

Explaining Children Migration Patterns to France and Spain. Methodological Challenges for Cross-National Research

Tatiana Eremenko (INED, Paris)

Amparo González-Ferrer (CCHS-CSIC, Madrid)

Introduction

Children make the largest part of family-linked migration to developed countries. However, very little is known about when and why their parents decide to bring them in or not. The selection process by which some children join their parents at destination while others are left behind is the focus of this paper. Utilizing two nationally representative surveys of immigrants in France (TeO 2008) and Spain (ENI 2007), we examine rates and timing of their foreign-born children's migration. The gender of the pioneer parent and the child, number and ages of siblings and ethnic origin appear important in accounting for the observed variations. However, even among similar ethnic groups, cross-national differences remain larger than expected, which suggests some role of immigration policies but also the difficulty of comparing the behavior of migrants living in countries at different stages of their migration experience.

In order to understand the factors driving child reunification in these two contexts, we first describe the general migration patterns to these two countries over the last decades, with special attention to the Moroccan population, one of the eldest flows to both countries, as well as the main changes that the legal procedure for family reunification affecting children of immigrants has gone through. Next, we present a brief summary of the theoretical reasoning developed in this area and draw some basic hypotheses concerning the main differences we may expect between these two countries concerning the characteristics of the process of child migration. A third section describes the data used for the study and the main categories built to characterize family migrations to France and Spain, and next we focus on the foreign-born (migrant) children of immigrants in these two countries, and carefully describe their own migration trajectories and their timing with regards to the migration of their parents. Finally, we conduct separated discrete event history analyses on the two samples in order to identify the main similarities and differences explaining the process of child migration for both the overall immigrant population and restricting the samples to families of Moroccan origin, in order to neutralize potential compositional effects derived from the different origin-mix in France and Spain. The paper concludes by discussing the results and highlighting some of the major methodological difficulties in carrying out cross-national comparisons in this area.

Migration context in France and Spain

France is the country with the oldest immigration history in Europe. Faced with low birth rates since the XIX century, it had started relatively early to recruit immigrants from neighboring European countries (Belgium, Italy, Poland) to work in the industrial sector. At the end of World War II, immigration to France, primarily composed of workers but also repatriates from former colonies, increased and remained at high levels until the mid-1970s. After the halt on labor migration, the composition of immigration flows went from mainly male workers to more family dominated, but immigration has nevertheless continued. The proportion of immigrants in the total population stayed constant throughout the period from 1975 to 1999 at 7.4%. Since 2000 immigration flows regained as in other European countries and as of 2008, immigrants accounted for 5.3 million persons (8.4% of the total population).

The composition of the migration flows and the immigrant populations have also changed since the end of World War II (Tribalat 1995, Breuil-Genier, Borrel, and B. Lhommeau 2012). South European nationals (Italy, Spain) had already started arriving in the pre-war period and were joined by Portuguese starting from the 1950s. In 1982 Portuguese immigrants represented the largest immigrant group in France (more than 600,000) and remained so until 1999. Immigration from the Maghreb region started with Algerians in the 1950s, followed a decade later by Moroccans and Tunisians. Turkish immigrants have also been present in France since the 1960s. The latter four countries account for more than one third of immigrants residing in France since the 1980s. However a diversification of flows has been observed in the last decades. Migrants from other African countries have become one of the fastest growing communities: their proportion in the immigrant population increased from 4.3% in 1982 to 12.5% in 2008.

The indicators regarding the socio-economic integration of immigrants have also changed with time. Whereas the first migrants were recruited to work in specific sectors (manufacturing, construction) and did not face unemployment, the situation has negatively evolved with time due to several reasons (deindustrialization, no recognition of qualifications, discrimination). In 2010 their unemployment rate was twice the one of non immigrants (20% vs. 11%), with some origins being particularly disadvantaged: among African and Turkish immigrants the rate was over 24% (INSEE 2012). Immigrants also continue to be over-represented among workers, especially non skilled ones (INSEE 2005). Women have on average lower activity rates than men and their native counterparts: one fourth of immigrant women were out of the labor market in 2010 compared to one out of ten non immigrant women.

