rentabilidad marginal que el acumulado en origen (Sanromá *et al.,* 2009). Stanek y Veira (2009) han analizado el descenso ocupacional como resultado de la emigración hacia España, poniendo el acento en el género, el capital humano y las redes sociales. Es el mismo comportamiento que muestran Caparrós y Navarro (2010) poniendo el acento en los niveles educativos y zonas de origen de los inmigrantes. Simón *et al.* (2010) toman en consideración un conjunto amplio de factores explicativos para estudiar la trayectoria ocupacional entre el país de origen, el primer empleo y el trabajo actual en España.

La orientación teórica dominante subyacente en los estudios sobre la movilidad ocupacional de los inmigrantes elaborados en la estela de Chiswick es la de la «jerarquía social» (Erikson y Goldthorpe, 1993). La mayor parte de esos trabajos considera que la movilidad se produce a lo largo de toda una escala ocupacional jerarquizada donde los inmigrantes circulan entre las distintas ocupaciones. Es el mismo supuesto implícito en las teorías funcionalistas de la estratificación (Grusky, 1994). De ahí la preferencia por el estudio de la evolución de los salarios de los inmigrantes, que es una variable continua fácilmente modelable y cuyos resultados se muestran como de evidente interpretación; cuando analizan ocupaciones utilizan con frecuencia escalas de prestigio o estatus cu-

yos «límites» son puramente empíricos (formales, artificiales y desplazables) para darles un carácter continuo y automáticamente jerarquizable. Son enfoques graduacionales. Se da por hecho, como supone la teoría neoclásica del mercado de trabajo, que los individuos se mueven a lo largo de toda esa escala social (ocupacional/salarial). Esta literatura analiza los determinantes del logro salarial u ocupacional con apoyo de la perspectiva teórica del capital humano (Becker, 1993 [1964]). A veces se formulan hipótesis explicativas ligadas a otros supuestos teóricos como el capital social o la segmentación del mercado de trabajo, pero solo a efectos analíticos que ayuden a la comprensión de algunos resultados.

ORIENTACIÓN TEÓRICA E HIPÓTESIS DE INVESTIGACIÓN

Nuestra discusión con el argumento de Chiswick parte de una lectura selectiva de dos enfoques que proporcionan conceptos alternativos para analizar la integración económica (ocupacional) de los inmigrantes: las teorías de la segmentación del mercado de trabajo (SMT) y las aportaciones de la sociología de la movilidad social, sobre todo el concepto de «fluidez social».

Aunque puede rastrearse la idea de la segmentación en los clásicos de la ciencia económica, las teorías de la SMT comienzan a formularse como tales en los años cincuenta. Dunlop (1957) habla de «contornos salariales» y «clúster de ocupaciones», siendo estos últimos grupos de ocupaciones determinadas. Los trabajos de Piore y sus colaboradores por una parte, y los de Edward *et al.* (1975), por otra, contribuyen a consolidar este enfoque analítico en los años setenta. La idea básica inicial, formulada por Doeringer y Piore (1985 [1971]), es que el mercado de trabajo está dividido en dos segmentos distintos, que denominan *primario* y *secundario*. El primario ofrece puestos de trabajo

con salarios relativamente elevados, buenas condiciones de trabajo, posibilidades de promoción, procedimientos más reglados y más estabilidad en el empleo. En cambio, los puestos de trabajo del secundario ofrecen características típicamente opuestas. No hay que «distraerse» con la posible polémica acerca del número de segmentos que conforman el mercado de trabajo. Lo relevante no es cuántos segmentos hay, sino el hecho de que existen «discontinuidades» en el «campo» del mercado de trabajo con algún tipo de barrera entre los segmentos (Berger y Piore, 1980). Estas discontinuidades desvelan unos segmentos con distintas lógicas de funcionamiento (procesos de formación, ascenso, determinación de salarios, etc.) y distintos rasgos de conducta de trabajadores y empresarios (Villa, 1990). Pero se debería añadir la pregunta de si hay o no movilidad entre esos segmentos y qué pautas sigue esa movilidad. Porque los segmentos conforman espacios de circulación intensa *dentro* de ellos y limitada *entre* ellos. Si se pudiera mostrar la existencia de no-movilidad relativa entre segmentos se añadiría un carácter especialmente sólido al carácter «clasista» de la SMT que está en la base de esta argumentación. Definir los segmentos por el hecho de que entre ellos no se produce una movilidad significativa no es una redundancia o una argumentación circular. Porque esa «no circulación» es, precisamente, uno de los rasgos de los segmentos/clases: su «cierre» hacia fuera.

Las teorías actuales de la SMT siguen proporcionando conceptos relevantes para la comprensión de los fenómenos sociales y en los últimos años se está produciendo un renovado interés por sus planteamientos, como lo muestra la antología editada por Reich (2008) *Segmented Labor Markets and Labor Mobility*.

Las teorías de la SMT suelen recordar que algunos grupos de personas quedan «atrapadas» en empleos del sector secundario en una fase temprana de sus carreras, entre otras ra-

zones, porque han sido socializadas en determinada «moral» (Edward, 1979; Sabel, 1986). Uno de estos colectivos más frágiles que tienen más probabilidades de verse en esa situación son los inmigrantes. Pero el «confinamiento» debe ser estudiado y explicado (Granovetter, 1994). Pocos investigadores han analizado la movilidad entre segmentos ocupacionales de los inmigrantes. Rosenberg (1981) ha mostrado que los inmigrantes que comienzan a trabajar en el segmento secundario tienen menos probabilidades de pasar al primario que los blancos y que las variables de capital humano no ayudan a explicar esos comportamientos. Dickens y Lang (1985) señalan que los resultados de su investigación proporcionan un fuerte apoyo a dos de los principios básicos de la SMT: hay dos segmentos distintos del mercado de trabajo con diferentes mecanismos de determinación salarial y existen barreras no económicas entre ellos. Al analizar la situación de los inmigrantes en Austria, Fassmann (1997) señala que las observaciones en el mundo real muestran que los nativos y los trabajadores extranjeros y sus puestos de trabajo son heterogéneos y se ubican en diferentes segmentos laborales con estructuras y dispositivos de asignación diferentes y más o menos separados uno del otro.

El análisis de la movilidad social ha sido una cuestión central en la sociología de la estratificación social, ya que ratificaba uno de sus supuestos de partida: *debe* existir movilidad. Pero, frente a este supuesto, podría decirse que el descubrimiento fundamental de los estudios de movilidad social es, precisamente, la *in*-varianza, la estabilidad, la reproducción social (Cachón, 1989). Por eso se necesita reorientar radicalmente la perspectiva: «Deben centrarse, no en las explicaciones del cambio social a través de las relaciones de clase, sino en la comprensión de los procesos que subyacen a la profunda resistencia al cambio que ofrecen las relaciones de este tipo» (Goldthorpe y Marshall, 1997: 61-62).

Se podría decir que la línea argumental que ha conducido a este «descubrimiento» de la *in*-varianza social tiene cinco etapas. La primera es el trabajo pionero de Sorokin (1959 [1859]) y su apunte de que la estratificación social misma es un factor endógeno de movilidad social. La segunda es la hipótesis enunciada por Lipset y Zetterberg (1959: 90), que apuntan que «las pautas de movilidad en las sociedades industrializadas occidentales están determinadas por la estructura ocupacional» y como ésta tiende a parecerse en las sociedades industriales, las pautas de movilidad tienden también a ser homogéneas. La tercera etapa es una nueva «hipótesis provisional» enunciada por Featherman, Jones y Hauser (FJH) (1975: 340) que establece que «la pauta genotípica en términos de movilidad (movilidad de circulación) en las sociedades industriales con economía de mercado y sistema de familia nuclear es básicamente la misma. La pauta fenotípica de movilidad (movilidad observada) difiere de acuerdo con la tasa de variación de la estructura ocupacional». En la cuarta etapa se producen un conjunto de aportaciones teóricas, analíticas y metodológicas de diversos autores entre los que destacan Miller (que diferencia el cambio estructural de la «fluidez»), Goldthorpe (que distingue entre «fenotipo» y «genotipo» y que introduce el concepto de «deseabilidad»), Girod (1971) (que introduce el concepto de «contra-movilidad», referido al movimiento que lleva a recuperar la posición de origen) y Hauser y sus colaboradores (que hablan de «régimen endógeno de movilidad»). Con estos instrumentos, la hipótesis de FJH ha sido precisada en la quinta etapa, sobre todo con los trabajos de Goldthorpe y colaboradores (Goldthorpe, 1980, 2010; Erikson y Goldthorpe, 1993) que enuncian el «modelo de fluidez constante»: existe un grado de constancia temporal y una semejanza entre países en las tasas relativas de movilidad intergeneracional de clase.

Goldthorpe (2010) sintetiza los debates teóricos actuales sobre movilidad social en

dos aspectos: primero, las tasas absolutas de movilidad intergeneracional de clase, que muestran una variación considerable a lo largo del tiempo, son resultado de «efectos estructurales» exógenos, básicamente de cómo han evolucionado las estructuras de clase. Segundo, las tasas relativas parecen caracterizarse por un grado bastante sorprendente de *in*varianza: es decir, por una estabilidad temporal y por una semejanza transnacional sustantiva. Estos «regímenes endógenos de movilidad» o «fluidez» parecen determinar procesos que en gran medida son sistemáticos e independientes del contexto; es decir, que operan de forma muy similar en una amplia variedad de sociedades y que muestran regularidades sociales de gran alcance. Basados en estos enfoques, los estudios de movilidad social se han incrementado de modo notable en los últimos años.

Obras clásicas en este campo como Lipset y Zetterberg (1959) y Blau y Duncan (1967) pusieron de relieve la importancia de analizar la inmigración dentro de un programa de investigación sobre la movilidad social, y avanzaron algunos de los resultados clave que más de una década después fueron reformulados por economistas como Chiswick. Por ejemplo, Blau y Duncan (1967: 256-257) señalan que «los migrantes en general tienen carreras más exitosas que otros hombres», y concluyen que sus resultados son «consistentes con la interpretación de que la migración es un proceso selectivo de personas predispuestas para el éxito profesional». Además proponen una hipótesis: la migración es una experiencia ventajosa que mejora las habilidades ocupacionales de las personas. Sin embargo, esta línea de investigación no ha influido en la investigación general sobre la movilidad social ni en los trabajos de Chiswick. Esta discontinuidad puede explicar por qué no se han incorporado las innovaciones metodológicas de la sociología de la movilidad social en el estudio de la movilidad laboral inmigrante. Los sociólogos han emprendido un camino fructífero pero paralelo: el análisis de las trayectorias de los inmigrantes de segunda y tercera generación (Portes, 2012; Telles y Ortiz, 2011).

Nuestro artículo estudia la movilidad ocupacional de la primera generación de inmigrantes, revisa la pauta en forma de «U» propuesta por Chiswick y propone la existencia de un patrón *segmentado* en forma de «U» para aquella. Para ello partimos de una perspectiva de «estructura de clases» (Erikson y Goldthorpe, 1993) que asume que hay rupturas entre un número limitado de conjuntos «discretos», de escalones sociales en los cuales los individuos ocupan posiciones. Este enfoque necesita clasificar a los individuos en categorías mutuamente exclusivas y exhaustivas. La breve lectura selectiva de las teorías de la SMT y de la sociología de la movilidad social que hemos presentado nos permite señalar que existe una no-movilidad entre segmentos en el mercado de trabajo, como existe una no-fluidez entre clases. Permite también apuntar que la integración laboral dentro de cada uno de ellos es diferente y que los determinantes de la movilidad descendente ocupacional inicial y de la «contra-movilidad» posterior son diferentes en función del segmento del mercado de trabajo y de la escasa movilidad observada entre los segmentos.

Al examinar la movilidad ocupacional de los inmigrantes no estamos haciendo un estudio de movilidad «social», porque no estamos analizando «clases sociales» (Erikson *et al.,* 2012). No partimos de una perspectiva durkheimiana tendente a descubrir «microclases» en las categorías ocupacionales (Grusky, 2005); más bien adoptamos una perspectiva weberiana (Breen, 2005) en un doble sentido: estudiamos «agregados ocupacionales» (a nivel de un dígito de la Clasificación Nacional de Ocupaciones) para el estudio de cambio ocupacional, y utilizamos el criterio «clúster de intercambio» para construir los segmentos en el mercado de trabajo.

Pero nuestro análisis no se limita a un estudio de la movilidad ocupacional que contraste los resultados de Chiswick y otros autores. En línea con los resultados de las teorías de la SMT, partimos de que el mercado de trabajo funciona de modo segmentado y que existen segmentos con rasgos diferentes, tanto desde el punto de vista de la oferta como de la demanda. Un problema persistente en esta área es la dificultad de delimitar los segmentos laborales (Rosenberg, 1980; Boston, 1990). Se podría hacer una asignación de los grupos ocupacionales a dos (o más) segmentos (primario y secundario; no manual y manual, en términos ocupacionales) en función de algunas de sus características. Pero nosotros procederemos de manera distinta porque abordaremos la delimitación de los segmentos como espacios discretos en términos de movilidad. No agrupamos las ocupaciones *a priori* en función de indicadores como salario o prestigio, sino que delimitamos los segmentos de acuerdo a los límites de la fluidez ocupacional partiendo de los datos empíricos. La definición de los segmentos sobre esta base no es una redundancia. Porque la inmovilidad ligada a las barreras del mercado es una característica fundamental de los segmentos: son espacios sociales cerrados. Lo que Weber (1969 [1922]: 142) dice para las clases sociales es aplicable a los segmentos del mercado de trabajo: «*Clase social* se llama a la totalidad de situaciones de clase *entre* las cuales un intercambio personal en la sucesión de las generaciones es fácil y suele ocurrir de modo típico». Parafraseando a Weber diremos que un segmento laboral, típicamente, es un «clúster de ocupaciones» que tienen algunas características comunes y entre las cuales es fácil y suele ocurrir un intercambio personal de posiciones de ocupaciones. El test empírico que llevamos a cabo resuelve la incertidumbre sobre los límites entre los clústeres ocupacionales, ya que deja que sean los datos los que fijen la demarcación de los segmentos. Si los límites de los segmentos coinciden con los identificados en

las teorías SMT entonces estarían definiendo espacios acotados en lo que los agentes desarrollan sus estrategias de movilidad. Pero para ello hay que superar algún aspecto de las teorías de SMT que han descuidado la importancia de la existencia o no de movilidad entre los segmentos primario y secundario, porque hacen hincapié en mecanismos de funcionamiento, reglas y resultados (Villa, 1990). En contra de este argumento hay que poner de relieve la importancia de considerar los procesos de movilidad (mayor o menor) entre segmentos como una característica estructural del mercado laboral segmentado. Como señalaban Blau y Duncan (1967: 60), «una pauta persistente de desproporcionados bajos movimientos entre grupos ocupacionales es todo lo que se necesita para señalar que hay un límite de clase».

Nosotros vamos a reexaminar el patrón descendente inicial y ascendente posterior de la «U» de Chiswick desde este contexto teórico. Nuestro trabajo probará para el caso español dos hipótesis enunciadas por Chiswick *et al.* (2005), pero reformuladas desde una doble dimensión: los procesos de movilidad ocupacional se producen *dentro* de los segmentos primario y secundario y *escasamente* fuera de ellos; y el análisis no se hará con tasas absolutas que muestran la movilidad total, sino con tasas relativas que permiten desvelar la «fluidez» ocupacional. Nuestras dos hipótesis son las siguientes:

1. Según Chiswick *et al.* (2005), «los inmigrantes experimentan una disminución en el estatus ocupacional del origen al destino y un posterior aumento a medida que pasan más tiempo en el destino», es decir, siguen una pauta ocupacional en forma de «U»; pero tanto la movilidad ocupacional descendente inicial (entre la ocupación en origen y el primer empleo en España) como la contra-movilidad ascendente parcial posterior (entre el primer empleo y el empleo actual) de los

inmigrantes no comunitarios se producen *dentro* de dos grandes segmentos ocupacionales y prácticamente solo en ellos: es decir, que tienen una *pauta ocupacional segmentada en forma de «U».* Las tasas de movilidad relativas nos permitirán mostrar una «fluidez» importante *dentro* de los segmentos y escasa *fuera* de ellos en las dos transiciones.

2. La *pauta ocupacional segmentada en forma de «U»* puede tener variaciones que muestran regularidades explicables por distintos factores. Estas «*variantes regulares*» hacen que la trayectoria de las ocupaciones entre la primera y la segunda transición no solo sea una «U» más o menos pronunciada o superficial (por retomar expresiones de Chiswick), sino que implican variaciones en las pautas de fluidez entre los segmentos. Algunos de los factores relevantes que pueden producir estas «variantes regulares» y que son analizables a partir de la ENI-2007, son características personales como el género, el nivel educativo (y las competencias en general), el idioma, el origen nacional y/o étnico, las condiciones legales de llegada o el capital social de los inmigrantes.

Si este planteamiento se muestra correcto, implica una matización relevante de los argumentos de Chiswick y una crítica de las teorías que defienden la movilidad ascendente o descendente en la escala ocupacional de modo lineal. Pero también pone en cuestión dos supuestos de las teorías de la SMT: la omisión de la importancia de la (no) movilidad en la definición de espacios sociales en el mercado de trabajo; y la asignación de los inmigrantes como un conjunto único general al mercado de trabajo secundario.

Datos y métodos

La *Encuesta Nacional de Inmigrantes* (ENI-2007) recoge información sobre 15.465 personas nacidas fuera de España mayores de 16 años que vivían en España o tenían intención de hacerlo durante más de un año, y que fueron entrevistadas entre noviembre de 2006 y febrero de 2007. La muestra es representativa de las personas que viven en España y nacieron en Ecuador, Marruecos, Rumanía, y en las siguientes regiones: América Latina, África (con la excepción de Sudáfrica), Asia (con la excepción de Japón), América del Norte (Estados Unidos y Canadá) y Oceanía, la UE-15 más el Espacio Económico Europeo y Suiza. La ENI-2007 contiene datos sobre características de los migrantes e información retrospectiva sobre el último empleo de los migrantes en el país de origen, y el primer y el último empleo en España. Para cada uno de estos empleos la encuesta recaba información sobre la ocupación, la situación profesional, el sector de actividad y la duración del contrato laboral.

