

Family status, labor market integration and remittances. Bolivian families in Spain

Rafael Grande Martin - rgrande@usal.es
Alberto del Rey Poveda - adelrey@usal.es
University of Salamanca (Spain).

ABSTRACT:

The aim of this paper is to analyze the transfer of remittances by immigrant families taking into account the labor market integration and family status in the country of destination. Our main hypothesis is that the migrant-family status affects both the labor market integration and the transfer of remittances to the country of origin. In this study we focus on analyzing the case of Bolivian families in Spain. This is an immigrant group highly feminized, with a lower time of residence, and it presents a weak family reunification process. These features define a particular framework for the study of remittances.

The data used in this study are mainly from National Immigrant Survey 2007 from de Spanish National Statistics Institute. Using logistic regression models we estimate two relative risks: the labor market integration and the transfer of remittances considering socio-demographic, family and employment characteristics of migrants.

The results indicate from one hand that the Bolivian labor integration is very weak compared to other immigrant groups because of its recent arrival and their individual and family socio-demographic conditions. On the other hand, given their particular family status, with many married women with children, but living alone, the flow of remittances is much more intense than other immigrant groups with better labor market integration.

The main finding of this study is to see that family status of immigrants, marital status and residential status, are more important than labor market position in order to send remittances.

EXTENDED ABSTRACT:

Introduction

Today the study of remittances is one of the main topics of interest within the studies of migration. Remittances are a key factor to assure the survival and to promote the development of families, communities and even countries.

In this paper we focus on the case of the Bolivian population living in Spain, although adopting a comparative perspective in relation to the whole population in general and Latin American immigrants in particular. Bolivian immigration is one of the main groups of immigrants in Spain and presents several important aspects to the study of their employment situation and remittances. Firstly, it is one of the last groups to arrive and presents a short period of residence, which affects their level of integration in the labor market. Secondly, it is a highly feminized group, in relation to other Latin American groups and generally with respect to all the immigrant population. Thirdly, it presents a high percentage of married population, although with a weak process of family reunification has not yet completed the process of family reunification (Table 1). These elements define a particular context in terms of access to the labor market and the transfer of remittances.

The short period of residence in Spain and the low skills of a highly feminized group leads us to assume a poor incorporation into the labor market, weakening their chances of transferring remittances to their families. By contrast, their family status, married women and / or dependent children in their home countries, indicate a strong demand for resources. This somewhat "contradictory" allows us to evaluate the influence of the labor market against the family situation in the transfer of remittances.

Literature review

In order to analyze the factors that affect the sending of remittances of immigrant population we can adopt two perspectives. One, the macro-economic perspective emphasizes the importance of economic factors including the level of income per capita (Lianos, 1997). Second, the micro-social perspective stresses the importance of the migratory project, as well as socio-demographic, family and employment characteristics of migrants (Stark and Levhari, 1982; Lukas and Stark 1985; Menjivar et al. 1998; Funkhouser, 1995; Sanaand Massey, 2005; Hagen-Zanker and Siegel 2007 and 2008; Canales 2008).

This paper assumes the micro-social perspective, since we focus on the socio-demographic and employment characteristics and their family status at origin and destination.

Data and methods

The data used in this study are mainly from 2007 National Immigrant Survey. Using logistic regression models we estimate the relative risk of sending remittances and of labor market integration considering the socio-demographic characteristics, family and employment and economic migrants.

Preliminary results

First, the results show that Bolivian immigrants in Spain have high level of job insecurity in relation to other immigrant groups due to its recent arrival and their specific socio-demographic and family conditions. Most of them are working into low-skilled sectors and with a low productivity, women mainly working in domestic service and men in the construction and public services.

This precarious employment performance contrasts with the high participation in the labor market (over 90%), well above of other Latin American groups. This fact indicates that the particular family circumstances lead them to be more active in the labor market even in worst conditions and salaries.

Second, the transfer of remittances from Bolivians is higher than those of other Latin American groups. That is, despite its worst labor market position and lower wages, Bolivians immigrants present a higher transfer of remittances (63% of Bolivians send remittances). The most important factor in the transfer of remittances, as has shown the preliminary results (Table 2), seems to be a particular family circumstance, i.e., the fact that a high percentage of women live alone in Spain, although many are married and have children.

Discussion

The main finding of this study is to confirm that the family condition of women migrants, in relation to marital status and residential situation of her husband and children, are more important than job position in the sending of remittances. This result involves a strong family migration project in this group, largely due to the gender status of migrants. In the case of male migrants with similar family status, remittance flows are less intense.