Recent immigration to Spain has attracted the attention of many scholars and policy-makers because of its sharp increase in a very short time. In effect, the immigrant population has dramatically increased over the last two decades, especially since 2000: in 1991, approximately 400,000 foreign-born people lived in Spain (Ministry of Employment and Social Security 1993), but 10 years later this number increased up to almost 2

million people and reached a peak in 2011 with more than 6,700,700 (INE 2011)¹. Along with this substantial growth, the national-origin mix has also considerably changed over time. Immigrants from the EU-15 represented 44% of total foreign population in 1991 but their relative size declined over time (Ministry of Employment and Social Security 1993), down to 32% in 2001 and 14% in 2011 (INE 2011). In contrast, immigrants from Latin America have steadily increased their share in the immigrant population in Spain from 15% in 1991 (Ministry of Employment and Social Security 1993), to 26 in 2001 and 31% in 2011 (INE 2011). The African community, in contrast, experienced changes of a smaller size than EU15 or Latin Americans, increasing from 15% of total in 1991 (Ministry of Employment and Social Security 1993) to 20% in 2001 and decreasing down to 16% in 2011 (INE 2011).

Apart from such a remarkable growth, the second major trait of the Spanish immigration system relies on its 'structural irregularity', label utilized by different authors to refer to persistently high percentages of foreigners without the proper residence permit, which were estimated to represent up to 70% of the total foreign population in 2002, 40% in 2005 and 24% in 2007 (Cebolla-Boado and González-Ferrer 2008). In this context, official statistics are not a very reliable source to study immigration dynamics in general, and the process of family reunification in particular (González-Ferrer 2011a). However, the decision passed in 2000 allowing undocumented immigrants to register in the Municipal Census (known as Padrón Municipal), necessary for gaining access to the public health and school systems, and also used as proof of length of residence in Spain in regularisation processes, made possible to track the increase of the foreign-born population in the country, regardless of their legal status. Moreover, this measure has probably also helped reducing the social exclusion of this group, mainly concentrated in cities where the demand for cheap labor in (mostly) low-skilled services and the construction sector expanded over the last decade.

In our search for a comparable migrant group in the two countries under study here, it appeared that Moroccans are the only migrants present in both France and Spain in sufficiently large numbers: in 2008 they accounted for 650,000 to 700,000 individuals, respectively. However the characteristics and population dynamics of the two communities appear still somewhat different. The Moroccans residing in France have been arriving on a regular basis since the 1960s and one third of the migrants currently residing there has arrived more than 30 years ago (Breuil-Genier, Borrel and Lhommeau 2012). In Spain, the Moroccan flow was already the largest non-EU flow to Spain as of 1991, when they represented one third of the total non-EU resident foreign population (Cebolla and Requena 2009). In spite of this, it is still a relatively new flow in comparison to the French case, as revealed by the two different indicators graphed in Figure 1. As most of the pioneer migrants in the Moroccan flow are male, the sex ratio illustrates to which degree the flow is still developing or has entered a maturing stage with a growing proportion of female migrants. At present the immigrant population in France is almost sex balanced (111 male for 100 female), which is far from being the case in Spain where only 100 female for 170 male are present. This last level is similar to the one observed in

¹ The source is the municipal population register and includes most undocumented migrants in Spain.

France, albeit three decades earlier, in 1982 (165 male for 100 female). The proportion of immigrants under the age of 15 also points to different population dynamics. The immigrant population does not increase through natural growth, but only through immigration. The higher proportion of children among immigrants points to the arrival of families with small children. Immigrants under the age of 15 accounted for 15% of the Moroccan immigrant population in France in 1982. Their proportion has since that time regularly decreased and was only 3% as of 2008, indicating that the family reunification process among this community is more or less complete. In Spain, the proportion of this age group among resident Moroccan immigrants in 2008 was three times the one in France (9%). It has also slightly increased since 1999 (going from 8% to 9%) pointing to the fact that family reunification among Moroccans in Spain started in the last decade but is still ongoing.

Legal framework concerning family reunification

The possibility to join a family member residing in France and thus the right to family reunification was declared in the edict of 2 November 1945 relative to the entry and stay of foreigners in France. Although migration of families certainly existed prior to this date, starting from 1946 family members become a separate category in the immigration legislation and appear in immigration statistics. The first decree to address the family reunification of foreigners and the necessary conditions to fulfill for a family to be granted entry appeared in 1976,² shortly after the halt on labor immigration. This procedure allowed to bring to France one's spouse and minor children if the sponsoring spouse / parent could justify, among other conditions, of one year of legal residence, stable and sufficient financial resources and housing adapted for the family. It was possible to apply for family reunification of family members still at origin or already in France (regularization), but not as family members. However starting from 1984³ the regularization of family members already residing in France was restricted.