Para nuestro análisis hemos excluido a las personas nacidas en la UE-15, el EEE y Suiza, los nacionales españoles por nacimiento, las personas sin experiencia laboral en sus países de origen y a los que no tienen experiencia laboral en España. La muestra que utilizamos en nuestro análisis contiene datos sobre 7.280 inmigrantes no comunitarios en España. Para estudiar la movilidad ocupacional de inmigrantes entre su primer empleo y el actual en España, hemos seleccionado los individuos empleados en el momento de la encuesta que informaron de que su trabajo actual (pero no necesariamente su ocupación) era diferente a su primer trabajo en España (n = 4.031). Las características de los inmigrantes con un solo trabajo desde la llegada (n = 3.249) son similares a las de los que tienen varios trabajos.

Aunque muchos estudios sobre la integración laboral de los inmigrantes han utilizado datos de estudios transversales, recientemente las nuevas fuentes han facilitado el acceso a los datos longitudinales (Chiswick *et al.,* 2005; Duleep y Regets, 1997; Bauer y Zimmermann, 1999; Adsera y Chiswick, 2007;

Aslund y Rooth, 2007; Beenstock *et al*., 2010). En España, la única encuesta nacional que contiene información sobre la experiencia laboral de los inmigrantes a través del tiempo en España y en su país de origen es la ENI 2007.

Como sostienen Simón *et al.* (2010), hay tres posibles fuentes de sesgo en el uso de datos retrospectivos de muestras completas de estudios transversales: los cambios en la composición del flujo de inmigrantes a través del tiempo (Borjas, 1985, 1995); las fluctuaciones del ciclo económico y las características de los inmigrantes que entran en la fuerza de trabajo (Aslund y Rooth, 2007) y la migración de retorno o el tránsito hacia un tercer país (Constant y Massey, 2003). Al igual que en otros estudios (Reyneri y Fullin, 2011), asumimos que las características no observadas de los migrantes no cambian con el tiempo, y que la migración de retorno no ha sido un proceso selectivo hasta 2007, dado que la inmigración en España comenzó a crecer a finales de la década de los años noventa y continuaba haciéndolo en 2007, impulsada por un crecimiento económico sostenido.

Variables

Nuestro análisis se centra en la movilidad ocupacional entre y dentro de los segmentos del mercado de trabajo en dos transiciones: desde el último empleo en origen al primer empleo en España y desde el primer empleo al empleo en el momento de la encuesta. La ENI-2007 recopila información sobre la ocupación en cada empleo. Esta información se clasifica según la Clasificación Internacional Uniforme de Ocupaciones (CIUO-88) en su versión adaptada para España (CNO-94). Nosotros utilizamos la clasificación de un dígito para este análisis[1]:

---

1. Dirección de empresas y administraciones públicas.

2. Técnicos y profesionales científicos e intelectuales.

3. Técnicos y profesionales de apoyo.

4. Empleados de tipo administrativo.

5. Trabajadores de servicios de restauración, personales, protección y vendedores de comercio.

6. Trabajadores cualificados en la agricultura y en la pesca.

7. Artesanos y trabajadores cualificados de las industrias manufactureras, la construcción y la minería.

8. Operadores de instalaciones y maquinaria y montadores.

9. Trabajadores no cualificados.

Nuestro argumento se centra en la SMT y por ello hemos de clasificar las ocupaciones por segmentos. En lugar de hacerlo a priori, lo que pudiera ser un tanto arbitrario, como señala Rosenberg (1980), dividiremos los segmentos donde aparecen los límites de circulación que nos señalan los datos empíricos. Y, como se mostrará en el análisis de los resultados de las razones de probabilidad, aparecen dos clústers de ocupaciones que calificaremos como los segmentos primario y secundario. En el mercado de trabajo primario ubicaremos los grupos ocupacionales de las primeras cuatro categorías (uno a cuatro) y en el mercado de trabajo secundario los otros cinco (cinco a nueve). El quinto grupo ocupacional (Trabajadores de servicios) se puede identificar como una «zona de amortiguación» (Parkin, 1978).

Con el fin de comprender mejor la movilidad de los inmigrantes en un mercado de trabajo segmentado, en nuestro análisis incluimos mediciones de fluidez ocupacional de acuerdo a variaciones en capital humano, uso del español, experiencia migrante, capital social, género y características del empleo anterior que han sido utilizados en investigaciones

---

[1] Dado que solo disponemos de datos sobre población civil no se tiene en cuenta la categoría 0 (Fuerzas Armadas).

previas (Chiswick *et al.,* 2005; Redstone, 2006; Stanek y Viera, 2009; Caparrós y Navarro, 2010). Estas variables son medidas en el momento de su llegada a España (para el estudio de la primera transición) y en el momento de la encuesta (para la segunda transición).

Métodos

Para contrastar las hipótesis sobre la movilidad ocupacional segmentada, nuestro análisis ofrece estimaciones sobre movilidad general, movilidad en los segmentos del mercado de trabajo y movilidad en términos absolutos y relativos. Estudiamos la movilidad ocupacional absoluta y relativa con distribuciones conjuntas ponderadas y con razones de probabilidad *(odds ratios)*, respectivamente, para las dos transiciones (cuadros 1, 2, 4 y 5). La estimación de razones de probabilidad se ha convertido en una práctica estándar en el análisis de tablas de movilidad, ya que «muestran las probabilidades relativas de que individuos en dos categorías diferentes de origen se encuentren en una y no en otra categorías de destino» (Erikson y Goldthorpe, 1993: 55). Las razones de probabilidad nos permiten observar efectos relativos, ya que expresan el patrón de asociación *neta* entre las categorías de origen y destino, es decir, «el patrón de asociación considerado neto de los efectos de la distribución marginal de estas categorías» (ibíd. 56). Una razón de probabilidad diferente de 1 indica que las variables de columna y fila no son independientes; por tanto, proporciona una medida de asociación sin efectos derivados de las distribuciones marginales de las variables. Las razones de probabilidad capturan esta asociación neta porque son insensibles a las distribuciones marginales (Bishop, Fienberg y Holland, 1975). Además, debido a su propiedad de invarianza multiplicativa, el logaritmo de las razones de probabilidad es el mismo independientemente del tamaño de la muestra y es igualmente válida para diseños de muestreo retrospectivos, prospectivos y transversales (Agresti, 1990). Otra ventaja importante de las tasas relativas en términos de razones de probabilidad es que estas razones constituyen los elementos de modelos log-lineares.

Una implicación importante es que las tablas de movilidad pueden compartir regímenes de movilidad relativa similares a pesar de que difieran en sus distribuciones marginales y que, por tanto, sus tasas de movilidad absoluta sean diferentes. En nuestro caso, representan un indicador de la asociación neta entre la última ocupación en origen y la primera en España sin los efectos de la distribución ocupacional de los migrantes en sus países de origen y en España (primera transición), y para los que han tenido más de un empleo en España, desde el primer al último empleo sin los efectos marginales de la distribución ocupacional de esta población en ambos momentos (segunda transición).

Con el fin de incorporar el análisis de la «fluidez social» desarrollado por Erikson y Goldthorpe (1993), hemos estimado las razones de probabilidad para la tabla de movilidad siguiendo a Agresti (1990: 18)[2,3]:

$$\alpha_{ij} = \frac{n_{ij}\, n_{55}}{n_{5j}\, n_{i5}}$$

donde:

α_{ij} es la razón de probabilidad *(odds ratio)* para la celda *ij* en la tabla de movilidad.

n_{ij} es el número de personas con empleo *i* en su origen y *j* en destino.

n_{55} es el número de personas con empleo en la categoría 5 (Trabajadores de servicios de

---

[2] Se han estimado también las razones de probabilidad utilizando modelos log-lineales (Hout, 1983) y las razones de probabilidad globales (Heagerty y Zeger, 1996). Todos los resultados fueron consistentes. Se presentan las estimaciones utilizando los métodos desarrollados por Agresti (1990) porque esos son más utilizados en el análisis de la movilidad social y son más fáciles de interpretar.

[3] Hemos detectado unas pocas casillas sin observaciones. Como una tabla de movilidad no tiene ceros estructurales, siguiendo el ajuste propuesto por Goodman (1979) se añadió 0,01 observaciones a todas las casillas con el fin de calcular nuestras razones de probabilidad.

restauración, personales, protección y vendedores de comercio, que es nuestra categoría de referencia) en origen y destino.

n_{5j} es el número de personas en la categoría 5 en origen y en la categoría j en destino.

n_{i5} es el número de personas en la categoría i en el origen y en la categoría 5 en destino.

Para nuestras estimaciones de razones de probabilidad, elegimos la categoría 5 como la categoría de referencia debido a que se la puede calificar como una «zona de amortiguación» entre los segmentos del mercado de trabajo (Parkin, 1978).

Después de analizar las pautas de movilidad absoluta y relativa de nuestros datos, procedemos a definir los segmentos del mercado de trabajo en dos grupos, primario y secundario, y mostramos estimaciones de las medidas de movilidad relativa de las dos transiciones para variables relevantes. Las razones de probabilidad del cuadro 3 ilustran cómo las posibilidades de encontrarse en el segmento primario en lugar de en el secundario difieren entre las personas según su empleo anterior fuera en el primario o en el secundario.

Las variables asociadas a la movilidad ocupacional de los inmigrantes se agrupan en los siguientes vectores: capital humano (nivel educativo, certificados de estudios y credenciales y conocimiento del idioma), experiencia migratoria (región de origen, periodo de llegada, ciudadanía o estatus inmigrante, razón para la migración, e intención de asentamiento), capital social (si encontró el primer empleo a través de sus redes sociales) y género.

Resultados

Los resultados muestran regularidades de comportamiento de la movilidad ocupacional de los inmigrantes no comunitarios en España en las dos transiciones que permiten contrastar las hipótesis enunciadas. Para ello, en

el siguiente epígrafe se expondrán los resultados de la movilidad ocupacional absoluta en ambas transiciones; este epígrafe pondrá de relieve algunas regularidades de comportamiento que apuntan a la existencia de barreras entre los segmentos y mostrará distintas pautas de movilidad absoluta según diversas variables. La segmentación será abordada en un epígrafe posterior («Pautas de movilidad ocupacional relativa») al examinar, para las dos transiciones, las pautas que sigue la movilidad relativa, medida a través de razones de probabilidad; sus resultados apuntan regularidades que permiten hablar de una pauta de fluidez ocupacional segmentada en cada una de las transiciones; se mostrará también cómo esa pauta segmentada se reproduce con algunos rasgos específicos según diversas variables.

Pautas de movilidad ocupacional absoluta: los límites de un mercado de trabajo abierto

Los cuadros 1 y 2 recogen, respectivamente, la movilidad ocupacional absoluta que se produce entre la última ocupación que el emigrante tuvo en su país de origen y la del primer empleo en España (primera transición) y la que se produce entre ese primer empleo y el empleo actual (segunda transición). La literatura ha mostrado de modo reiterado que los inmigrantes tienen una movilidad (ocupacional) inicial descendente y que posteriormente recuperan, al menos en parte, las posiciones de origen en un proceso que calificamos como de contra-movilidad. Los datos de la ENI-2007 confirman estos hallazgos para España.

En una tabla de movilidad ocupacional, las tasas de movilidad absoluta se explican sobre todo por factores exógenos, que son «los que determinan las "formas" de las estructuras de clase (ocupacional), es decir, sus tamaños proporcionales y las tasas de crecimiento o decrecimiento de las diferentes clases, y no los que determinan las pro-

CUADRO 1. *Movilidad ocupacional absoluta de los inmigrantes no comunitarios entre la ocupación del último empleo en origen y la del primer empleo en España*

| | | Primero en España | | | | | | | | | | |
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	%	N
Último en origen	1	**0,6**	0,2	0,4	0,2	1,0	0,1	0,7	0,1	1,7	4,89	365
	2	0,1	**2,5**	0,5	0,6	2,1	0,1	0,6	0,3	3,2	10,11	752
	3	0,2	0,4	**1,3**	0,3	3,3	0,2	0,9	0,2	3,0	9,80	736
	4	0,1	0,2	0,2	**0,6**	2,5	0,1	0,5	0,2	3,2	7,51	597
	5	0,2	0,3	0,5	0,6	**7,3**	0,3	1,9	0,4	10,1	21,69	1.668
	6	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,3	**0,3**	0,5	0,1	1,4	2,53	152
	7	0,0	0,2	0,2	0,0	2,2	0,4	**8,8**	0,7	7,7	20,20	1.295
	8	0,0	0,0	0,1	0,1	0,9	0,3	1,7	**1,0**	4,4	8,51	604
	9	0,1	0,0	0,1	0,1	2,0	0,4	1,4	0,5	**10,3**	14,77	1.111
	%	1,37	3,85	3,36	2,51	21,47	2,13	16,81	3,60	44,90	100	
	N	90	287	245	188	1.692	152	1.001	247	3.378		7.280

Nota: Las categorías 1 a 9 corresponden a los grupos ocupacionales a nivel de un dígito en la CNO-94 (véase el texto).

Fuente: Elaboración propia a partir de los microdatos de la ENI-2007. Cifras relativas calculadas sobre los datos ponderados.

pensiones de los individuos a conservar o cambiar de posición dentro de esas estructuras» (Goldthorpe, 2010: 425). En nuestras tablas de movilidad ocupacional de los inmigrantes, los factores clave que determinan las «formas» de las distribuciones marginales hay que buscarlos en factores «externos» y ajenos a ellos y que son los que ubican a los inmigrantes en esas posiciones y no en las propensiones de los migrantes a conservar o cambiar de ocupación. Uno de aquellos es el mercado de trabajo español y el peso de los empleos secundarios y de los bajos salarios en él; otro de los factores «externos» es el «marco institucional discriminatorio» (Cachón, 2009). Por eso hablamos de movilidad «estructural»: es la que resulta de estos factores «externos» que producen la configuración de los datos marginales. El cuadro 1 indica que el 32% que trabajaba en origen lo hacía en ocupaciones del sector primario y el 68% en el secundario; y que en el primer empleo en España se produce un cambio

radical porque solo el 11% lo hace en el primario frente al 89% que trabaja en el secundario. Esto ya apunta un notable descenso ocupacional que sufren los inmigrantes en España en el momento inicial de la inmigración. Este es un descenso ocupacional que podemos calificar de «estructural». El cuadro 2 muestra que en el empleo actual los inmigrantes ven mejorar algo la situación ocupacional pero sin recuperar la distribución en origen: los ocupados en el primario pasan del 8 al 14% mientras que disminuyen en el secundario del 92 al 86% .

Si se analiza la movilidad de los inmigrantes en las posiciones ocupacionales, a grandes rasgos puede decirse que la ocupación del primer empleo de los inmigrantes no comunitarios en España muestra que el 54% ha descendido de ocupación respecto a la que tenía en origen, frente a un 14% que asciende y un 33% que se mantiene en el mismo grupo ocupacional (cuadro 1). Este descenso inicial se ve compensado parcialmente cuando se

CUADRO 2. *Movilidad ocupacional absoluta de los inmigrantes no comunitarios entre el primer empleo en España al empleo actual*

		Actual en España										
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	%	N
Primero en España	1	**0,4**	0,0	0,1	0,1	0,0	0,0	0,1	0,1	0,0	0,71	26
	2	0,4	**1,9**	0,2	0,1	0,1	0,0	0,0	0,1	0,2	2,90	121
	3	0,3	0,2	**1,0**	0,2	0,6	0,0	0,2	0,2	0,2	2,75	114
	4	0,2	0,1	0,3	**0,6**	0,3	0,0	0,1	0,2	0,1	1,81	78
	5	1,0	0,4	1,2	1,1	**9,1**	0,2	1,8	0,9	6,0	21,58	939
	6	0,0	0,0	0,1	0,0	0,4	**0,5**	0,9	0,1	0,7	2,68	104
	7	0,3	0,2	0,1	0,2	1,0	0,1	**10,3**	0,9	2,4	15,45	521
	8	0,2	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,4	0,0	0,8	**1,5**	0,5	3,62	131
	9	0,4	0,3	0,8	1,4	8,1	0,8	9,1	4,1	**23,5**	48,51	1.997
	%	3,10	3,14	3,79	3,79	19,84	1,60	23,34	8,00	33,41	100	
	N	119	139	170	158	821	58	866	316	1.384		4.031

Nota: Las categorías 1 a 9 corresponden a los grupos ocupacionales a nivel de un dígito en la CNO-94 (véase el texto).

Fuente: Elaboración propia a partir de los microdatos de la ENI-2007. Cifras relativas calculadas sobre los datos ponderados.

analiza la contra-movilidad en la segunda transición: el 34% de los inmigrantes asciende de grupo ocupacional, frente al 17% que desciende y el 49% que se mantiene en el mismo grupo ocupacional (cuadro 2). Pero si se examinan con más detalle las pautas de movilidad absoluta que recogen los cuadros, puede verse que la importante movilidad descendente inicial se reparte entre una movilidad entre segmentos y una movilidad dentro de cada uno de los segmentos: el 24% pasa de ocupaciones del segmento primario a ocupaciones del secundario y otro 30% desciende de ocupación pero *dentro* del segmento primario (el 2,2%) o del secundario (27,6%). La pauta de la movilidad ascendente inicial es similar aunque con menor volumen de ascendentes. No ocurre así con la contra-movilidad ascendente de la segunda transición: un 8% se produce por paso de ocupaciones del secundario al primario frente a un 28% que es cambio ocupacional *dentro* del segmento secundario y otro 1,4% dentro del primario.

Hay que señalar que el papel de «zona de amortiguación» (Parkin, 1978) que cumple el grupo ocupacional 5 (Trabajadores de servicios de restauración, personales, protección y vendedores de comercio). Es en gran medida el grupo límite de la caída de los grupos ocupacionales del segmento primario en la primera transición y del ascenso de los grupos del secundario en la segunda, y por ello nuestra categoría de referencia.