References

- CANALES, Alejandro. 2008. *Vivir del Norte. Remesas, desarrollo y pobreza en México*. México: Conapo (Consejo Nacional de Población).
- FUNKHOUSER, Edward. 1995. "Remittances from International Migration: A Comparison of El Salvador and Nicaragua". *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, Vol. 77, n° 1, 137-146.
- HAGEN-ZANKER, Jessica and Melisa SIEGEL. 2007. "The determinants of remittances: A review of the literature". *Working Paper MGSOG/2007/WP003*. Universiteit Maastricht.
- HAGEN-ZANKER, Jessica and Melisa SIEGEL. 2008. "A critical discussion of the motivations to remit in Albania and Moldova". *CMR Working Paper*, No 30/88. Centre of Migration Research, Warsaw University.
- LIANOS, Theodore. 1997. "Factors determining migrant remittances: the case of Greece", *International Migration Review*, Vol. 31, n°1, pp. 72-87.
- LUKAS, Robert E. B. and Oded STARK. 1985. "Motivations to Remit: Evidence from Botswana". *The Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 93, n° 5, 901-918.
- MENJIVAR, Cecilia; Julie DA VANZO, Lisa GREENWELL; y Burciaga VALDEZ. 1998. "Remittance Behavior among Salvadoran and Filipino Immigrants in Los Angeles", *International Migration Review*, Vol. 32, n°1, pp. 97-126.
- SANA, Mariano and Douglas MASSEY. 2005. Household Composition, Family Migration, and Community Context: Migrant Remittances in Four Countries. *Social Science Quarterly*, 86(2), 509-528.
- STARK, O y D. LEVHARI. 1982. "On migration and risk in LDCs", *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, Vol.31, n° 1, pp. 191-196.

EUROPEAN POPULATION CONFERENCE - ECP 2012

TABLE 1. Marital status, children and living together of Bolivians in Spain in comparative perspective.

	Bolivians			Rest of Andean			Rest of Latin-Americans			Rest of Immigrants		
	Hombres	Mujeres	Total	Hombres	Mujeres	Total	Hombres	Mujeres	Total	Hombres	Mujeres	Total
Marital Status and living together												
Single	32,7	37,7	35,4	31,4	27,5	29,3	29,6	25,8	27,5	28,5	17,2	23,5
Single, living with a partner	22,7	21,6	22,1	19,5	17,8	18,6	13,6	10,6	11,9	8,6	10,6	9,5
Divorced, widowed or separated	3,3	11,4	7,7	5,7	13,2	9,8	6,7	14,5	10,9	5,3	16,0	10,0
Married and living with your partner	32,6	19,3	25,4	34,0	35,5	34,7	45,7	45,5	45,6	47,9	53,1	50,2
Married and not living with your partner	8,7	10,0	9,4	9,4	6,0	7,6	4,4	3,6	4,1	9,7	3,1	6,8
Total: children and living together												
No children	35,2	28,9	31,8	33,2	28,1	30,5	42,6	32,7	37,2	43,1	30,8	37,7
Have children and not live with none of them	34,3	38,0	36,3	27,1	20,1	23,3	17,1	16,3	16,6	21,9	18,2	20,3
Have children and live with any of them and not others	10,6	9,5	10,0	18,4	19,5	19,0	15,6	21,6	18,9	12,2	18,9	15,1
Have children and lives with them	19,9	23,6	21,9	21,2	32,3	27,2	24,6	29,4	27,2	22,8	32,1	26,9
Single*: children and living together												
No children	46,6	32,0	36,5	51,3	35,5	42,0	65,3	44,7	52,7	75,8	47,7	60,9
Have children and not live with none of them	25,0	41,0	36,1	25,2	24,4	24,7	19,9	19,4	19,6	13,1	19,8	16,7
Have children and live with any of them and not others	11,4	11,5	11,5	14,9	17,2	16,3	7,0	17,2	13,2	5,7	13,9	10,0
Have children and lives with them	17,0	15,5	16,0	8,5	22,8	17,0	7,7	18,7	14,5	5,4	18,6	12,4
Married and living with your partner: Children and living together												
No children	9,7	7,6	8,6	10,0	12,2	11,4	16,9	14,7	17,6	14,7	14,6	14,7
Have children and not live with none of them	30,6	19,7	25,0	12,5	14,1	13,5	15,0	48,5	15,7	18,0	14,8	16,3
Have children and live with any of them and not others	17,7	9,1	13,3	27,7	19,6	22,8	23,0	17,6	22,9	22,5	23,0	22,8
Have children and lives with them	41,9	63,6	53,1	49,8	54,1	52,4	45,1	19,1	43,8	44,7	47,5	46,2
Married and not living with your partner: Children and living together												
No children	0,0	8,1	6,1	12,6	11,5	12,1	23,1	18,1	18,3	25,5	17,2	23,1
Have children and not live with none of them	83,3	70,3	73,5	76,7	51,0	63,8	61,5	16,2	54,2	68,1	41,1	60,4
Have children and live with any of them and not others	16,7	16,2	16,3	5,8	23,1	14,5	7,7	22,8	13,3	4,4	19,6	8,8
Have children and lives with them	0,0	5,4	4,1	4,9	14,4	9,7	7,7	42,9	14,2	2,0	22,1	7,7

* Here Single include at single living with partner or not, and divorced, widowed or separated.