In 1993 the family reunification procedure was integrated within the Code for Entry and Residence of Foreigners and the Right of Asylum. Its' conditions were further restricted: the sponsoring family member had to have resided minimum 2 years in France, persons in polygamous unions were allowed to only bring one spouse. The legislator also stated that family reunification had to be applied for the whole family so as to avoid fragmented reunification and migrants bringing their nearly adult children to France to directly enter the labor market,⁴ thus reintroducing a condition that had previously existed for a short period in the past (1976-1980).⁵ Since 1993 the procedure has undergone changes as to the basic conditions: duration of prior residence, resources and housing. It's important to note that French citizens have a right to bring their family members –

² Décret n° 76-382 du 29 avril 1976

³ Décret n°84-1079 du 4 décembre 1984. Circulaire du 4 janvier 1985

⁴ Author's translation : "La procédure du regroupement familial ne saurait être utilisée par le demandeur pour fire venir non pas sa famille dans son entier, mais au coup par coup ses enfants lorsqu'ils s'approchent de leur majorité afin de les faire admettre sur le marché de l'emploi" (Circulaire du 7 novembre 1994. art. D)

⁵ Circulaire n°7-76 du 19 juillet 1976

spouse, minor or dependent children under 21 and ascendants – independent of any conditions. Thus a naturalized immigrant has greater facilities in bringing family members. Nationals of EU, Switzerland and AELE countries also have facilities in carrying out family reunification, on a similar level with French nationals.

The European directive 2003/86/CE on family reunification designed a general legal framework for EU members. Following numerous debates, the final document contains a minimal application of the right to family reunification: only the spouse and children are recognized as family members, and it establishes the possibility to introduce age limits for children at lower levels. The French procedure was more permissive than the EU directive, and was modified in a restrictive direction. In 2007 language and republican values knowledge tests were introduced for potential family migrants aged 16 et 65 years, thus making integration a prerequisite of family reunification (Chedal Anglay 2008).

The first Spanish Immigration Law, passed in 1985, did not even recognize the right of immigrants to family reunification. However, the Royal Decree that developed the Law in 1986 introduced the possibility that some relatives (spouse, children younger than 18 and relatives in the ascending line) of legal foreign residents in Spain applied for a visa for family reunification as long as they demonstrate economic dependency and the family link. The whole procedure, however, remained quite uncertain. Many applications were arbitrarily solved and courts were the ones clarifying the meaning and limits of the requirements applied by the administration (Quirós 2006).⁶ In the mid nineties, the government clearly established the requirement of more than one year of previous legal residence in Spain and renewed residence permit for all applicants, regardless of their nationality. In addition, the applicant needed also to prove adequate housing and sufficient income to sustain the family. The specific conditions to consider these two requirements fulfilled have been progressively specified, and generally also toughened. Between 2001 and 2007, the income requirement was generally met if the applicant was able to demonstrate continuous wage employment during the last three to six months, depending on the province, and about 300 € a month per relative. However, the 2009 legal reform and the 2011 Immigration Regulations eliminated much of the leverage that Immigration Offices had before, established higher income requirements and quite rigid procedures to prove their fulfillment.

The requirement related to the applicant previous residence in Spain (more than one year and renewed permit) remained unchanged since 1994 up to now. In fact, since 2004 it is allowed to submit the application for family reunification simultaneously with the application to renew the initial residence, which shortened the waiting period to be eligible for family reunification applications. Indeed, the 2004 Immigration Regulations also shortened the time the Spanish administration could take to make a decision. However, even if the application for family reunification is accepted in Spain, it will still take a long time until reunification effectively

⁶ The « Vademecum for immigrants » from 1987 established additional requirements not even mentioned in the Royal Decree. These requirements related to the length of previous residence that the applicant had to demonstrate, which varied across nationalities, and to the age of the family member to reunify.

takes place because the sponsored relatives need to obtain a visa in their country of origin, which is the most uncertain and complicated step of the entire process (González-Ferrer 2011b)⁷.