El cuadro 3 compara la movilidad absoluta y relativa de las variables más significativas para las dos transiciones. Para facilitar la comparación se pasa de una tabla de 9 x 9, a analizar los resultados en una tabla 2 x 2 agrupando las ocupaciones en los dos segmentos del mercado de trabajo identificados. El cuadro 3 muestra los que se han mantenido en el segmento primario y en el secundario en los dos momentos (columnas 2, 3, 8 y 9), los que han descendido del primario al secundario (columnas 4 y 10) y los que han ascendido del secundario al primario (columnas 5 y 11). Los datos totales muestran que en la primera tran-

CUADRO 3. *Movilidad absoluta y relativa de los inmigrantes no comunitarios entre y en los segmentos del mercado de trabajo según variables relevantes*

Variable	Primera transición (origen-primer empleo)					Segunda transición (primero-actual)				
	Movilidad absoluta (%)				Razones de probabilidad	Movilidad absoluta (%)				Razones de probabilidad
	P→P	S→S	P→S	S→P		P→P	S→S	P→S	S→P	
Número de las columnas	2	3	4	5	6	8	9	10	11	12
Total (n)	---	---	---	182	---	250	---	89	336	---
(%)	8,63	63,85	25,03	2,50	8,79	5,74	83,76	2,43	8,08	24,51
Características demográficas										
Género										
Hombres	8,17	72,87	16,22	2,74	13,40	5,26	85,96	2,67	6,11	27,75
Mujeres	8,86	54,44	34,22	2,48	5,69	6,49	80,28	2,05	11,2	22,75
Capital humano										
Educación										
Sin educación o elemental	1,13	89,24	8,70	0,93	12,51	0,57	95,99	0,82	2,62	25,54
Secundaria obligatoria	3,16	77,37	16,83	2,64	5,49	0,78	92,59	1,68	4,95	8,65
Secundaria posobligatoria	7,15	62,83	27,03	2,99	5,57	2,85	86,15	2,73	8,27	10,88
Superior	28,10	20,73	46,71	4,47	2,79	23	55,36	4,41	17,2	16,83
Certificado estudios y estudios en España										
Sin certificado	6,01	78,74	12,67	2,59	14,43	1,04	94,79	1,63	2,54	23,66
Certificado de país de origen	9,55	59,04	28,77	2,65	7,40	4,55	85,19	2,17	8,09	22,04
Certificado homologado en España	---	---	---	---	---	29,00	40,25	5,53	25,20	8,39
Certificado de institución española	---	---	---	---	---	18,60	59,49	6,38	15,50	11,20
Fluidez en español										
Lengua materna										
Español	10,71	56,17	30,40	2,72	7,26	7,56	78,71	3,40	10,30	21,11
Otra	6,11	74,37	16,99	2,53	10,58	---	---	---	---	---
Fluidez	---	---	---	---	---	4,78	86,66	1,82	6,74	33,67
Fluidez parcial	---	---	---	---	---	0,37	98,27	0	1,36	403,43
Sin fluidez	---	---	---	---	---	2,19	91,84	0	5,97	70,40
Experiencia migratoria										
Región de origen										
Europa no UE	4,71	75,83	17,55	1,91	10,64	1,89	92,25	1,10	4,76	33,33
Marruecos	2,44	88,01	7,91	1,64	16,56	1,77	92,63	0,67	4,93	49,69
África sin Marruecos	5,25	72,99	20,05	1,70	11,22	2,24	90,78	1,17	5,81	29,99

CUADRO 3. *Movilidad absoluta y relativa de los inmigrantes no comunitarios entre y en los segmentos del mercado de trabajo según variables relevantes (continuación)*

América Latina	10,52	56,15	30,51	2,82	6,86	7,67	78,76	3,43	10,10	17,36
Resto de países	20,70	50,58	21,72	7,00	6,89	15,5	71,43	2,74	10,40	38,86
Período de llegada										
Antes de 1998	17,98	57,83	19,39	4,80	11,17	16,00	68,62	2,77	12,60	31,49
Entre 1998 y 2000	6,67	63,14	27,84	2,36	6,41	4,29	84,39	1,71	9,61	22,03
Entre 2001 y 2003	6,63	67,29	24,24	1,84	9,99	2,98	88,19	2,80	6,03	15,56
Después de 2004	5,92	68,71	22,86	2,51	7,09	3,57	88,50	2,24	5,69	24,77
Ciudadanía y estatus inmigrante										
Ciudadanos UE	20,55	49,63	24,83	4,99	8,23	16,20	66,96	3,40	13,40	23,85
Resid. permanente y documentados inmigrantes	8,16	67,33	21,49	3,02	8,48	3,12	87,51	2,25	7,11	17,10
Inmigrantes indocumentados	3,64	70,64	24,18	1,54	6,88	0,21	94,75	1,60	3,44	3,53
Razones para la migración										
Empleo	8,42	74,15	15,14	2,29	18,03	4,74	88,51	1,83	4,92	46,63
Otras	8,47	63,45	25,39	2,69	7,87	5,91	82,93	2,53	8,63	22,45
Contrato de trabajo antes del viaje										
Con contrato de trabajo	16,00	60,54	21,45	2,01	22,47	8,85	81,42	2,45	7,28	40,40
Sin contrato de trabajo	6,92	65,99	24,33	2,75	6,81	5,15	84,20	2,42	8,23	21,75
Capital social										
Encuentra primer empleo en España:										
A través de la familia o amigos	4,97	69,23	23,90	1,90	7,55	3,33	87,24	2,31	7,12	17,64
A través de otros cauces	16,74	55,20	23,72	4,34	8,97	11,80	75,01	2,72	10,50	31,05
Mercado de trabajo										
Sector del empleo anterior										
Agricultura, pesca, etc.	0,40	86,65	12,88	0,08	34,32	0,39	98,29	1,08	0,24	61,25
Manufacturas y energía	8,92	70,29	18,83	1,95	17,08	6,08	87,32	2,16	4,45	54,12
Construcción	1,28	82,63	14,94	1,15	6,17	0,82	93,51	2,08	3,59	17,34
Comercio	11,94	57,11	25,12	5,83	4,65	6,66	71,39	4,16	17,80	6,47
Hostelería	3,68	58,24	36,97	1,11	5,23	2,64	87,96	3,34	6,05	14,36
Transporte y comunicaciones	23,17	47,83	18,94	10,06	5,82	7,12	64,94	5,81	22,10	6,93
Actividades financieras e inmobiliarias	23,82	47,54	23,30	5,34	9,09	17,4	66,12	0,51	16,00	84,82
Hogares con asalariados	0,32	58,28	41,22	0,18	2,48	0	99,01	0,99	0	75,57
Resto servicios	42,34	26,57	20,71	10,38	5,23	25,1	53,23	2,92	18,8	18,96

Segmento Primario (P);Segmento Secundario (S).

Fuente: Elaboración propia a partir de los microdatos de la Encuesta Nacional de Inmigrantes 2007.

sición un 9% de los inmigrantes no comunitarios se mantiene en el segmento primario, un 64% se mantiene en el secundario y los restantes se dividen en un 25% que desciende del primario al secundario y un 2,5% que asciende del secundario al primario. En el segundo momento hay una mayor estabilización en el segmento secundario (el 84% de los casos) y el ascenso del secundario al primario es algo superior al descenso del primario al secundario (un 8% ascienden frente a un 2,4% que descienden). Son las mismas pautas generales de movilidad ascendente y descendente en las dos transiciones que las que ofrecen los cuadros 1 y 2.

Estas pautas de reproducción de los segmentos de origen en el destino en las dos transiciones y las pautas de movilidad descendente en la primera y algo ascendente en la segunda se dan en todas las desagregaciones de las variables recogidas en el cuadro 3. Pero lo hacen con variaciones relevantes que matizan la profundidad de la «U» y la recuperación que se produce en la segunda transición. Por ejemplo, la movilidad descendente inicial de las mujeres y de los que tienen mayor nivel educativo es mayor, pero su contra-movilidad es también algo superior; lo mismo ocurre con los que tienen un certificado de titulación en origen o aquellos cuya lengua materna es el español. Por regiones de origen, los latinoamericanos son los que sufren mayores descensos al inicio y luego también mayores ascensos; en cuanto al momento de llegada a España, los que lo hicieron después de 1998 tienen mayores descensos en la primera transición y en la segunda no se recuperan todavía (lo que está ligado al corto tiempo que llevan en España). Ser ciudadano de la UE (son inmigrantes no nacidos en la UE, pero que tienen la nacionalidad de uno de los Estados miembros) o no serlo introduce una diferencia notable en las pautas de movilidad ocupacional absoluta; y dentro de los no-UE, los indocumentados no se diferencian mucho de los documentados en la primera transición pero en la segunda quedan relegados a ocu-

paciones del segmento secundario. Las pautas que aparecen por sectores de actividad económica (en el primer empleo o en el empleo actual) son de gran interés: construcción, agricultura y manufactura son los tres sectores donde más se reproduce la ocupación en los segmentos ocupacionales que se tenían en origen. Otro sector que recibe muchos inmigrantes es el servicio doméstico, pero en este caso provocando una gran movilidad descendente. Estos sectores, junto con hostelería, son los que muestran mayor nivel de reproducción en la segunda transición. Y son los que mayor población inmigrante ocupan en España. En la segunda transición es relevante la movilidad ocupacional ascendente que se produce en los sectores de servicios (con la excepción de hostelería y servicio doméstico).

Aunque la movilidad absoluta de los inmigrantes está muy influenciada por la estructura de los marginales en origen y destino, hay que señalar que aparecen regularidades correspondientes, en líneas generales, a los planteamientos de Chiswick, pero con limitados efectos en la segunda transición. Esto puede ser resultado de las características del mercado de trabajo español y del poco tiempo transcurrido desde la llegada a España de la mayor parte de los inmigrantes; también aparecen curvas de distinta profundidad en algunas variables (como las mujeres o el mayor nivel educativo). Pero también ha podido verse, ya a este nivel de movilidad absoluta, cierto «cierre» dentro de los segmentos.

Pautas de movilidad ocupacional relativa: entre la fluidez *dentro* de los segmentos y el cierre *entre* ellos

Solo el análisis del «régimen endógeno de movilidad» (Hauser, 1978) nos permitirá comprobar si se produce ese comportamiento que insinúan los datos de movilidad absoluta. Para ello necesitamos examinar las pautas de movilidad de los individuos sin los efectos de la estructura ocupacional de los marginales,

CUADRO 4. *Movilidad ocupacional relativa (logaritmos naturales de las razones de probabilidad) de los inmigrantes no comunitarios entre la última ocupación en origen y la del primer empleo en España (Categoría de referencia: 5)*

		Primera en España								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Última en origen	1	**2,8**	1,4	1,4	0,7	-	0,6	0,7	1,0	0,1
	2	0,6	**3,4**	1,5	1,5	-	0,3	0,2	0,8	0,2
	3	0,9	0,9	**1,7**	0,8	-	0,4	0,2	0,5	-0,2
	4	0,4	0,3	0,3	**1,4**	-	-0,7	-0,4	0,3	-0,1
	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	6	-3,8	0,3	-0,2	-0,1	-	**3,4**	1,8	1,2	1,3
	7	-0,6	0,7	0,1	-1,0	-	1,9	**2,7**	2,0	1,1
	8	0,5	-5,7	0,3	0,5	-	1,9	1,9	**2,9**	1,2
	9	-0,2	-0,4	-1,1	-0,4	-	1,3	0,8	1,3	**1,1**

Nota: Las categorías 1 a 9 corresponden a los grupos ocupacionales a nivel de un dígito en la CNO-94 (véase el texto).

Fuente: Elaboración propia a partir de los microdatos de la ENI-2007. Razones de probabilidad calculadas sobre los datos ponderados.

es decir comprobar el comportamiento de la movilidad ocupacional relativa a partir de razones de probabilidad (y sus logaritmos). Analizando estas probabilidades relativas u oportunidades de movilidad de los agentes podemos explorar las pautas de «fluidez» ocupacional (en el sentido introducido por Miller y utilizado por Goldthorpe) dentro de los segmentos y de cierre fuera de ellos.

Los datos de movilidad relativa del conjunto de inmigrantes (presentados como logaritmos naturales de las razones de probabilidad en los cuadros 4 y 5) muestran regularidades relevantes. En primer lugar, el comportamiento de las casillas de la diagonal: en las dos transiciones todas ellas tienen valores superiores el resto de las filas y de las columnas (excepto en casillas de la fila 9 ligadas al destino en 6 y 8), lo que muestra que la probabilidad de reproducción en cada grupo ocupacional es significativamente superior a cualquier otra opción; además, dentro de cada segmento los valores de las razones de probabilidades tienden a ser más elevadas en los grupos más altos en las dos transiciones, como si tendiera

a reproducirse el efecto «cebolla» de que habla Hauser (1978), pero dentro de cada segmento. Hay que señalar también que las razones de probabilidad próximas a la diagonal (es decir, las que muestran el intercambio entre los grupos ocupacionales colindantes) tienden a ser más altas que el resto.

En segundo lugar, si se analizan las casillas fuera de la diagonal, la mayor parte tienen logaritmos superiores a 0 dentro de los segmentos y muy inferiores a 0 fuera de los segmentos (con algunas excepciones en el primario en la primera transición, ligadas a la escasa fluidez ascendente, y en el secundario en la segunda transición). Lo que muestra que en las dos transiciones se produce una gran fluidez dentro de los segmentos y muy escasa fuera. Son sobre todo estos resultados los que nos permiten presentar los clústers de grupos ocupacionales agregados en dos segmentos en el mercado de trabajo: primario y secundario.

En tercer lugar, los datos muestran una fluidez sobre todo descendente en la primera transición y predominantemente ascen-

CUADRO 5. *Movilidad ocupacional relativa (logaritmos naturales de las razones de probabilidad) de los inmigrantes no comunitarios entre la ocupación del primer empleo en España y la del empleo actual (categoría de referencia: 5)*

		Actual en España								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Primera en España	1	**3,8**	2,8	2,0	1,7	-	-0,8	1,6	2,1	-5,3
	2	3,3	**5,8**	2,6	1,4	-	-1,5	-0,2	1,4	0,0
	3	2,2	2,5	**2,8**	1,3	-	2,0	0,5	1,8	-0,4
	4	2,1	2,3	2,0	**2,7**	-	-2,3	0,2	1,5	-0,6
	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	6	0,3	-3,6	0,9	1,0	-	**5,3**	3,1	2,4	1,5
	7	1,2	1,6	-0,5	0,3	-	3,3	**3,9**	2,5	1,1
	8	1,9	2,1	1,1	1,5	-	2,4	2,6	**3,8**	0,8
	9	-0,4	0,2	-0,2	0,3	-	2,6	1,8	1,8	**1,5**

Nota: Las categorías 1 a 9 corresponden a los grupos ocupacionales a nivel de un dígito en la CNO-94 (véase el texto).

Fuente: Elaboración propia a partir de los microdatos de la ENI-2007. Razones de probabilidad calculadas sobre los datos ponderados.

dente en la segunda. Pero, lo que es más importante para nuestro argumento, esta fluidez ascendente o descendente se produce *dentro* de los segmentos y es muy limitada *entre* ellos. En la primera transición (cuadro 4), la media de los logaritmos de las razones de probabilidad que reflejan movilidad descendente dentro del sector primario es del 1,2 y dentro del secundario es 1,4, mientras que la que recoge el descenso entre un grupo ocupacional del primario al secundario es de tan solo 0,2. También existe fluidez ascendente en esta fase inicial y la media de los logaritmos es del 1,5 dentro del secundario, del 0,6 dentro el primario y es del -0,7 entre el secundario y el primario. Esta pauta, sobre todo descendente, se invierte en la segunda transición (cuadro 5): aquí la media de los logaritmos ascendentes dentro de los dos segmentos es del 2,4, mientras que del primario al secundario es tan solo 0,5. También existe en esta transición una correlativa fluidez descendente: la media dentro del primario es del 2,0 y dentro del secundario del 1,9, pero es del 0,0 entre

el primario y el secundario. Estos datos muestran una gran fluidez dentro de los segmentos; muestran también que la fluidez descendente o ascendente no se produce solo durante la primera y la segunda transición, respectivamente. Además, la intensa fluidez que se produce entre los grupos ocupacionales 1 y 2, especialmente en la segunda transición, apunta a la existencia de un subsegmento «primario superior», como lo ha calificado la literatura (Piore, 1983), también en términos de circulación.

En cuarto lugar, las razones de probabilidad del cuadro 3 (sobre una tabla 2 x 2, agrupando las ocupaciones en dos clústers, columnas 6 y 12) muestran las diferencias que se producen en estas pautas según distintas variables y permiten contrastar la segunda hipótesis. La movilidad inicial descendente segmentada no se produce para todos los inmigrantes por igual ni la contra-movilidad de la segunda transición tiene la misma dimensión para todos. La movilidad relativa confirma lo que ya apuntaban los datos de movilidad absoluta: una mayor fluidez descendente ini-

cial y ascendente posterior de las mujeres y de los que tienen estudios superiores a los primarios. También de aquellos para los que el español es su lengua materna, que son los que provienen de América Latina. Lo mismo ocurre con los que llegaron por motivos distintos a la búsqueda de empleo o aquellos que fueron ayudados a buscar su primer empleo por familiares o amigos. Los que no son ciudadanos de la UE tienen una mayor fluidez (descendente) en la primera transición y si son indocumentados esa fluidez descendente continúa en la segunda transición: es en esta segunda transición cuando el hecho de ser indocumentado introduce una mayor diferencia. La mayor fluidez en los dos momentos analizados se da entre los inmigrantes que trabajan en sectores de servicios, especialmente en servicio doméstico en la primera transición (la descendente), pero no en la segunda.

CONCLUSIONES

Este artículo pone de relieve la importancia del estudio del mercado de trabajo segmentado en la primera generación de inmigrantes siguiendo las enseñanzas de la sociología de la movilidad social, de la misma manera, por ejemplo, que los estudios de Portes y sus colaboradores han estudiado la «asimilación segmentada» de la segunda generación (Stepick y Stepick 2010). Para ello hemos puesto el acento en el estudio de fluidez ocupacional que tiene lugar en las dos transiciones laborales de los inmigrantes en España, mostrando la notable fluidez que se produce *dentro* de los segmentos primario y secundario del mercado de trabajo y la muy escasa que se produce *fuera* de ellos en ambas transiciones. Esto permite matizar los planteamientos de la pauta en forma de «U» de Chiswick e introducir la idea de una pauta segmentada en forma de «U».