Source: Authors' analysis from ENI 2007.

TABLE 2. Models predicting to probability of remit or not from Bolivians in Spain.

Variable		Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		
		Coefficiente	Odd Ratio	Coefficiente	Odd Ratio	Coefficiente	Odd Ratio	
Sex	Male	ref.	ref.			ref.	ref.	
	Female	0,487**	1,627			0,568	1,764	
Age	16 to 25 years	ref.	ref.			ref.	ref.	
	26 to 35 years	0,487**	1,627			0,572*	1,772	
	36 to 45 years	0,721**	2,057			0,804*	2,235	
	More thar 46 years	0,067	1,069			-0,020	0,980	
Educational level	Uneducated	ref.	ref.			ref.	ref.	
	Primary	-0,334	0,716			0,021	1,021	
	Secondary	-0,171	0,842			0,025	1,025	
	Tertiary or Higher	-0,557	0,573			-0,344	0,709	
Before migrating activity	Inactive	ref.	ref.			ref.	ref.	
	Active	0,285	1,330			0,104	1,110	
Region of origin	Altiplano	ref.	ref.			ref.	ref.	
	Los Valles	0,182	1,199			0,085	1,088	
	Los Llanos	0,127	1,135			0,425	1,530	
Owner of property in Bolivia	No	ref.	ref.			ref.	ref.	
	Yes	0,124	1,132			0,046	1,047	
Year of Arrival in Spain	10 years ago or more			ref.		ref.		
	From 6 to 9 years			2,446***	11,542	2,428***	11,341	
	From 3 to 5 years			2,580***	13,201	2,680***	14,588	
	2 years or less			1,509*	4,522	1,603*	4,968	
Concentration Index (Province)	IC < 0,999			ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	
	IC > 1 y < 1,999			-0,049	0,952	-0,083	0,920	
	IC > 2			0,083	1,087	-0,099	0,906	
Future Plans	Do not know or go to another country			ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	
	Back to home			0,090	1,095	0,215	1,240	
	Staying in Spain			-0,398	0,672	-0,293	0,746	
Marital Status and living together	Single			ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	
	Single, living with a partner			0,288	1,333	0,383	1,466	
	Divorced, widowed or separated			0,404	1,497	0,354	1,425	
	Married and not living with your partner			0,881	2,413	0,870	2,386	
	Married and living with your partner			0,040	1,041	0,153	1,166	
Children and living together	No children			ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	
	Have children and not live with none of them			1,365***	3,916	1,265***	3,541	
	Have children and live with any of them and not others			-0,863**	0,422	-1,029**	0,357	
	Have children and lives with them			-0,479	0,619	-0,901**	0,406	
Employment situation	Managerial, technical and professional and administrative			ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	
	Services workers			-0,665	0,514	-0,707	0,493	
	Skilled worker			0,098	1,102	0,353	1,423	
	Unskilled workers			-0,474	0,622	-0,434	0,648	
	Not occupied			2,444**	11,519	2,452**	11,609	
Sector	Agriculture, forestry and fishing			ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	
	Industry and Energy			1,819***	6,168	1,748**	5,743	
	Construction			1,858***	6,410	1,696**	5,450	
	Trade			1,855***	6,391	1,728**	5,631	
	Other tertiary activities			1,426**	4,162	1,176*	3,243	
	Housekeeping			2,265***	9,631	1,920***	6,820	
Average monthly income	No income			ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	
	Lees than 499€			1,889**	6,614	1,842*	6,312	
	500 to 999€			2,530***	12,552	2,578***	13,169	
	More than 1000€			2,035**	7,651	2,221**	9,218	
Housing	Owned			ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	
	Rented			0,054	1,055	-0,091	0,913	
	Relinquished			-0,193	0,825	-0,350	0,705	
	Resides in it as domestic worker			1,119**	3,063	1,142*	3,134	
Constant			-0,195	0,822	-5,185***	0,006	-6,111***	0,002
	Number of observations included in the analysis			452		458		446
	R ² Nagelkerke			0,056		0,387		0,405

*** Significant at 99% (P<0,01) / ** Significant at 95% (P<0,05) / * Significant at 90% (P<0,1)

Source: Authors' analysis from ENI 2007.