Taking into account the aforementioned difficulties, it is not surprising that legal entries on the grounds of family reunification to Spain kept always low in comparison to other EU countries. On average, entries due to legal family reunification did not represent more than 20 percent of total annual legal entries between 2000 and 2007 (González-Ferrer 2011a). However, legal family reunification reveals just a partial view of the picture, as we know. Statistics of permits granted for the purpose of family reunification clearly underestimate the actual size of family-linked migration to Spain over the last decades, since a large proportion of the hundreds of thousands foreigners that entered the country as tourists were likely practicing *de facto* family reunification⁸. In fact, the relatively frequent and generous regularization programs implemented since the mid-eighties in Spain have periodically rescued from irregularity a large number of *de facto* reunified relatives. However, the most common procedure to regularize family members already in Spain was for long the ‘visa exemption’ procedure, widely used since the early nineties as a way out of the too rigid legislation on family reunification.

Family related child migration

Data and analyses concerning the size and patterns of child migration in the context of family migration, or more generally empirical studies analyzing the process of immigrants’ family reunification, are still very limited (for exceptions see Jasso and Rosenzweig 1986, 1989, Velling 1999, González-Ferrer 2006, 2007, Tribalat 1978, 1995); this observation also applies to the theoretical reasoning dealing with it (Boyd 1989). The lack of a well developed and articulated body of research on this issue has to do with mainly two causes. First of all, the overwhelming attention the labor dimensions of international migration have traditionally received. And secondly, and strongly related to the previous one, the traditional model of economic male led migration that dominated in most of the literature for decades (Kofman 2004, Zlotnik 1995, Boyd 1989).

Child migration in the context of family migration has been widely disregarded as a relevant demographic and sociological issue to study to the point that, nowadays, it is easier to find published articles and research on unaccompanied migrant children (Empez 2007, EMN 2010, Levinson 2011) – a much more recent and numerically limited phenomenon – than on children’s reunification in virtually any destination country we can think of. Moreover, we – demographers and sociologists – have jumped to analyzing the integration outcomes of the second generation children without understanding the process and the reasons why child migrants came

⁷ Newspapers and NGOs have periodically reported cases of unjustified delays and rejections of visa’s applications for family reunification in Spain by the Consulates abroad (El País. 9.02.2008).

⁸ González-Ferrer (2010) estimated that approximately 65 percent of total spouses’ reunification in Spain had occurred outside the established legal procedure.

to our countries, and how that process might condition their own integration prospects and those of their children.

The process of family reunification has been scarcely theorized. In fact, only by stretching some aspects of the theoretical reasoning developed within the framework of the Neoclassical Economy (Sjaastad 1962, Todaro 1975) and the New Economics of Labour Migration (Stark 1991), may we derive some theoretical predictions to be tested whenever the required data are available. The Neoclassical Economy indirectly assumes the long-term settlement of migrants in their countries of destination, to the extent that migrants are income-maximizers and international migration is largely caused by bi-national wage differentials that are unlikely to substantially reduce or disappear in the course of one generation. Accordingly, family reunification – including of course children's migration – is very likely to happen but it will take some time, during which the first migrant (generally the father) seeks to accomplish the proper arrangements in terms of housing, legal and labor stability to bring the spouse and the children. In other words, the probability of child's migration will increase with time since separation, but they will migrate as young as possible so as to facilitate future integration.

The New Economics of Labor Migration, in contrast, conceived migrants as target-earners who migrated to diversify their household's income sources. Family reunification, especially that of their non-adult children, implied a clear burden on migrants intending to rapidly achieve a savings target and return home, even if a later migration may follow afterwards. This logic makes family reunification unlikely. Maybe only as immigrants realize the impossibility of fulfilling their initial plans and start delaying their return once and again, family reunification emerges as a non-intended outcome. In this case, it is expected that children's reunification takes longer compared to migrant parents who had settlement intentions from the very beginning, and therefore children will migrate, on average, at an older age. In addition, partial and staggered children's migration seems also a more likely outcome for these initially temporary migrants than for the income-maximizers.

Leaving aside the fact that neither the NE nor the NELM ever formulated explicitly any prediction from their respective models of the migration decision-making process with regards to the process of family reunification, the actual problem is that it is never clear in advance whether migrants are temporary workers or permanent settlers. And therefore, we could only assess the empirical strength of the previous hypotheses ex-post: we would deduce that migrants were mostly temporary workers with a saving target if they did not reunify with their children at destination at all or, if they did, it was at a slower pace and in a staggered manner. In addition to this crucial problem, the previous predictions completely ignore the potential effect that different immigration policies and changing living conditions in the countries of origin may imply for these processes.