Los datos de la ENI-2007 sobre movilidad absoluta de los inmigrantes en España muestran la existencia de una movilidad ocupacional «estructural» descendente en la primera transición y solo ligeramente ascendente en la segunda transición. Pero este hecho, que viene señalado por las distribuciones de los marginales de origen y destino, se reproduce cuando se examina la movilidad de los inmigrantes entre posiciones ocupacionales: en la primera transición tienen una movilidad claramente descendente y en la segunda una ligera contra-movilidad ascendente. Todo esto se corresponde bien con lo señalado por la literatura en la estela de Chiswick. Pero incluso a este nivel de movilidad absoluta, es observable que los procesos de movilidad se producen sobre todo *dentro* de los segmentos y son muy escasos *entre* ellos. El examen de la movilidad relativa nos ha permitido aclarar que eso que aparece insinuado en la superficie de los datos absolutos desvela un «régimen endógeno de movilidad» que apunta pautas sólidas de no-fluidez ocupacional fuera de los segmentos.

La fluidez ocupacional que muestran los datos de movilidad relativa, medida en razones de probabilidad y presentadas en forma de logaritmos naturales, apunta tres regularidades claras: 1) los flujos son, sobre todo, la fluidez que se produce *dentro* de los segmentos primario y secundario y son muy escasos los que se producen *entre* ellos; 2) tanto la movilidad descendente en la primera transición como la contra-movilidad ascendente en la segunda se producen *dentro* de los segmentos y ambas son escasas *fuera* de ellos. Estos rasgos permiten confirmar que existe una pauta de movilidad ocupacional segmentada en forma de «U» en la evolución de las posiciones ocupacionales de los inmigrantes no comunitarios en España, con una significativa *fluidez* dentro de los segmentos y un notable *cierre* entre ellos. Se puede señalar también que 3) esa pauta general de fluidez dentro y de cierre hacia fuera se reproduce en todas las variables consideradas, pero que muchas de ellas muestran una pauta de movilidad ocupacional segmentada en forma de «U» más o menos pronunciada o superficial.

Estos resultados muestran que «hay una diferencia inmediata entre lo que observamos (las razones de probabilidad que describen la asociación entre origen y destino) y de lo que hablan las teorías (la parte de la asociación que surge de una manera particular)» (Breen, 2004: 391). Por ello creemos que, de acuerdo con una de las hipótesis enunciadas, habría que hablar de que la pauta de movilidad ocupacional de los inmigrantes en España responde a una pauta de movilidad ocupacional *segmentada* en forma de «U». Esto no quiere decir que las barreras que separan los segmentos primario y secundario sean impermeables. Porque, como recuerdan Erikson y Goldthorpe (1993: 396-397) citando a Lieberson, «se encontrarán variaciones incluso cuando operen fuerzas poderosas. Pero se requiere una manera diferente de pensar sobre la materia (...) La cuestión no es negar la variabilidad estadística, sino utilizarla adecuadamente, distinguiendo sus aplicaciones poco significativas de las que muestran regularidades profundamente importantes».

Los datos también permiten confirmar la existencia de «variaciones regulares» de este modelo general. Por ejemplo, la diferencia entre varones y mujeres (estas tienen una «U» más profunda, con mayor descenso ocupacional en la primera transición y mayor contra-movilidad en la segunda y pautas distintas de fluidez entre segmentos con mayor presencia en el primario en la segunda transición). También distintas variables de capital humano han mostrado su relevancia para explicar distintos comportamientos de la «U», especialmente el mayor nivel educativo y su importancia para fijar a los inmigrantes con mayor nivel educativo en el mercado primario. Algunas variables de la experiencia migratoria tienen gran importancia: el origen nacional de los inmigrantes marca diferencias significativas en la adscripción al mercado primario o secundario y en las pautas de asimilación en el mercado de trabajo en el país de destino; la motivación de la inmigración

tiene también efectos significativos, ya que si es económica los inmigrantes tienen mayores probabilidades de tener más descenso inicial y menos contra-movilidad posterior y menor fluidez que los que no han llegado por motivos económicos; el hecho de estar o no en situación regular desde el punto de vista administrativo es otra variable que produce los mismos efectos negativos en la asimilación laboral y una relegación al mercado secundario. Los datos ponen de manifiesto la importancia ambivalente del capital social: las redes familiares y de amigos ayudan al inmigrante recién llegado a encontrar un empleo con rapidez, pero este aspecto positivo viene acompañado de un aumento de la probabilidad de un descenso ocupacional tanto inicial como posterior y de una menor fluidez ocupacional en las dos transiciones. Los datos confirman a grandes rasgos la segunda hipótesis, aunque serán necesarios trabajos monográficos para analizar algunas de las «variantes regulares» más significativas.

A partir de aquí se abren nuevas preguntas a la investigación sobre la importancia que tiene el estudio de la movilidad ocupacional o la no-fluidez social de los inmigrantes en las sociedades industriales y la relevancia de hacerlo desde una perspectiva que ponga el acento en la pauta de movilidad ocupacional segmentada en forma de «U» y en sus «variantes regulares»; y preguntarse, por ejemplo, si los determinantes de las posiciones ocupacionales de los inmigrantes juegan un papel diferente en los distintos segmentos y en las dos transiciones (Aysa-Lastra y Cachón, 2013).

BIBLIOGRAFÍA

Adsera, Alicia y Barry Chiswick (2007). «Are There Gender and Country of Origin Differences in Immigrant Market Outcomes across European Destinations?». *Journal of Population Economics*, 20(3): 495-526.

Agresti, Alan (1990). *Categorical Data Analysis*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Alcobendas, Miguel A. y Nuria Rodríguez (2009). «Immigrants' Assimilation Process in a Segmented Labor Market». *IZA Discussion Paper* 4394.

Amuedo, Catalina y Sara de la Rica (2007). «Labour Market Assimilation of Recent Immigrants in Spain». *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 45(2): 257-284.

— y — (2009). «Complements or Substitutes? Task Specialization by Gender and Nativity in Spain». *IZA Discussion Paper* 4348.

Aslund, Olof y Dan-Olof Rooth (2007). «Do When and Where Matter? Initial Labour Market Conditions and Immigrant Earnings». *The Economic Journal,* 117: 422-448.

Aysa-Lastra, María y Lorenzo Cachón (2012). «Latino Immigrant Employment during the Great Recession: A Comparison between the United States and Spain». *Norteamerica* 7(2): 7-45.

— y — (2013). «Determinantes de la movilidad ocupacional segmentada de los inmigrantes no comunitarios en España». *Revista Internacional de Sociología,* 71(2): 383-413.

Bauer, Thomas y Klaus Zimmerman (1999). «Occupational Mobility of Ethnic Immigrants». *IZA Discussion Paper* 58.

Becker, Gary S. (1993) [1964]. *Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis, with Special Reference to Education.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Beenstock, Michael; Barry Chiswick y Ari Patiel (2010). «Testing the Immigrant Assimilation Hypothesis with Longitudinal Data». *Review of Economics of the Household*. 8(1): 7-27

Berger, Suzanne y Michael Piore (1980). *Dualism and Discontinuity in Industrial Societies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bernardi, Fabrizio; Luis Garrido y Maria Miyar (2011). «The Recent Fast Upsurge of Immigrants in Spain and Their Employment Patterns and Occupational Attainment». *International Migration*, 49(1): 148-187.

Bishop, Yvonne V.; Stephen E. Fienberg y Paul Holland (1975). *Discrete Multivariate Analysis*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Blau, Peter M. y Otis Duncan (1967). *The American Occupational Structure.* New York: Wiley.

Borjas, George (1985). «Assimilation, Changes in Cohort Quality, and the Earnings of Immigrants». *Journal of Labor Economics*, 3(4): 463-489.

— (1995). «Assimilation and Changes in Cohort Quality Revisited: What Happened to Immigrant Earnings in the 1980s?». *Journal of Labor Economics*, 13(2): 201-245.

— (1999). «The Economic Analysis of Immigration». En: O. Ashenfelter y D. Card (eds.), *Handbook of Labor Economics* (vol. 3A). Ámsterdam: Elsevier.

Boston, Thomas (1990). «Segmented Labor Markets: New Evidence from a Study of Four Race-Gender Groups». *Industrial and Labor Relations Review,* 44 (1): 99-115.

Breen, Richard (2004). *Social Mobility in Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

— (2005). "Foundations of a neo-Weberian Class Analysis". En: E. O. Wright (ed.), *Approaches to Class Analysis.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 31-50.

Cachón, Lorenzo (1989). *¿Movilidad social o estructuras de clase? Elementos para una crítica de la sociología de la movilidad social*. Madrid: Siglo XXI-CIS.

— (1995). «Marco institucional de la discriminación y tipos de inmigrantes en el mercado de trabajo en España». *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas*, 69: 105-124.

— (2002). «La formación de la "España inmigrante": mercado y ciudadanía». *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas*, 97: 95-126.

— (2009). *La «España inmigrante»: marco discriminatorio, mercado de trabajo y políticas de integración.* Barcelona: Anthropos.

Caparrós, Antonio y María Luisa Navarro (2010). «Movilidad ocupacional de los inmigrantes en España». *Investigaciones de Economía de la Educación,* 5: 873-890.

Carrasco, Concepción (1999). *Mercados de trabajo: los inmigrantes económicos*. Madrid: IMSERSO.

Chiswick, Barry R. (1977). «A Longitudinal Analysis of the Occupational Mobility of Immigrants». En: B. D. Dennis (ed.), *Proceedings of the 30th Annual Winter Meetings, Industrial Relations Research Association*. Madison WI: IRRA.

— (1978). «The Effect of Americanization on the Earnings of Foreign-born Men». *The Journal of Political Economy,* 86(5): 897-921.

— (1979). «The Economic Progress of Immigrants: Some Apparently Universal Patterns». En: W. Fellner (dir.), *Contemporary Economic Problems 1979*. Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research.

— (1997). «The Economics of Immigrant Skill and Adjustment». *The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance*, 37 (Special Issue): 183-188.

— (1999). «Immigration Policy and Immigrant Quality. Are Immigrants Favorably Self-Selected?». *American Economic Review*, 89(2): 181-185.

— (2008). «Are Immigrants Favorable Self-selected? An Economic Analysis». En: C. B. Bretell y J. F. Hollifield (eds.), *Migration Theory: Talking across Disciplines* (2ª ed.). New York: Routledge.

—; Yinon Cohen y Tzippi Zach (1997). «The Labor Market Status of Immigrants: Effects of the Unemployment Rate at Arrival and Duration of Residence». *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 50(2): 289-303.

—; Yew Lee y Paul W. Miller (2005). «A Longitudinal Analysis of Immigrant Occupational Mobility: A Test of the Immigrant Assimilation Hypothesis». *International Migration Review*, 39(2): 332-353.

— y Magnus Lofstrom (2010). «The Labor Market Adjustment of Immigrants». *Review of Economics of the Household*, 8(1): 1-5.

Colectivo IOÉ (1998). *Inmigración y trabajo. Trabajadores inmigrantes en el sector de la construcción*. Madrid: IMSERSO.

— (2010). «Las migraciones laborales hacia España». En: *Encuesta Nacional de Inmigrantes 2007: el mercado laboral y las redes sociales*. Madrid: MTIN.

Constant, Amelie y Douglas S. Massey (2003). «Self-selection, Earnings, and Out-migration: A Longitudinal Study of Immigrants to Germany». *Journal of Population Economics*, 16: 631-653.

Dickens, Williams T. y Kevin Lang (1985). «A Test of Dual Labor Market Theory». *American Economic Review,* 75: 792-805.

Doeringer, Pater B. y Michael J. Piore (1985). *Mercados internos de trabajo y análisis laboral*. Madrid: MTAS.

Duleep, Harriet O. y Mark C. Regets (1997). «The Decline in Immigrant Entry Earnings: Less Transferable Skills or Lower Ability?». *The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance*, 37: 189-208.

Dunlop, John T. (1957). «The Task of Contemporary Wage Theory». En: G. W. Taylor y F. C. Pierson (comps.), *New Concepts for Wage Determination*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Edward, Richard (1979). *Contested Terrain. The Transformation of the Workplace in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Basic Books.

—; Michael Reich y David M. Gordon (eds.) (1975): *Labor Market Segmentation*. Lexington, MA: Heath.

Erikson, Robert y John H. Goldthorpe (1993). *The Constant Flux: A Study of Class Mobility in Industrial Societies*. Oxford: Clarendon.

—, — y Martin Hällsten (2012). "No Way Back Up from Ratcheting Down? A Critique of the 'Microclass' Approach to the Analysis of Social Mobility", *Acta Sociológica,* 55(3): 211-229.

Fassmann, Heinz (1997). «Is the Austrian Labour Market Ethnically Segmented?». *European Journal of Population,* 13: 17-32.

Featherman, David L.; Frank L. Jones y Robert M. Hauser (1975). «Assumptions of Social Mobility Research in the U.S.: The Case of Occupational Status». *Social Science Research*, 4: 329-360.

Fernández, Cristina y Carolina Ortega (2008). «Labor Market Assimilation of Immigrants in Spain: Employment at the Expense of Bad Job-Matches?». *Spanish Economic Review*, 10(2): 83-107.

Girod, Robert (1971). *Mobilité sociale. Faits établis et problèmes ouverts*. Ginebra: Droz.

Goldthorpe, John H. (1980). *Social Mobility and Class Structure in Modern Britain*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Goldthorpe, John H. (2010). *De la sociología*. Madrid: CIS.

Goldthorpe, John H. y George Marshall (1997). «The Promising Future of Class Analysis: A Response to Recent Critiques». En: G. Marshall, *Repositioning Class. Social Inequality in Industrial Societies*. London: SAGE.

Goodman, Leo A. (1979). «Simple Models for the Analysis of Association in Cross-Classifications Having Ordered Categories». *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 74(367): 537-552.

Granovetter, Mark (1994). «Toward a Sociological Theory of Income Differences». En: D. B. Grusky, *Social Stratification in Sociological Perspective. Class, Race & Gender*. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Grusky, David B. (1994). «The Contours of Social Stratification». En: D. B. Grusky, *Social Stratification in Sociological Perspective. Class, Race & Gender*. Boulder (CO): Westview.

— (2005). "Foundations of a neo-Durkeimian Class Analysis". En: E.O. Wright (ed.), *Approaches to Class Analysis.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 51-81.

Hauser, Robert M. (1978). «A Structural Model of the Mobility Table». *Social Forces*, 56(3): 919-953.

Heagerty, Patrick J. y Scott L. Zeger (1996). «Marginal Regression Models for Clustered Ordinal Measurements». *Journal of the American Statistical Association,* 91(435): 1024-1036.

Hout, Michael (1983). *Mobility Tables*. Sage University Paper series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences. Series 07-031. Beverly Hills & London: Sage Publications.

Izquierdo, Mario; Aitor Lacuesta y Raquel Vegas (2009). «Assimilation of Immigrants in Spain: A Longitudinal Analysis». *Labour Economics,* 16(6): 669-678.

Lipset, Seymour M. y Hans L. Zetterberg (1959). «La movilidad social en las sociedades industriales». En: R. Bendix y S. M. Lipset, *Movilidad social en la sociedad industrial*. Buenos Aires: Eudeba.

Martín, Antonio; Pablo López y Óscar Molina (2011). «Movilidad ascendente de la inmigración en España: ¿asimilación o segmentación ocupacional?». *Papers*, 96(4): 1311-1338.

Massey, Douglas S. y Aysa-Lastra, María (2011). «Social Capital and International Migration from Latin America». *International Journal of Population Research*, Article ID 834145.

McAllister, Ian (1995). «Occupational Mobility among Immigrants: The Impact of Migration on Economic Success in Australia». *International Migration Review*, 29(2): 441-468.

Miller, Stephen I. (1980). «The Calculation of Mobility Rates as Applied to Boudon's Models». *Sociologia Internationalis*, 18(1-2): 35-47.

OECD (2001). «The Employment of Foreigners: Outlook and Issues in OECD Countries». En: OECD, *Employment Outlook 2001*. Paris: OECD.

Parella, Sonia (2003). *Mujer, inmigrante y trabajadora: la triple discriminación*. Barcelona: Anthropos.

Parkin, Frank (1978). *Orden político y desigualdades de clase*. Madrid: Debate.

Piore, Michael (1983). «Notas para una teoría de la estratificación del mercado de trabajo». En: L. Toharia, *El mercado de trabajo: Teorías y aplicaciones*. Madrid: Alianza.

— (1979). *Birds of Passage: Migrant Labour and Industrial Societies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Portes, Alejandro (2012). *Sociología económica de las migraciones internacionales*. Barcelona: Anthropos.

Redstone, Ilana (2006). «Occupational Mobility among Legal Immigrants to the United States». *International Migration Review*, 40(4): 854-884.

— (2008). «Occupational Trajectories of Legal US Immigrants: Downgrading and Recovery». *Population and Development Review*, 34(3): 435-456.

Reich, Michael (ed.) (2008). *Segmented Labor Markets and Labor Mobility*. Cheltenham & Northampton: Edward Elgar.

Reyneri, Emilio y Giovanna Fullin (2011). «Labour Market Penalties of New Immigrants in New and Old Receiving West European Countries». *International Migration*, 49(1): 32-57.

Rosenberg, Sam (1980). «Male Occupational Standing and the Dual Labor Market». *Industrial Relations*, 19(1): 34-49.

— (1981). «Occupational Mobility and Short Cycles». En: F. Wilkinson, *The Dynamics of Labour Market Segmentation*. London: Academic Press.

Sabel, Charles (1986). *Trabajo y política. La división del trabajo en la industria*. Madrid: MTSS.

Sanromá, Esteban; Raúl Ramos e Hipólito Simón (2009). «Los salarios de los inmigrantes en el mercado de trabajo español. ¿Importa el origen del capital humano?». Document de Treball*, Xarxa de Referència en Economía Aplicada,* 4.

Simón, Hipólito; Ramos Ramón y Esteban Sanromá (2010). «Movilidad ocupacional de los inmigrantes en una economía de bajas cualificaciones. El caso de España». Document de treball, *Xarxa de Referència en Economía Aplicada,* 6.

—; Esteban Sanromá y Ramos Ramón (2008). «Labour Segregation and Immigrant and Native-born Wage Distributions in Spain: An Analysis Using Matched Employer-Employee Data». *Spanish Economic Review*, 10(2):135-168.

Solé, Carlota (coord.) (2001). *El impacto de la inmigración en la economía y la sociedad receptora*. Barcelona: Anthropos.

Sorokin, Pitrim [1859] (1959). *Social and Cultural Mobility*. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.

Stepick, Alex y Carol D. Stepick, (2010). «The Complexities and Conclusions of Segmented assimilation». *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 33(7): 1149-1167.

Stanek, Mikolaj (2011). «Nichos étnicos y movilidad socio-ocupacional. El caso del colectivo polaco en Madrid». *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas*, 135: 69-88.

Stanek, Mikolaj y Alberto Veira (2009). «Occupational Transitions and Social Mobility at Migration to Spain». Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Documento de Trabajo GEPS 4/2009 (III).

Telles, Edward, E. y Vilma Ortiz (2011). *Generaciones excluidas: mexicano-estadounidenses, asimilación y raza.* Madrid: CIS.

Thomas, William I. y Florian Znaniecki (2004) [1918]. *El campesino polaco en Europa y en América*. Madrid: CIS.

Veira, Alberto; Stanek, Mikolaj y Lorenzo Cachón (2011). «Los determinantes de concentración étnica en el mercado laboral español». *Revista Internacional de Sociología,* 69: 219-242.

Villa, Paula (1990). *La estructuración de los mercados de trabajo*. Madrid: MTAS.

Weber, Max (1978) [1922]: *Economía y sociedad. Esbozo de sociología comprensiva*. México: FCE.

Weiss, Yoram; Robert M. Sauer y Manachem Gotlibovski (2003). «Immigration, Search, and Loss of Skill». *Journal of Labor Economics*, 21(3): 557-592.

Segmented Occupational Mobility: The Case of Non-EU Immigrants in Spain

Movilidad ocupacional segmentada: el caso de los inmigrantes no comunitarios en España

María Aysa-Lastra and Lorenzo Cachón

Key words

Occupational Mobility
• International Migration
• Foreign Workers
• Labor Market Segmentation
• Economic Integration of Immigrants

Abstract

Literature regarding immigrant economic integration tends to highlight a U-shaped economic mobility pattern. Our article challenges this argument based on labor market segmentation theories and an occupational mobility analysis made from a "class structure" perspective. Data from the 2007 National Immigrant Survey in Spain was used to create mobility tables indicating immigrants' occupational mobility fluidity from their last employment in their country of origin to their first employment in Spain (n = 7,280), and from their first employment in Spain to their current employment (n = 4,031), estimating odds ratios in order to examine the relative mobility. Two labor market segments were identified as having frequent occupational mobility within them and limited mobility outside of them. Our analysis suggests the existence of a *segmented* U-shaped pattern of immigrant occupational mobility.

Palabras clave

Movilidad ocupacional
• Migración internacional
• Trabajadores extranjeros
• Segmentación del mercado de trabajo
• Integración económica de los emigrantes

Resumen

La literatura sobre la integración económica de los inmigrantes ha destacado la existencia de un patrón de movilidad en forma de «U». En este artículo discutimos esta argumentación partiendo de las teorías de la segmentación del mercado de trabajo y del análisis de la movilidad desde la perspectiva de la «estructura de clase». Se analizan los datos de la Encuesta Nacional de Inmigrantes de 2007 para elaborar tablas de movilidad ocupacional de los inmigrantes entre su última ocupación en origen a la primera ocupación en destino (n = 7.280), y desde la primera a la última ocupación en España (n = 4.031), estimando razones de probabilidad para estudiar la movilidad relativa. Se han identificado dos segmentos del mercado laboral dentro de los cuales la fluidez ocupacional es frecuente y fuera de los cuales es limitada. Nuestro análisis sugiere la existencia de un patrón de movilidad ocupacional *segmentada* de los inmigrantes en forma de «U».

Citation

María Aysa-Lastra: Florida International University | aysam@fiu.edu
Lorenzo Cachón: Universidad Complutense de Madrid | lcachon@cps.ucm.es

INTRODUCTION

Ever since Thomas and Znaniecki's *Polish Peasant in Europe and America* study (2004 [1918]), literature has frequently examined social and occupational mobility and the related concept of migrant geographic mobility. The majority of these studies are based on the underlying logic of the "organization-disorganization-reorganization" cycle developed by Thomas and reformulated by other authors from the Chicago School. Such is the case with Chiswick's seminal works (1977; 1978) on a U- shaped pattern of immigrant occupational mobility in immigrant's incorporation into the labor market of their destination country. A considerable portion of the literature was developed in the wake of Chiswick, creating notable comparative advances. However, other alternative perspectives have been widely ignored in this area. First, the omission of labor market segmentation theories. The absence of these theories in this field is particulary surprising given the pervasive references to immigrants' geographic, occupational, and social segregation in host-country societies. Second are the results of social mobility sociology, in particular, "social fluidity" approaches, analyzed from the related costs of mobility. This is of particular relevance when considering that migrations are, in themselves, social mobility processes.

The objective of this article is to examine occupational mobility in non-European Union immigrants in Spain, both at their initial time of migration, comparing their last employment in their country of origin with their first employment in Spain and their most recent employment in Spain at the time of the survey. We will examine this typically downward mobility of the first moment followed by the upward "counter-mobility" of the second, demonstrating that it occurs almost exclusively *within* a segment (primary or secondary) of the labor market. Immigrant data collected retrospectively from the 2007 National Immigrant Survey was used.

The Spanish case study has been incorporated into recent migration literature. This is logical since the "immigrant Spain" phenomenon (Cachón 2002) is relatively recent. It is only since the first decade of the 21st century that immigration has become a massive phenomenon: immigrants grew from 2.9% of Spain's population in 2000, to 12.3% in 2011. Over this time, Spain has become the member state of the European Union (EU) with the largest proportion of foreigners living within its territory (with the exception of four small countries). Over the decade 1997-2007, employment in Spain grew at an extraordinary pace: average annual growth over these ten years was 5%, with employment among the immigrant population growing at an average annual rate of 147%. However, the labor market continues to be highly sensitive to the economic cycle, having high temporary employment taxes, low wages and with some 28% of the population being engaged in four activity areas: agriculture, construction, the hotel industry and domestic services (Aysa-Lastra and Cachón 2012).

This article is structured into five sections, in addition to this introduction. Section 2 offers a brief review of the main focuses and results of the study of immigrant occupational mobility in the aftermath of Chiswick; section 3 presents the theoretical approaches on which we have based this study as well as our research hypotheses; section 4 offers the data source and methodology used; the 5th section presents the results of the absolute and relative mobility rates; and finally, the 6th section offers conclusions and a discussion of the results in relation to the proposed hypotheses.

THE STUDY OF IMMIGRANT OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY IN THE AFTERMATH OF CHISWICK

In the late 1970s, B. R. Chiswick published a series of studies announcing "some appa-

rently universal patterns". In these studies, he presented what would later be referred to as a U-shaped pattern of earnings and employment occurring in the immigrant assimilation process, due to the "effect of Americanization" (Chiswick 1978). In 1977, he compared immigrant employment from 1965 and 1970; and in 1978, he examined salary evolution for white male immigrants. The conclusions made led to the publishing of a third article (1979) titled "The Economic Progress of Immigrants". These early texts suggested the existence of "a single, relatively simple model [that] can explain [immigrant's] progress regardless of ethnic group": although the immigrants initially had lower wages than their equivalent US counterparts (approximately 10% lower after residing in the United States for five years), later their incomes grew rapidly and after 13 years, the incomes for both groups were similar; once the immigrants resided in the United States for at least 20 years, their average salaries were approximately 6% higher than those of the US natives. Later, having data regarding the last employment of the immigrants in their country of origin, a comparison of this employment with the first in the destination country and with the current employment allowed for the confirmed of the U-shaped occupational pattern. Chiswick *et al.* (2005) went on to create this model for the immigrant experience in Australia.

Chiswick identified two principal determining factors in immigrant economic progress: transferability and self-selection. The greatest initial difficulties in finding employment for immigrants in the United States were attributed to the fact more likely than not, foreign human capital, in the form of the immigrant employee, has a less than perfect transferability to the US labor market (Chiswick *et al.* 1997). These difficulties in transferability of certain qualifications are compensated for by the immigrants with the acquisition and improvement of language skills and by improving their knowledge of the customs and functioning of the labor market. Further, immigrants make new training investments that are relevant to their employment in their new destination (Chiswick 1978). The second determinant, self-selection, is a standard proposition in economic literature used to explain immigrant economic success: economic migrants are typically described as being more capable, ambitious, aggressive and entrepreneurial than similar individuals opting to remain in their country of origin (Chiswick 1999). This line of reasoning is considered from the supply side, however, when analyzed from the demand perspective (selection and visa processing policies) the result is similar (Chiswick 2008). Self-selection presents significant variations in the "apparently universal pattern" based on immigration motivation and other circumstances including country of origin, racial or ethnic group, level of education and employment qualifications level in the country of origin (Chiswick 1978, 1979, 2008).

This literature has demonstrated that initial occupational mobility is, above all, a downward mobility followed by a limited upward "counter-mobility" process (Weiss *et al.* 2003; Redstone 2006 and 2008). This initial downward mobility has been explained by problems of qualifications transferability (Chiswick *et al.* 2005); by a greater or lesser degree of economic, cultural or linguistic proximity between country of origin and country of destination which may ease or hinder this transferability (Redstone 2006); or by deficiencies in migrants' initial human capital, as it has been shown that current immigrant flows are less qualified than they were in the past (Borjas 1995; 1999).

The study of immigration in Spain has been recently included in this discussion. It is not yet possible to definitively evaluate the second transition of Chiswick's "U" pattern, as a short amount of time that has passed since the massive immigration wave in Spain of the decade prior to 2007. Initial research studies on the immigrant situation in the

Spanish labor market suggest that immigrants are at a disadvantage (Cachón 1995; 1998 IOÉ Collective; Carrasco 1999; Sole 2001; Parella 2003). Research has also shown: that immigrants tend to be placed in employment positions with low qualifications, as compared to natives (Amuedo and De la Rica 2009; Bernardi et al. 2011); this occupational segregation is the fundamental explanation for the immigrant salary disadvantage (Simón et al. 2008); immigrants tend to be over-qualified (educationally) and tend to hold temporary jobs (Fernández and Ortega 2008); immigrants do not attain the employment status and/or salary level of native workers having comparable human capital (Amuedo and De la Rica 2007; Cachón 2009; Sanroma et al. 2009; Caparros and Navarro 2010; Stanek 2011; Martín et al. 2011); that although the wage differential is significantly reduced over the first 5-6 years, this differential never completely disappears (Izquierdo et al. 2009); labor niches (Veira et al. 2011) repeat in the case of some collectives such as the Polish (Stanek 2011); and that immigrants are much more mobile than native workers (Alcobendas and Rodríguez 2009). Using Social Security records, a significant upward mobility has also been found when following the work trajectory of immigrants in Spain (Martín *et al* 2011), although it does not reach the same level as that of natives (Alcobendas and Rodríguez 2009), or their previous level in their countries of origin (Izquierdo *et al.* 2009).

The 2007 National Immigrant Survey has allowed for the comparison of many other international hypotheses for the Spanish case. Diverse studies have demonstrated how immigrants in Spain suffer a notably downward occupational mobility trend upon incorporating themselves into the labor market, which is followed by a partial "countermobility" (Cachón 2009; 2010 IOÉ Collective, Stanek and Veira 2009, Simón et al. 2010). These studies have demonstrated the relevance of educational level and place of origin

to immigrant mobility in Spain (Caparros and Navarro 2010) and how the human capital acquired in Spain has a higher marginal profitability than that accumulated in the country of origin (Sanroma *et al.* 2009). Stanek and Veira (2009) analyzed occupational descent as a result of emigration into Spain, accentuating gender, human capital and the social networks. Similar behavior was demonstrated by Caparros and Navarro (2010), accentuating educational levels and immigrant places of origin. Simon *at al.* (2010) considered a large set of explanatory factors in order to study occupational trajectory between country of origin, first employment and current employment in Spain.

The dominant theoretical orientation underlying the studies regarding occupational mobility of immigrants created in the wake of Chiswick is that of the "social hierarchy" (Erikson and Goldthorpe 1993). Most of these studies consider mobility to be produced across a hierarchical occupational scale with immigrants moving between the distinct occupations. It is the same implicit assumption as that of the functionalist theories of stratification (Grusky 1994). Therefore, there is a preference for studying the evolution of immigrant salaries, an easily moldable continuous variable whose results are clearly interpreted. Moreover, when analyzing occupations researchers frecuency use prestige or status scales. The "limits" in these scales are formal, artificial and displaceable, offering a continuous and automatically hierarchical nature. These are graduated approaches. It may be taken for granted, as in the neoclassic approach to the labor market, that individuals move across this entire social scale (occupational/salary). These studies analyzed the determining factors behind salary or occupational achievement with the support of the theoretical perspective of human capital (Becker 1993[1964]). At times, explanatory hypotheses are formulated, linked to other theoretical assumptions such as those of social capital or labor market segmenta-

tion, but only for analytical purposes, to assist in results comprehension.

THEORETICAL FOUNDATION AND RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

Our discussion regarding the Chiswick argument is based on the selective reading of two approaches that offer alternative concepts to analyze economic (occupational) integration of immigrants: the theories of labor market segmentation and the offerings of social mobility sociology, in particular, regarding the concept of "social fluidity".

Although it may be traced back to the idea of segmentation from the classics of economics, theories of labor market segmentation began being formulated as such in the 1950s. Dunlop (1957) spoke of "wage contours" and "job clusters", with this last group being composed of specific occupations. The works of Piore and his colleagues on the one hand, and those of Edward and his colleagues (1975) on the other hand, strengthened this analytical approach in the 1970s. The basic initial idea, formulated by Doeringer and Piore (1985[1971]), is that the labor market is divided into two distinct segments, referred to as *primary* and *secondary*. The primary segment includes work positions of relatively elevated salaries, good working conditions, promotion possibilities, more regulated procedures and more employment stability. On the other hand, secondary segment positions have the opposite characteristics. While there is a potential controversy regarding the number of segments making up the labor market, what is important is not how many segments actually exist, but the fact that there are labor market "discontinuities" with barriers between the segments (Berger and Piore 1980). These discontinuities reveal segments of distinct functioning principles (training, promotion, wage determination processes, etc.) and different employer and employee behavior

traits (Villa 1990). But it is also important to determine whether or not there is mobility between these segments and if there are patterns to this mobility. It has been determined that these segments have intense circulation *within* them and limited circulation *between* them. If the existence of a relative lack of mobility between the segments can be determined, then another particularly solid characteristic may be added to the "classist" nature of the labor market segmentation theory based on this line of argumentation. Defining the segments based on the fact that there is no significant mobility between them is not a redundancy or a circular argument. This "lack of circulation" is, precisely, one of the features of the segments/classes: a segment "closure".

Current labor market segmentation theories continue to offer relevant concepts for the understanding of social phenomenon and, over recent years, there has been a renewed interest in these concepts, as demonstrated by the anthology edited by Reich (2008) *Segmented Labor Markets and Labor Mobility*.

The labor market segmentation theories suggest that some groups of individuals get "trapped" in secondary sector jobs early on in their careers, among other reasons, because they have been socialized in a specific "moral" (Edward 1979; Sabel 1986). Immigrants form one of the most susceptible collectives, having a greater potential to wind up in this situation. But this "confinement" must be examined and explained (Granovetter 1994). Few researchers have analyzed immigrant mobility between occupational segments. Rosenberg (1981) demonstrated that immigrants who begin working in the secondary segment had fewer chances of moving into the primary segment than did white workers controling for human capital variables that failed to explain this behavior. Dickens and Lang (1985) suggested that the results of their research offered strong support for two of the primary foundations of

the labor market segmentation theories: there are two distinct segments of the labor market having different wage determination mechanisms and non-economic barriers exist between them. Upon analyzing the immigrant situation in Austria, Fassmann (1997) suggested that real world observations show that native and foreign workers and their job positions are heterogeneous, being situated in different labor segments having distinct and separate allocation mechanisms and structures.

Analysis of social mobility has been a main question in social stratification sociology as it confirms a primary assumption: that mobility *should* exist. However, faced with this assumption, it may be said that the fundamental discovery in the studies of social mobility, is *in*variance, instability, social reproduction (Cachón 1989). Therefore, this perspective must be radically repositioned to "focus, not on the explanations of social change via class relations, but rather on understanding the processes that underlie the profound resistance to change that such relations offer" (Goldthorpe and Marshall 1997: 61-2).

It may be said that this line of argumentation has led to the "discovery" that social *in*variance over the course of five stages. The first stage is that of the pioneering work conducted by Sorokin (1959[1859]) and his finding that social stratification is an endogenous factor of social mobility. The second includes the hypothesis offered by Lipset and Zetterberg (1959: 90), suggesting that "mobility patterns in Western industrialized societies are determined by the occupational structure" and since this tends to be similar among industrial societies, mobility patterns also tend to be similar. The third stage is a new "provisional hypothesis" offered by Featherman, Jones and Hauser (FJH) (1975: 340) establishing that "the genotypic pattern in terms of mobility (mobility of movement) in industrial societies with a market economy and a nuclear family system is basically the same. The phenotypic mobility pattern (ob-

served mobility) differs according to the rate of change in the occupational structure". The fourth stage includes a set of theoretical, analytical and methodological contributions from diverse authors including Miller (who referred to the structural change of "fluidity"), Goldthorpe (who distinguished between "phenotype" and "genotype" and introduced the concept of "desirability"), Girod (1971) (who introduced the "counter-mobility" concept, in reference to the movement in which the original position is recovered) and Hauser and colleagues (who discussed an "endogenous regimen of mobility"). The hypothesis of FJH has been included among these instruments in the fifth stage, along with the works of Goldthorpe *et al.* (Goldthorpe 1980, 2010; Erikson and Goldthorpe 1993) in their discussion of a "constant fluidity model": there is a degree of temporary constancy and a similarity between countries in relative rates of intergenerational class mobility.

Goldthorpe (2010) summarized the current theoretical arguments regarding social mobility in two aspects: first, the absolute rates of intergenerational class mobility, wich have a considerable variation across time result from exogenous "structural effects", or the evolution of the class structure; second evolved the relative rates seem to be characterized by a surprising degree of *in*variance: that is, by a temporary instability and a substantive transnational similarity. These "endogenous mobility regimens" or "fluidity" seem to determine processes that are mostly systematic and independent of context; in other words, they operate in a similar manner across a wide variety of societies, having numerous social regularities. Based on these approaches, the number of studies on social mobility has increased considerably in recent years.

Classic works in this field such as those of Lipset and Zetterberg (1959) and Blau and Duncan (1967) highlighted the importance of analyzing immigration within a social mobility research program and advanced some of the key concepts that would

be reformulated over a decade later by economists such as Chiswick. For example, Blau and Duncan (1967:256-257) suggested that "migrants in general, have more successful careers than other men", and concluded that their results are "consistent with the interpretation that migration is a selective process of individuals who are predisposed for professional success". In addition, they offered a hypothesis: migration is an advantageous experience improving an individual's occupational skills. However, this line of research did not influence general research on social mobility or the work of Chiswick. This discontinuity may explain why methodological sociology innovations were not included in the study of immigrant occupational mobility. Sociologists have embarked on a successful yet parallel course: analysis of the trajectories of second and third generation immigrants (Portes 2012; Telles and Ortiz 2011).

Our article examines occupational mobility of first generation immigrants. We revise the U-shaped pattern proposed by Chiswick and suggest the existence of a *segmented* U-shaped mobility pattern for these immigrants. Therefore, we begin from a "class structure" perspective (Erikson and Goldthorpe 1993) that assumes that there are ruptures between distinct numbers of "discrete" sets of social echelons in which individuals occupy positions. This approach requires the classification of individuals into mutually exclusive and comprehensive categories. The brief summary of labor market segmentation theories and social mobility sociology that we presented suggests the existence of a lack of mobility between labor market segments, as well as a lack of fluidity between classes. It also allows us to demonstrate that labor integration within each of these segments is different and that the determining factors of the initial downward occupational mobility are different for each labor market segment, as well as determinants associated with the limited mobility between segments.

In examining immigrant occupational mobility, we are not conducting a study of "social mobility", as we are not analyzing "social classes" (Erikson *et. al* 2012). We are not driven by a Durkheimian perspective to discover "micro-classes" in occupational categories (Grusky 2005); rather, we use a dual approach Weberian perspective (Breen 2005): we examine "occupational aggregates" (using a one-digit level of the International Standard Classification of Occupations) to study occupational change, and we use "exchange cluster" criteria to construct the labor market segments.

Our analysis is not, however, limited to a mere study of occupational mobility opposing the results of Chiswick and other authors. As in labor market segmentation theories, we base our work on the assumption that the labor market functions in a segmented manner and that there are segments having distinct features, both from the supply and the demand perspective. One persistent problem in this area is the difficulty in defining these labor segments (Rosenberg 1980; Boston 1990). It is possible to distinguish between two (or more) occupational group segments (primary and secondary; manual and non-manual, in occupational terms) in function of some of their characteristics. But we have proceeded in a different manner in order to define the segments as discrete spaces in terms of mobility. We do not group the occupations *a priori,* in function of indicators such as salary or prestige, but rather, we define the segments in accordance with occupational fluidity limits based on empirical data. The definition of the segments, on this basis, is not a redundancy because a lack of mobility linked to the market barriers is a fundamental characteristic of the segments: they are closed social spaces. What Weber (1969[1922]:142) discussed in reference to social classes is applicable to the labor market segments: "*Social class* refers to the entirety of the class situations *between* which a personal exchange in the succession of ge-

nerations is easy and occurs frequently". Paraphrasing Weber, we can say that in general, a labor segment is a "cluster of occupations" having some common characteristics including the easy and frequent personal exchange of occupational positions. Our empirical test resolves any uncertainty regarding limits between the occupational clusters, as it allows for the data to set the segment limits. If segment limits coincide with those identified in the labor market segmentation theories, then the segment limits are defining limited spaces in which the agents develop their mobility strategies. But for this, the segment limits must extend beyond some aspect of the labor market segmentation theories that do not consider the importance of mobility or lack of mobility between the primary and secondary segments, as labor market theories choose to emphasize functioning mechanisms, rules and results (Villa 1990). On the contrary to this argument, we suggest the importance of considering these mobility processes (greater or fewer) between segments as a structural characteristic of the segmented labor market. As Blau and Duncan (1967:60) suggested, "a persistent pattern of disproportionate low movements between occupational groups is all that is needed to suggest a class limit".

We aim to re-examine the initial downward and subsequent upward pattern of the Chiswick "U" from this theoretical context. Our study will test two of the Chiswick *et al.* (2005) hypotheses on the Spanish case, but reformulated from a double dimension: the occupational mobility processes are produced *within* the primary and secondary segments and *rarely* occur outside of these segments; and the analysis will not be made with absolute rates showing total mobility, but rather, with relative rates allowing us to uncover the occupational "fluidity". Our two hypotheses are the following:

1. According to Chiswick *et al.* (2005), "immigrants experience a decrease in occupational status from the country of origin to their destination and a posterior increase over time in the destination", that is, the U-shaped occupational pattern remains, but both the initial downward occupational mobility (between employment in the origin and first employment in Spain) and the later partial upward counter-mobility (between first employment and current employment) of non-European Union immigrants is produced *within* two large occupational segments and practically only within them. That is, there is a *segmented U-shaped occupational pattern*. The relative mobility rates allow us to demonstrate a large degree of "fluidity" occurring *within* the segments that is limited *outside* of them in the two transitions.

2. The *segmented U-shaped occupational pattern* may present variations having regularities that may be explained by distinct factors. As a result of these "*regular variants*" the occupational trajectory between the first and second transition is not only a shallower or a deeper "U" (in Chiswick's language), but the regular variants also result in variations in fluidity patterns between the segments. Some of the relevant factors that may produce these "regular variants" and which may be analyzed using the ENI-2007 data, include personal characteristics such as gender, educational level (and skills in general), language, national and/or ethnic origin, legal conditions upon arrival and immigrant social capital.

If this approach proves to be correct, it implies a subtle nuance in Chiswick's arguments and a critique of the theories that defend continuous upward or downward mobility in the occupational scale. But it also may put into question two assumptions of the labor market segmentation theories: the omission of the importance of the lack of mobility in defining labor market social spaces; and the assignation of immigrants as a unique general set within the secondary labor market.

Data and methodology

The *National Immigrant Survey* (ENI-2007) collected information regarding 15,465 individuals over the age of 16 who were born outside of Spain, and live in Spain or had the intention of doing so for over one year, and who were interviewed between November of 2006 and February of 2007. The sample is representative of individuals living in Spain and who were born in Ecuador, Morocco, Romania, and the following regions: Latin America, Africa (with the exception of South Africa), Asia (with the exception of Japan), North America (the United States and Canada) and Oceania, the EU-15 plus the European Economic Area (EEA) and Switzerland. The ENI-2007 contains data regarding immigrant characteristics and retrospective information regarding their last employment in their country of origin, and their first and last employments in Spain. For each of these employments, the survey collected information regarding the occupation, professional status, activity sector and work contract duration.

For our analysis, we have excluded those individuals who were born in the EU-15, the EEA and Switzerland, Spanish citizens by birth, individuals with no work experience in their country of origin and those with no work experience in Spain. Our sample consists of data on 7,280 non-EU immigrants in Spain. In order to study the occupational mobility of immigrants between their first and current employment position in Spain, we selected those individuals who were employed at the time of the survey and who responded that their current job (though not necessarily their occupation) was different from their first job in Spain (n=4,031). The characteristics of those immigrants having only one job since their time of arrival (n=3,249) were similar to those having various jobs.

Although many studies regarding immigration labor integration have used data from transversal studies, recently, new sources have facilitated access to longitudinal data

(Chiswick *et al.* 2005; Duleep and Regets 1997; Bauer and Zimmermann 1999; Adsera and Chiswick 2007; Aslund and Rooth 2007; Beenstock *et al*. 2010). In Spain, the ENI-2007 is the only national survey containing information on immigrant labor experiences across time in both Spain and countries of origin.

As affirmed by Simon *et al.* (2010), there are three possible sources of bias when using retrospective data from complete samples of transversal studies: changes in the composition of the immigrant flow across time (Borjas 1985, 1995); fluctuations in the economic cycle and in the characteristics of the immigrants entering the work force (Aslund and Rooth 2007); and return migration or transit to a third country (Constant and Massey 2003). Like in other studies (Reyneri and Fullin 2011), we have assumed that the characteristics not observed in the migrants did not change over time, and that return migration has not been a selective process until 2007, given that immigration in Spain began to grow in the late 1990s and continued doing so in 2007, driven by a growing sustained economy.

Variables

Our analysis focuses on occupational mobility between and within the labor market segments in two transition periods: from the last employment in the country of origin to the first employment in Spain and from the first employment in Spain to the current employment at the time of the survey. The ENI-2007 survey collected information regarding the occupation in each employment position. This information has been classified based on the International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO-88) in its version adapted for Spain (CNO-94). We used one-digit classification for this analysis[1]:

---

[1] In this English version, we list the one digit classification of occupations as in ISCO-88. Given that we only have data available for the civil population, we did not take category 0 (Armed Forces) into consideration.

1. Legislators, senior officials and managers

2. Professionals

3. Technicians and associate professionals

4. Clerks

5. Service works and shop and market saled workers

6. Skilled agricultural and fishery workers

7. Craft and related trades workers

8. Plant and machine operators and assemblers

9. Elementary occupations

Our argument is based on labor market segmentation theories and therefore we classified the occupations by segments. Instead of doing so a priori, which could be somewhat arbitrary, as suggested by Rosenberg (1980), we divided the segments where empirical data suggested that there were circulation limits. Our analysis of the odds ratios results in the identification of two occupational clusters, classified as primary and secondary segments. In the primary labor market we include the occupational groups from the first four categories (one to four) and in the secondary labor market we include the other five (five to nine). The fifth occupational group (Service workers) may be considered to be a "buffer zone" (Parkin 1978).

In order to better understand immigrant mobility in a segmented labor market, our analysis includes measurements of occupational fluidity based on human capital variations, Spanish language usage, immigration experience, social capital, gender and previous employment characteristics that were used in prior research studies (Chiswick *et al.* 2005; Redstone 2006, Stanek and Viera 2009; Caparros and Navarro 2010). These variables are measured as of the moment of the immigrant's arrival in Spain (for the study of the first transition) and at the time of the survey (for the second transition).

Methodology

In order to compare the hypotheses regarding segmented occupational mobility, our analysis offers estimates on general mobility, mobility in labor market segments and mobility in absolute and relative terms. We study absolute and relative occupational mobility with weighted distribution sets and odds ratios, respectively for the two transitions (Tables 1, 2, 4 and 5). Odds ratio estimation has become standard practice in the analysis mobility tables, because it "show the relative odds of an individual in two different categories of origin being found in one rather than another of two different categories of destination" (Erikson and Goldthorpe 1993:55). Odds ratios allow us to observe relative effects, because they express the *net* association pattern between the origin and destination categories, that is, "the pattern of association considered net of the effects of marginal distribution of these categories" (ibid.: 56). An odds ratio that is not equal to 1 indicates that the row and column variables are not independent; therefore, it offers a measurement of association without effects derived from the marginal distributions of the variables. The odds ratios capture this net association because they are not sensitive to marginal distributions (Bishop, Fienberg and Holland 1975). Furthermore, due to their property of multiplicative invariance, the odds ratio logarithm is the same independent of the sample size and is equally valid for designs of retrospective, prospective and transversal sampling (Agresti 1990). Another important advantage of the relative rates, in terms of odds ratios, is that these ratios constitute log-linear model elements.

One important implication is that the mobility tables may share similar mobility schemes despite the fact that they differ in their marginal distributions and that their absolute mobility rates are therefore different. In our case, the relative mobility tables represent an indicator of the net associa-

tion between the last occupation in the country of origin and the first in Spain without the effects of the occupational distribution of the immigrants in their countries of origin and in Spain (first transition), and for those who have had more than one job in Spain, from the first to the most recent employment without the marginal effects of the occupational distribution of this population at both moments (second transition).

In order to incorporate Erikson and Goldthorpe's "social fluidity" analysis (1993), we have estimated the odds ratios for the mobility table in accordance with Agresti (1990:18)[2,3]:

$$\alpha_{ij} = \frac{n_{ij}\, n_{55}}{n_{5j}\, n_{i5}}$$

where:

α_{ij} is the odds ratio for the cell ij in the mobility table

n_{ij} is the number of individuals with employment i in their country of origin and j in their destination

n_{55} is the number of individuals with employment in category 5 (Restaurant, personnel, protection and sales service workers, which serves as our reference category) in their country of origin and destination

n_{5j} is the number of individuals in category 5 in their country of origin and in category j in their destination

n_{i5} is the number of individuals in category i in their country of origin and in category 5 in their destination

For the odds ratio estimates, we selected category 5 as the reference category since it may be considered a "buffer zone" between the labor market segments (Parkin 1978).

After analyzing the absolute and relative mobility patterns from our data, we proceeded to define the labor market segments in two groups, primary and secondary, and to show estimates of the relative mobility measures of the two transitions for relevant variables. The odds ratios from Table 3 illustrate how the possibility of being in the first segment instead of the second differs between individuals based on whether their previous employment was in the first or the second segment.

The variables associated with immigrant occupational mobility are grouped together based on the following vectors: human capital (educational level, educational certificates and credentials and language knowledge), immigration experience (region of origin, arrival period, nationality or immigration status, reason for migrating and settlement intentions), social capital (whether or not they found their first job through their social networks) and gender.

RESULTS

Results suggest regularities in the behavior of non-EU immigrant occupational mobility in Spain in the two transitions, allowing for comparison of the previously stated hypotheses. First, next section shows the results of the absolute occupational mobility for both transitions; this section highlights some irregularities in behavior that suggest the existence of barriers between the segments and shows distinct patterns of absolute mobility for several variables. Second, we address the segmentation upon examination

---

[2] Odds ratios were also estimated using log-linear models (Hout 1983) and global odds ratios (Heagerty and Zeger 1996). All results were consistent. Estimates were presented using methods developed by Agresti (1990) as these are the most frequently used in the analysis of social mobility and are the easiest to interpret.

[3] We detected several boxes having no observations. Since a mobility table has no structural zeros, following the adjustment proposed by Goodman (1979) we added 0.01 observations to all of the boxes in calculating our odds ratios.

of, for the two transitions, the patterns followed by the relative mobility, measured using odds ratios; the results highlight regularities that suggest a segmented occupational fluidity pattern in each of the transitions; we will also show how this segmented pattern is repeated with some specific features for diverse variables.

Absolute occupational mobility patterns: limitations of an open labor market

Tables 1 and 2 respectively show the absolute occupational mobility produced between the immigrants' last employment in their country of origin and their first employment in Spain (first transition) and that which is produced between this first employment in Spain and their current employment (second transition). Literature has repeatedly demonstrated that immigrants have an initial downward mobility (occupational) that later recovers, at least in part, in an upward manner in a process that is referred to as counter-mobility. Data from the ENI-2007 confirms these findings for Spain.

In a table of occupational mobility, the absolute mobility rates are explained, above all, by exogenous factors that are "those determining the 'forms' of the class structures (occupational), that is, their proportional sizes and the rates of increase or decrease for the different classes, and not those that determine the individual propensities to maintain or change position within these structures" (Goldthorpe 2010:425). In our immigrant occupational mobility tables, key factors determining the 'forms' of the marginal distributions are found in "external" factors and those which situate the immigrants in these positions and not in immigrant propensities to maintain or change their occupation. One of these is the Spanish labor market and the burden of the secondary sector jobs and their low salaries; another "external" factor is the "discriminatory institutional fra-

mework" (Cachón 2009). Here we refer to "structural" mobility. "Structural" mobility results from these external factors, which produce the marginal distribution of the data. Table 1 indicates that 32% worked in primary sector occupations in their country of origin and 68% in secondary sector occupations; and that in their first employment in Spain there was a radical change produced as only 11% worked in the primary segment as opposed to 89% who were in the secondary. This already suggests a notable occupational descent suffered by immigrants in Spain at the initial moment of immigration. This occupational descent may be described as "structural". Table 2 shows that in the immigrant's current employment, the occupational situation has improved somewhat but is still not fully recovered to the distribution from the country of origin: those in the primary sector increased from 8 to 14% while the secondary group diminished from 92 to 86%.

If we are to broadly analyze immigrant mobility in the occupational positions, it can be said that the first employment occupation of the non-EU immigrants in Spain demonstrates that some 54% had occupational declines in comparison to their employment in their country of origin, compared to 14% who had increases and 33% who remained in the same occupational group (Table 1). This initial descent was partially compensated for when analyzing the counter-mobility of the second transition: 34% of the immigrants ascended occupational groups, as compared to 17% who dropped and 49% who remained in the same group (Table 2). But upon further examination of the patterns of absolute mobility in the tables, we can see that the significant initial downward mobility was divided between a mobility between segments and a mobility within each of the segments: 24% went from primary segment occupations to the secondary segment and another 30% showed occupational decreases but *within* the primary segment (2.2%) or the secondary segment

TABLE 1. *Absolute occupational mobility of non-EU immigrants between the last employment in origin and the first employment in Spain*

		First in Spain										
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	%	N
Last in country of origin	1	**0.6**	0.2	0.4	0.2	1.0	0.1	0.7	0.1	1.7	4.89	365
	2	0.1	**2.5**	0.5	0.6	2.1	0.1	0.6	0.3	3.2	10.11	752
	3	0.2	0.4	**1.3**	0.3	3.3	0.2	0.9	0.2	3.0	9.80	736
	4	0.1	0.2	0.2	**0.6**	2.5	0.1	0.5	0.2	3.2	7.51	597
	5	0.2	0.3	0.5	0.6	**7.3**	0.3	1.9	0.4	10.1	21.69	1,668
	6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	**0.3**	0.5	0.1	1.4	2.53	152
	7	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.0	2.2	0.4	**8.8**	0.7	7.7	20.20	1,295
	8	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.9	0.3	1.7	**1.0**	4.4	8.51	604
	9	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.1	2.0	0.4	1.4	0.5	**10.3**	14.77	1,111
	%	1.37	3.85	3.36	2.51	21.47	2.13	16.81	3.60	44.90	100	
	N	90	287	245	188	1,692	152	1.001	247	3,378		7,280

Source: Prepared from micro-data from the ENI-2007. Relative figures calculated from the weighted data

Note: Categories 1 to 9 correspond to the occupational groups at a one-digit level from the CNO-94 (see text).

(27.6%). The initial ascending mobility pattern is similar although with a lower volume of increases. This was not the case with the ascending counter-mobility of the second transition 8% went from secondary segment occupations to primary ones, as compared to 28% who had occupational changes *within* the secondary segment and another 1.4% *within* the primary segment.

We should note the role of the "buffer zone" (Parkin 1978) consisting of occupational group 5 (Service workers and shop and market sales workers); it is, the limiting group at the base of the occupational groups for the primary segment in the first transition and at the height of the secondary groups in the second transition, and therefore it serves as our reference category.

Table 3 compares the absolute and relative mobility of the most significant variables for the two transitions. In order to facilitate the comparison, results were passed from a 9x9 table to be analyzed in a 2x2 table, grou-

ping the occupations in two identified labor market segments. Table 3 shows those that remained in the primary and secondary segment over the two moments (columns 2, 3, 8 and 9), those that descended from the primary to the secondary (columns 4 and 10) and those that rose from the secondary to the primary (columns 5 and 11). The overall data shows that in the first transition, some 9% of the non-EU immigrants remain in the primary segment, 64% remain in the secondary and the remainder includes 25% that descended from the primary to the secondary and 2.5% that rose from the secondary to the primary. In the second moment there is an improved stabilization in the secondary segment (84% of the cases) and the ascent from the secondary to the primary segment is somewhat greater than the descent from primary to secondary (an 8% rise as opposed to a 2.4% drop). These are the same general patterns of upward and downward mobility in the two transitions as those shown in Tables 1 and 2.

TABLE 2. *Absolute occupational mobility of non-EU immigrants between their first employment in Spain and their current employment*

		Current in Spain										
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	%	N
First in Spain	1	**0.4**	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.71	26
	2	0.4	**1.9**	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.2	2.90	121
	3	0.3	0.2	**1.0**	0.2	0.6	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.2	2.75	114
	4	0.2	0.1	0.3	**0.6**	0.3	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.1	1.81	78
	5	1.0	0.4	1.2	1.1	**9.1**	0.2	1.8	0.9	6.0	21.58	939
	6	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.4	**0.5**	0.9	0.1	0.7	2.68	104
	7	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.2	1.0	0.1	**10.3**	0.9	2.4	15.45	521
	8	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.4	0.0	0.8	**1.5**	0.5	3.62	131
	9	0.4	0.3	0.8	1.4	8.1	0.8	9.1	4.1	**23.5**	48.51	1,997
	%	3.10	3.14	3.79	3.79	19.84	1.60	23.34	8.00	33.41	100	
	N	119	139	170	158	821	58	866	316	1,384		4,031

Source: Prepared from micro-data from the ENI-2007. Relative figures calculated from the weighted data.

Note: Categories 1 to 9 correspond to the occupational groups at a one-digit level from the CNO-94 (see text).

The occupational segmented patterns of origin are reproduced in destination in both transitions and regularities are shown in the initial downward mobility and limited upward mobility in destination for all variables in Table 3. But they occur, with relevant variations that qualify the depth of the "U" and the recovery that occurs in the second transition. For example, the initial downward mobility of women and of those having a higher education level is greater, but the counter-mobility of these groups is also somewhat greater; the same occurs with those having certification degrees in their country of origin and with those whose maternal language is Spanish. As for regions of origin, Latin Americans suffer from the greatest initial decreases and they have the greatest subsequent increases; as for the moment of arrival in Spain, those arriving after 1998 had larger decreases in the first transition and they still have not recovered in the second (linked to the short amount of time that they have been in Spain). Being an EU citizen (immigrants not born in the EU but having nationality in one of the member states) or not introduces a notable difference in the absolute mobility patterns; and within the non-EU immigrants, those who are not documented do not differ greatly from those having documentation in the first transition but in the second they tend to remain in secondary segment occupations. Patterns based on economic activity sectors (in the first employment or in the current employment) are of great interest: construction, agriculture and manufacturing are the three sectors where the occupational segments are most often repeated from those held in the country of origin. Domestic service is another sector that is filled with immigrants, but in this case, it results in considerable downward mobility. These sectors, along with the hotel industry, have the greatest level of repetition in the second transition. And they also have the greatest number of immigrants in Spain. In the second transition, the upward occupational mobility pro-

duced in the service sectors (with the exception of the hotel industry and domestic services) is relevant.

Although the absolute mobility of immigrants is very much influenced by the marginal structure in the country of origin and destination, it should be noted that there are corresponding regularities, broadly speaking, with the Chiswick concepts, but with limited effects on the second transition. This may be the result of characteristics of the Spanish labor market as well as the short amount of time since arrival in Spain for the majority of the immigrants; there are also curves of differing depths for some variables (such as women and highest education level). But there is a certain "closure" within the segments that can also be seen at this level of absolute mobility.

Relative occupational mobility patterns: fluidity within the segments and the closure between them

Only the analysis of the "endogenous mobility regime" (Hauser 1978) allows us to test whether or not these behaviors occur, as suggested by the absolute mobility data. In order to do so, we must examine the mobility patterns of the individuals without the effects of the marginal occupational structure, that is, we must check the relative occupational mobility behavior based on the odds ratios (and their logarithms). Analyzing these relative mobility probabilities or opportunities of the agents allows us to explore the occupational "fluidity" patterns (as introduced by Miller and utilized by Goldthorpe) within the segments and closed off outside of them.

The relative mobility data for the immigrant set (presented as natural logarithms of the odds ratios in tables 4 and 5) shows some relevant regularities. First, in the behavior of the diagonal boxes: in the two transitions they all have values above those of the rest of the rows and columns (except

for cells from line 9 that are linked to the results of 6 and 8), demonstrating that the probability of reproduction in each group is significantly higher than any other option; further, within each segment, the values of the odds ratios tend to be higher in the highest groups in the two transitions, as if tending to repeat the "onion" effect that Hauser (1978) referred to, but within the segments. It is also noteworthy that the odds ratios nearer to the diagonal (that is, those demonstrating the exchange between adjoining occupational groups) tend to be higher than the others.

Secondly, if the boxes are analyzed outside of this diagonal, the majority of them have logarithms that are greater than 0 within the segments and much less than 0 outside of them (with some exceptions in the former in the first transition, related to the very low upward fluidity, and in the latter in the second transition). This demonstrates that the two transitions produce considerable fluidity within the segments and very little fluidity outside of them. These results allow us to present the occupational group clusters aggregated into two segments in the labor market: primary and secondary.

Thirdly, the data shows that there is a primarily downward fluidity in the first transition and a primarily upward fluidity in the second. But more importantly for our argument, this upward and downward fluidity is produced *within* the segments and is very limited *between* them. In the first transition (Table 4), the average of the odds ratio logarithms reflecting downward mobility within the first sector is 1.2 and within the second sector it is 1.4 while that of the descent between an occupational group of the primary segment to the secondary is only 0.2. An upward fluidity is also found in this initial phase and the average of the logarithms is 1.5 within the secondary, 0.6 within the primary and it is -0.7 between the secondary and the primary. This primarily downward pattern is reversed in the second transition

TABLE 3. *Absolute and relative mobility of non-EU immigrants between and within the labor market segments according to relevant variables*

Variable	First transition (origin-first employment)					Second transición (first-current)				
	Absolute mobility (%)				Odds ratios	Absolute mobility (%)				Odds ratios
	P→P	S→S	P→S	S→P		P→P	S→S	P→S	S→P	
Column number	2	3	4	5	6	8	9	10	11	12
Total (n)	---	---	---	182	---	250	---	89	336	---
(%)	8.63	63.85	25.03	2.50	8.79	5.74	83.76	2.43	8.08	24.51
Demographic characteristics										
Gender										
Male	8.17	72.87	16.22	2.74	13.40	5.26	85.96	2.67	6.11	27.75
Female	8.86	54.44	34.22	2.48	5.69	6.49	80.28	2.05	11.2	22.75
Human Capital										
Education										
No education or Elementary	1.13	89.24	8.70	0.93	12.51	0.57	95.99	0.82	2.62	25.54
Secondary Education	3.16	77.37	16.83	2.64	5.49	0.78	92.59	1.68	4.95	8.65
University	7.15	62.83	27.03	2.99	5.57	2.85	86.15	2.73	8.27	10.88
Advanced studies	28.10	20.73	46.71	4.47	2.79	23	55.36	4.41	17.2	16.83
Certified studies and studies in Spain										
Uncertified	6.01	78.74	12.67	2.59	14.43	1.04	94.79	1.63	2.54	23.66
Certified from country of origin	9.55	59.04	28.77	2.65	7.40	4.55	85.19	2.17	8.09	22.04
Certifications accredited in Spain	---	---	---	---	---	29.00	40.25	5.53	25.20	8.39
Certified by Spanish institution	---	---	---	---	---	18.60	59.49	6.38	15.50	11.20
Fluent in Spanish										
Maternal language										
Spanish	10.71	56.17	30.40	2.72	7.26	7.56	78.71	3.40	10.30	21.11
Other	6.11	74.37	16.99	2.53	10.58	---	---	---	---	---
Fluency	---	---	---	---	---	4.78	86.66	1.82	6.74	33.67
Partial fluency	---	---	---	---	---	0.37	98.27	0	1.36	403.43
Not fluent	---	---	---	---	---	2.19	91.84	0	5.97	70.40
Migration experience										
Region of origin										
Europe, non-EU	4.71	75.83	17.55	1.91	10.64	1.89	92.25	1.10	4.76	33.33
Morocco	2.44	88.01	7.91	1.64	16.56	1.77	92.63	0.67	4.93	49.69
Africa, not Morocco	5.25	72.99	20.05	1.70	11.22	2.24	90.78	1.17	5.81	29.99

TABLE 3. *Absolute and relative mobility of non-EU immigrants between and within the labor market segments according to relevant variable (continuation)*

Latin America	10.52	56.15	30.51	2.82	6.86	7.67	78.76	3.43	10.10	17.36
Other countries	20.70	50.58	21.72	7.00	6.89	15.5	71.43	2.74	10.40	38.86
Arrival period										
Prior to 1998	17.98	57.83	19.39	4.80	11.17	16.00	68.62	2.77	12.60	31.49
Between 1998 and 2000	6.67	63.14	27.84	2.36	6.41	4.29	84.39	1.71	9.61	22.03
Between 2001 and 2003	6.63	67.29	24.24	1.84	9.99	2.98	88.19	2.80	6.03	15.56
After 2004	5.92	68.71	22.86	2.51	7.09	3.57	88.50	2.24	5.69	24.77
Nationality and immigration status										
EU citizens	20.55	49.63	24.83	4.99	8.23	16.20	66.96	3.40	13.40	23.85
Permanent residents and documented	8.16	67.33	21.49	3.02	8.48	3.12	87.51	2.25	7.11	17.10
Undocumented immigrants	3.64	70.64	24.18	1.54	6.88	0.21	94.75	1.60	3.44	3.53
Reasons for migration										
Employment	8.42	74.15	15.14	2.29	18.03	4.74	88.51	1.83	4.92	46.63
Other reasons	8.47	63.45	25.39	2.69	7.87	5.91	82.93	2.53	8.63	22.45
Work contract prior to travel										
With work contract	16.00	60.54	21.45	2.01	22.47	8.85	81.42	2.45	7.28	40.40
Without work contract	6.92	65.99	24.33	2.75	6.81	5.15	84.20	2.42	8.23	21.75
Social capital										
Finding first job in Spain through:										
Family or friends	4.97	69.23	23.90	1.90	7.55	3.33	87.24	2.31	7.12	17.64
Other channels	16.74	55.20	23.72	4.34	8.97	11.80	75.01	2.72	10.50	31.05
Labor market										
Previous employment sector										
Agriculture, Fishing, etc.	0.40	86.65	12.88	0.08	34.32	0.39	98.29	1.08	0.24	61.25
Manufacturing and energy	8.92	70.29	18.83	1.95	17.08	6.08	87.32	2.16	4.45	54.12
Construction	1.28	82.63	14.94	1.15	6.17	0.82	93.51	2.08	3.59	17.34
Sales	11.94	57.11	25.12	5.83	4.65	6.66	71.39	4.16	17.80	6.47
Hotel industry	3.68	58.24	36.97	1.11	5.23	2.64	87.96	3.34	6.05	14.36
Transportation and communications	23.17	47.83	18.94	10.06	5.82	7.12	64.94	5.81	22.10	6.93
Financial activities and real estate	23.82	47.54	23.30	5.34	9.09	17.4	66.12	0.51	16.00	84.82
Household employees	0.32	58.28	41.22	0.18	2.48	0	99.01	0.99	0	75.57
Other services	42.34	26.57	20.71	10.38	5.23	25.1	53.23	2.92	18.8	18.96

Source: Prepared from micro-data from the ENI-2007. Relative figures calculated from the weighted data.

Note: P= Primary Segment; S= Secondary Segment.

TABLE 4. *Relative occupational mobility (natural logarithms of the odds ratios) of non-EU immigrants between their last employment in country of origin and first employment in Spain (Reference category: 5)*

		First employment in Spain								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Last employment in country of origin	1	**2.8**	1.4	1.4	0.7	-	0.6	0.7	1.0	0.1
	2	0.6	**3.4**	1.5	1.5	-	0.3	0.2	0.8	0.2
	3	0.9	0.9	**1.7**	0.8	-	0.4	0.2	0.5	-0.2
	4	0.4	0.3	0.3	**1.4**	-	-0.7	-0.4	0.3	-0.1
	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	6	-3.8	0.3	-0.2	-0.1	-	**3.4**	1.8	1.2	1.3
	7	-0.6	0.7	0.1	-1.0	-	1.9	**2.7**	2.0	1.1
	8	0.5	-5.7	0.3	0.5	-	1.9	1.9	**2.9**	1.2
	9	-0.2	-0.4	-1.1	-0.4	-	1.3	0.8	1.3	**1.1**

Source: Prepared from micro-data from the ENI-2007. Relative figures calculated from the weighted data.

Note: Categories 1 to 9 correspond to the occupational groups at a one-digit level from the CNO-94 (see text).

(Table 5). Here the average of the upward logarithms within the two segments is 2.4 while the upward mobility between the primary and the secondary is only 0.5. At this transition, there is also a correlative downward fluidity: the average within the primary segment is 2.0 and within the secondary it is 1.9 but it is 0.0 between the primary and the secondary. This data suggests that there is considerable fluidity within the segments; it also suggests that the downward or upward fluidity is not only produced only during the first and the second transition, respectively. Further, the intense fluidity produced between occupational groups 1 and 2, in particular, in the second transition, suggests the existence of a "superior primary" sub-segment, as has been characterized in literature as well (Piore 1983), in terms of circulation.

Fourthly, the odds ratios from Table 3 (on a 2x2 table that groups the occupations into two clusters, columns 6 and 12) shows the differences produced in these patterns based on distinct variables and allows for comparison with the second hypothesis. The initial segmented downward mobility does not occur in the same manner for all immigrants and the counter-mobility of the second transition does not have the same dimension for all. The relative mobility confirms what the absolute mobility data already suggested: a greater initial downward flow and a posterior upward flow for women and those having advanced education. It is also the case for those having Spanish as their maternal language, who are immigrants from Latin America. The same occurs with those who migrate for reasons that are distinct from the search for employment and for those who were assisted by family or friends in finding their first employment. Those who are not EU-citizens had a greater fluidity (downward) in the first transition and if they are undocumented, this downward fluidity continues in the second transition: it is in this second transition when the state of being undocumented creates a major difference. The increased fluidity in the two analyzed moments occurs between immigrants working in service sectors, particu-

TABLE 5. *Relative occupational mobility (natural logarithms of the odds ratios) of non-EU immigrants between their first employment in Spain and their current employment (Reference category: 5)*

		Last employment in Spain								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
First employment in Spain	1	**3.8**	2.8	2.0	1.7	-	-0.8	1.6	2.1	-5.3
	2	3.3	**5.8**	2.6	1.4	-	-1.5	-0.2	1.4	0.0
	3	2.2	2.5	**2.8**	1.3	-	2.0	0.5	1.8	-0.4
	4	2.1	2.3	2.0	**2.7**	-	-2.3	0.2	1.5	-0.6
	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	6	0.3	-3.6	0.9	1.0	-	**5.3**	3.1	2.4	1.5
	7	1.2	1.6	-0.5	0.3	-	3.3	**3.9**	2.5	1.1
	8	1.9	2.1	1.1	1.5	-	2.4	2.6	**3.8**	0.8
	9	-0.4	0.2	-0.2	0.3	-	2.6	1.8	1.8	**1.5**

Source: Prepared from micro-data from the ENI-2007. Relative figures calculated from the weighted data.

Note: Categories 1 to 9 correspond to the occupational groups at a one-digit level from the CNO-94 (see text).

larly for those working in domestic services in the first transition (the downward) but not in the second.

CONCLUSIONS

This article highlights the importance of the study of the segmented labor market in first generation immigrants, based on the teachings of social mobility sociology, in the same manner in which the studies of Portes *et al.*, for example, looked at "segmented assimilation" for the second generation (Stepick y Stepick 2010). For this, we have highlighted the study of occupational fluidity occurring in the two labor transitions of immigrants in Spain, demonstrating the notable fluidity produced *within* the primary and secondary segments of the labor market and the very slight fluidity produced *outside* of them in both transitions. This allows us to expand upon the approaches regarding Chiswick's U-shaped pattern and to introduce the idea of a segmented U-shaped pattern.

Data from the ENI-2007 regarding absolute mobility of immigrants in Spain shows that there is a "structural" occupational mobility that is downward in the first transition and only slightly upward in the second transition. But this situation, which is seen from the marginal distributions of country of origin and destination, is reproduced upon examination of immigrant mobility between occupational positions: in the first transition there is a clearly downward mobility and in the second, a slightly upward counter-mobility. All of this corresponds with the literature created in the aftermath of Chiswick. But even at the level of absolute mobility, it can be observed that mobility processes are produced, above all, *within* the segments and are very scarce *between* them. Examination of relative mobility allows for clarification: the surface appearance of the absolute data reveals an "endogenous mobility regimen" that points to solid patterns of occupational non-fluidity outside of the segments.

The occupational fluidity demonstrated in the relative mobility data, measured in odds

ratios and presented in the form of natural logarithms, suggests three clear regularities: 1) The flows are, above all, the fluidity produced *within* the primary and secondary segments with very limited fluidity produced *between* them; 2) Both the downward mobility in the first transition and the upward counter-mobility in the second transition are produced *within* the segments and both are scarcely found *outside* of them. These characteristics allow us to confirm the existence of a segmented U-shaped occupational mobility pattern in the evolution of the occupational positions of non-EU immigrants in Spain, having a significant *fluidity* within the segments and a notable *closure* between them. It is also possible to see that 3) this general fluidity pattern within and the closure towards the outside is reproduced in all of the considered variables, yet many of them show a segmented U-shaped occupational mobility pattern that is more or less pronounced or superficial.

These results demonstrate that "there is thus an immediate disjunction between what we observe (odds ratio describing the association between origins and destinations) and what the theories speaks of (that part of the association that arises in a particular way)" (Breen 2004:391). For this, we believe that, in accordance to one of the our hypotheses, it is necessary to say that the immigrant occupational mobility pattern in Spain responds to a segmented U-shape occupational mobility pattern. This is not to imply that the barriers separating the primary and secondary segments are impermeable. Because, as Erikson and Goldthorpe (1993: 396-7) remember quoting Lieberson, "variation will be found even when powerful forces are operating. But a different way of thinking about the matter is required… So the issue is not to avoid statistical variability, but to use properly by distinguishing its shallow applications from those where there are profoundly important regularities".

The data also allows us to confirm the existence of "regular variations" of this general model. For example, the difference between males and females (the latter having a more pronounced "U" shape, with a greater downward occupational flow in the first transition and greater counter-mobility in the second and distinct fluidity patterns between segments with a greater presence of the primary in the second transition). Distinct human capital variables have also shown their relevance in explaining distinct U-shaped behaviors, particularly in increased educational level and its importance in maintaining more educated immigrants in the primary market. Some variables of the migration experience have also been found to have considerable importance: the national origin of the immigrants produces significant differences in entrance into the primary or secondary market and in assimilation patterns in the labor market in the destination country; immigrant motivation also has significant effects since if it is economic, immigrants have greater probabilities of showing a greater initial descent and less posterior counter-mobility and less fluidity than those who came for non-economic reasons; whether or not the immigrant has a authorized legal status is another variable producing the same negative effects on labor assimilation and relegation to the secondary market. Data highlights the ambivalent importance of social capital: family and friend networks help the recently arrived immigrant find quick employment, but this positive aspect is accompanied by an increase in the probability of an occupational descent that occurs both initially and later, as well as less occupational fluidity in the two transitions. The data broadly confirms the second hypothesis, although monographic studies will be necessary in order to analyze some of the more significant "regular variants".

From here, new research questions may be proposed regarding the importance of the

study of occupational mobility or the lack of immigrant social fluidity in industrial societies and the relevance of doing so from a perspective that highlights a segmented U-shaped pattern of occupational mobility and its "regular variants"; and it may be asked, for example, whether the determinants of the immigrant occupational positions play a different role in the distinct segments and in the two transitions (Aysa-Lastra and Cachón 2013).

REFERENCES

Adsera, Alicia and Barry Chiswick (2007). "Are There Gender and Country of Origin Differences in Immigrant Market Outcomes across European Destinations?". *Journal of Population Economics*, 20(3): 495-526.

Agresti, Alan (1990). *Categorical Data Analysis*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Alcobendas, Miguel A. and Nuria Rodríguez (2009). "Immigrants' Assimilation Process in a Segmented Labor Market". *IZA Discussion Paper* 4394.

Amuedo, Catalina and Sara de la Rica (2007). "Labour Market Assimilation of Recent Immigrants in Spain". *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 45(2): 257-284.

— and —(2009). "Complements or Substitutes? Task Specialization by Gender and Nativity in Spain". *IZA Discussion Paper* 4348.

Aslund, Olof and Dan-Olof Rooth (2007). "Do When and Where Matter? Initial Labour Market Conditions and Immigrant Earnings". *The Economic Journal,* 117: 422-448.

Aysa-Lastra, María and Lorenzo Cachón (2012). "Latino Immigrant Employment during the Great Recession: A Comparison between the United States and Spain". *Norteamerica* 7(2): 7-45.

— and — (2013). "Determinantes de la movilidad ocupacional segmentada de los inmigrantes no comunitarios en España". *Revista Internacional de Sociología,* 71(2): 383-413.

Bauer, Thomas and Klaus Zimmerman (1999). "Occupational Mobility of Ethnic Immigrants". *IZA Discussion Paper* 58.

Becker, Gary S. (1993) [1964]. *Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis, with Special Reference to Education.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Beenstock, Michael; Barry Chiswick and Ari Patiel (2010). "Testing the Immigrant Assimilation Hypothesis with Longitudinal Data". *Review of Economics of the Household*, 8(1): 7-27.

Berger, Suzanne and Michael Piore (1980). *Dualism and Discontinuity in Industrial Societies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Bernardi, Fabrizio; Luis Garrido and Maria Miyar (2011). "The Recent Fast Upsurge of Immigrants in Spain and Their Employment Patterns and Occupational Attainment". *International Migration*, 49(1): 148-187.

Bishop, Yvonne V.; Stephen E. Fienberg y Paul Holland (1975). *Discrete Multivariate Analysis*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Blau, Peter M. and Otis Duncan (1967). *The American Occupational Structure.* New York: Wiley.

Borjas, George (1985). "Assimilation, Changes in Cohort Quality, and the Earnings of Immigrants". *Journal of Labor Economics*, 3(4): 463-489.

— (1995). "Assimilation and Changes in Cohort Quality Revisited: What Happened to Immigrant Earnings in the 1980s?". *Journal of Labor Economics*, 13(2): 201-245.

— (1999). "The Economic Analysis of Immigration". In: O. Ashenfelter y D. Card (eds.), *Handbook of Labor Economics*. (vol. 3A), Ámsterdam: Elsevier.

Boston, Thomas (1990). "Segmented Labor Markets: New Evidence from a Study of Four Race-Gender Groups". *Industrial and Labor Relations Review,* 44 (1): 99-115.

Breen, Richard (2004). *Social Mobility in Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

— (2005). "Foundations of a neo-Weberian class analysis". In: E.O. Wright (ed.), *Approaches to class Analysis.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 31-50.

Cachón, Lorenzo (1989). *¿Movilidad social o estructuras de clase? Elementos para una crítica de la sociología de la movilidad social*. Madrid: Siglo XXI-CIS.

— (1995). "Marco institucional de la discriminación y tipos de inmigrantes en el mercado de trabajo en España". *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas*, 69: 105-124.

— (2002). "La formación de la 'España inmigrante': mercado y ciudadanía". *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas*, 97: 95-126.

— (2009). *La "España inmigrante": marco discriminatorio, mercado de trabajo y políticas de integración.* Barcelona: Anthropos.

Caparrós, Antonio and María Luisa Navarro (2010). "Movilidad ocupacional de los inmigrantes en España". *Investigaciones de Economía de la Educación,* 5: 873-890.

Carrasco, Concepción (1999). *Mercados de trabajo: los inmigrantes económicos*. Madrid: IMSERSO.

Chiswick, Barry R. (1977). "A Longitudinal Analysis of the Occupational Mobility of Immigrants". In: B. D. Dennis (ed.), *Proceedings of the 30th Annual Winter Meetings, Industrial Relations Research Association.* Madison WI: IRRA.

— (1978). "The Effect of Americanization on the Earnings of Foreign-born Men". *The Journal of Political Economy,* 86(5): 897-921.

— (1979). "The Economic Progress of Immigrants: Some Apparently Universal Patterns". In: W. Fellner (dir.), *Contemporary Economic Problems 1979*. Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research.

— (1997). "The Economics of Immigrant Skill and Adjustment". *The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance*, 37 (Special Issue): 183-188.

— (1999). "Immigration Policy and Immigrant Quality. Are Immigrants Favorably Self-Selected?". *American Economic Review*, 89(2): 181-185.

— (2008). "Are Immigrants Favorable Self-selected? An Economic Analysis". In: C. B. Bretell and J. F. Hollifield (eds.), *Migration Theory: Talking across Disciplines* (2nd. ed.). New York: Routledge.

—; Yinon Cohen and Tzippi Zach (1997). "The Labor Market Status of Immigrants: Effects of the Unemployment Rate at Arrival and Duration of Residence". *Industrial and Labor Relations Review,* 50(2): 289-303.

—; Yew Lee and Paul W. Miller (2005). "A Longitudinal Analysis of Immigrant Occupational Mobility: A Test of the Immigrant Assimilation Hypothesis". *International Migration Review*, 39(2): 332-353.

— and Magnus Lofstrom (2010). "The Labor Market Adjustment of Immigrants". *Review of Economics of the Household*, 8(1): 1-5.

Colectivo IOÉ (1998). *Inmigración y trabajo. Trabajadores inmigrantes en el sector de la construcción*. Madrid: IMSERSO.

— (2010). "Las migraciones laborales hacia España". In: *Encuesta Nacional de Inmigrantes 2007: el mercado laboral y las redes sociales*. Madrid: MTIN.

Constant, Amelie and Douglas S. Massey (2003). "Self-selection, Earnings, and Out-migration: A Longitudinal Study of Immigrants to Germany". *Journal of Population Economics*, 16: 631-653.

Dickens, Williams T. and Kevin Lang (1985). "A Test of Dual Labor Market Theory". *American Economic Review,* 75: 792-805.

Doeringer, Pater B. and Michael J. Piore (1985). *Mercados internos de trabajo y análisis laboral*. Madrid: MTAS.

Duleep, Harriet O. and Mark C. Regets (1997). "The Decline in Immigrant Entry Earnings: Less Transferable Skills or Lower Ability?". *The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance*, 37: 189-208.

Dunlop, John T. (1957). "The Task of Contemporary Wage Theory". In: G. W. Taylor and F. C. Pierson (comps.), *New Concepts for Wage Determination*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Edward, Richard (1979). *Contested Terrain. The Transformation of the Workplace in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Basic Books.

—; Michael Reich and David M. Gordon (eds.) (1975): *Labor Market Segmentation*. Lexington, MA: Heath.

Erikson, Robert and John H. Goldthorpe (1993). *The Constant Flux: A Study of Class Mobility in Industrial Societies*. Oxford: Clarendon.

—, — and Martin Hällsten (2012). "No way back up from ratchering down? A critique of the 'microclass' approach to the analysis of social mobility, *Acta Sociológica,* 55(3): 211-229.

Fassmann, Heinz (1997). "Is the Austrian Labour Market Ethnically Segmented?". *European Journal of Population,* 13: 17-32.

Featherman, David L.; Frank L. Jones and Robert M. Hauser (1975). "Assumptions of Social Mobility Research in the U.S.: The Case of Occupational Status". *Social Science Research*, 4: 329-360.

Fernández, Cristina and Carolina Ortega (2008). "Labor Market Assimilation of Immigrants in

Spain: Employment at the Expense of Bad Job-Matches?". *Spanish Economic Review*, 10(2): 83-107.

Girod, Robert (1971). *Mobilité sociale. Faits établis et problèmes ouverts*. Ginebra: Droz.

Goldthorpe, John H. (1980). *Social Mobility and Class Structure in Modern Britain*. Oxford: Clarendon.

— (2010). *De la sociología*. Madrid: CIS.

— and George Marshall (1997). "The Promising Future of Class Analysis: A Response to Recent Critiques". In: G. Marshall, *Repositioning Class. Social Inequality in Industrial Societies*. London: SAGE.

Goodman, Leo A. (1979). "Simple Models for the Analysis of Association in Cross-Classifications Having Ordered Categories". *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 74(367): 537-552.

Granovetter, Mark (1994). "Toward a Sociological Theory of Income Differences". In: D. B. Grusky, *Social Stratification in Sociological Perspective. Class, Race & Gender*. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Grusky, David B. (1994). "The Contours of Social Stratification". In: D. B. Grusky, *Social Stratification in Sociological Perspective. Class, Race & Gender*. Boulder (CO): Westview.

— (2005). "Foundations of a neo-Durkheimian class analysis". In: E.O. Wright, *Approaches to class Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 51-81.

Hauser, Robert M. (1978). "A Structural Model of the Mobility Table". *Social Forces*, 56(3): 919-953.

Heagerty, Patrick J. and Scott L. Zeger (1996). "Marginal Regression Models for Clustered Ordinal Measurements". *Journal of the American Statistical Association,* 91(435): 1024-1036.

Hout, Michael (1983). *Mobility Tables*. Sage University Paper series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences. Series 07-031. Beverly Hills & London: Sage Publications.

Izquierdo, Mario; Aitor Lacuesta and Raquel Vegas (2009). "Assimilation of Immigrants in Spain: A Longitudinal Analysis". *Labour Economics,* 16(6): 669-678.

Lipset, Seymour M. and Hans L. Zetterberg (1959). "La movilidad social en las sociedades industriales". In: R. Bendix and S. M. Lipset, *Movilidad social en la sociedad industrial*. Buenos Aires: Eudeba.

Martín, Antonio; Pablo López and Óscar Molina (2011). "Movilidad ascendente de la inmigración en España: ¿asimilación o segmentación ocupacional?". *Papers*, 96(4): 1311-1338.

Massey, Douglas S. and Aysa-Lastra, María (2011). "Social Capital and International Migration from Latin America". *International Journal of Population Research*, Article ID 834145.

McAllister, Ian (1995). "Occupational Mobility among Immigrants: The Impact of Migration on Economic Success in Australia". *International Migration Review*, 29(2): 441-468.

Miller, Stephen I. (1980). "The Calculation of Mobility Rates as Applied to Boudon's Models". *Sociologia Internationalis*, 18(1-2): 35-47.

OECD (2001). "The Employment of Foreigners: Outlook and Issues in OECD Countries". In: OECD, *Employment Outlook 2001*. Paris: OECD.

Parella, Sonia (2003). *Mujer, inmigrante y trabajadora: la triple discriminación*. Barcelona: Anthropos.

Parkin, Frank (1978). *Orden político y desigualdades de clase*. Madrid: Debate.

Piore, Michael (1983). "Notas para una teoría de la estratificación del mercado de trabajo". In: L. Toharia, *El mercado de trabajo: Teorías y aplicaciones*. Madrid: Alianza.

— (1979). *Birds of Passage: Migrant Labour and Industrial Societies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Portes, Alejandro (2012). *Sociología económica de las migraciones internacionales*. Barcelona: Anthropos.

Redstone, Ilana (2006). "Occupational Mobility among Legal Immigrants to the United States". *International Migration Review*, 40(4): 854-884.

— (2008). "Occupational Trajectories of Legal US Immigrants: Downgrading and Recovery". *Population and Development Review*, 34(3): 435-456.

Reich, Michael (ed.) (2008). *Segmented Labor Markets and Labor Mobility*. Cheltenham & Northampton: Edward Elgar.

Reyneri, Emilio and Giovanna Fullin (2011). "Labour Market Penalties of New Immigrants in New and Old Receiving West European Countries". *International Migration*, 49(1): 32-57.

Rosenberg, Sam (1980). "Male Occupational Standing and the Dual Labor Market". *Industrial Relations*, 19(1): 34-49.

Rosenberg, Sam (1981). "Occupational Mobility and Short Cycles". In: F. Wilkinson, *The Dynamics of Labour Market Segmentation*. London: Academic Press.

Sabel, Charles (1986). *Trabajo y política. La división del trabajo en la industria*. Madrid: MTSS.

Sanromá, Esteban; Raúl Ramos and Hipólito Simón (2009). "Los salarios de los inmigrantes en el mercado de trabajo español. ¿Importa el origen del capital humano?". Document de Treball, *Xarxa de Referència en Economía Aplicada,* 4.

Simón, Hipólito; Ramón Ramos and Esteban Sanromá (2010). "Movilidad ocupacional de los inmigrantes en una economía de bajas cualificaciones. El caso de España". Document de Treball, *Xarxa de Referència en Economía Aplicada,* 6.

—; Esteban Sanromá and Ramón Ramos (2008). "Labour Segregation and Immigrant and Native-born Wage Distributions in Spain: An Analysis Using Matched Employer-Employee Data". *Spanish Economic Review*, 10(2):135-168.

Solé, Carlota (coord.) (2001). *El impacto de la inmigración en la economía y la sociedad receptora*. Barcelona: Anthropos.

Sorokin, Pitrim [1859] (1959). *Social and Cultural Mobility*. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.

Stanek, Mikolaj (2011). "Nichos étnicos y movilidad socio-ocupacional. El caso del colectivo polaco en Madrid". *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas*, 135: 69-88.

Stanek, Mikolaj and Alberto Veira (2009). "Occupational Transitions and Social Mobility at Migration to Spain". Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Documento de Trabajo GEPS 4/2009 (III).

Stepick, Alex and Carl D. Stepick (2010). "The complexities and conclusions of segmented assimilation". *Ethnic and Racial Studies,* 33(7): 1149-1167.

Telles, Edward, E. and Vilma Ortiz (2011). *Generaciones excluidas: mexicano-estadounidenses, asimilación y raza.* Madrid: CIS.

Thomas, William I. and Florian Znaniecki (2004) [1918]. *El campesino polaco en Europa y en América*. Madrid: CIS.

Veira, Alberto; Stanek, Mikolaj and Lorenzo Cachón (2011). "Los determinantes de concentración étnica en el mercado laboral español". *Revista Internacional de Sociología,* 69: 219-242.

Villa, Paula (1990). *La estructuración de los mercados de trabajo*. Madrid: MTAS.

Weber, Max (1969) [1922]: *Economía y sociedad. Esbozo de sociología comprensiva*. México: FCE.

Weiss, Yoram; Robert M. Sauer and Manachem Gotlibovski (2003). "Immigration, Search, and Loss of Skill". *Journal of Labor Economics*, 21(3): 557-592.