Apart from these issues, it seems necessary to mention that data concerning only immigrants at destination (regardless of whether they come from retrospective individual surveys or aggregated official statistics) are the most widely used source for studying the characteristics of the family reunification process, despite the fact

that they are all affected by left truncation and, therefore, also by (potentially serious) return bias. This type of data tends to present a profile of the immigrant population biased towards the more settled migrants. Such a bias is likely to provide results that over-estimate the proportion of reunified children at destination and also that under-estimate the average age at child's migration. In our analyses, this type of bias will affect France more strongly than Spain due to the more recent arrival of immigration flows to the latter.

Another factor that has limited our capacity to understand the patterns of child migration in the context of family migration so far has to do, as we mentioned earlier, with the prevalence of the traditional model of male led migration. Women have always been present among migrants (Morokvasic 1984, Donato et al. 2011), but over the last decade migration flows have become increasingly feminized (Castles and Miller 2009). The increasing labor demand in the so-called female sectors in many receiving countries, have favored not only independent female migration but also mother led migration. This factor along with the stronger protection of the right to family reunification in comparison to previous decades (in spite of the recent attempts to restrict this door of entry by imposing tougher residence, income and housing conditions), is likely to have accelerated the process of children's reunification at destination. All these overlapping phenomena are expected to cause quicker reunification of children in Spain than in France, due to the higher proportion of female first-mover and joint couple migration in this country.

Yet, in spite of the expected acceleration of the reunification process in Spain, the legal rule aimed at avoiding fragmented family reunification that has been in force in France for most of the analyzed period (1976-1980 and 1993-2008) is likely to imply higher proportion of children reunified, even if reunification, on average, would have taken longer than in Spain.

Data and methods

Studies comparing family migration levels in several countries are often based on administrative data, such as statistics on entries within a specific migrant category (family reunification). However such data is limited as only information necessary to process an application are collected; the data are then processed to provide individual level statistics not allowing to grasp the group dynamics of a family's migration and the interdependence of the family's members moves. Also, families do not always follow the "rules" and carry out their migration projects in various ways: joint family migration, children coming outside the official family reunification procedure once they've passed the age limit (Kraler 2010). Studies by sociologists, anthropologists, psychologists working on families in a migratory context, on the contrary show the complex decisions behind migrating or not, together or in a staggered manner, and the role played by children, either directly or indirectly, in these decisions, etc. (Suarez-Orozco, Todorova et al. 2002, González-Ferrer, Beauchemin and Baizán 2012). They also acknowledge the existence of different types of child moves (Bledsoe and Sow 2011).

Demographic surveys occupy an intermediary position between the two types of sources described above. Most often focusing on ego and his / her nuclear family, they allow reconstructing family migration trajectories and thus going beyond an individualized vision of family migration. Because surveys collect a limited number of information on migration and the decision-making process prior to the move, certain questions related to family related child migration can be answered by analyzing how each child's migration trajectory is tied to the general family situation and it's socio-demographic characteristics (origin, period of arrival, activity, etc.).

TeO (France) and ENI (Spain) surveys

The National Statistical Institute (INSEE) and the National Institute for Demographic Studies (INED) conducted the Trajectories and Origins survey (TeO) in 2008-2009.⁹ Interviews were conducted with 21,000 persons residing in metropolitan France, aged 18 to 60 years, of which 8,250 were immigrants.¹⁰ The National Statistical Institute (INE) conducted the National Survey of Immigrants (ENI) in Spain in 2007. 15,465 immigrants (people born abroad) residing in Spain and aged 16 or more were interviewed. Both surveys interviewed respondents about family, migration, professional and housing trajectories. Thus basic socio-demographic information is available for the respondent, but also closest family members making it possible to reconstruct (at least partially) the migration trajectory of each specific family member. Table 1 summarizes each sample's main characteristics. As can be expected, immigrants in France have been residing there for a longer time than in Spain and the proportion of immigrants having come as children is also bigger.

In each case, respondents were asked to list all of their children: in France 6,470 immigrants declared 16,991 children; in Spain 10,066 immigrants declared 20,851 children. As this paper focuses on the experience of foreign-born children once their parents migrate to Europe, a sub-sample of children was kept in each country: only children born outside of France and Spain and aged under 18 at the time of the first parent's migration. This age limit was chosen to distinguish between children who were under the age limit allowing them to accompany / join a parent residing in Europe within the family reunification procedure.¹¹ The final sample size in France was 3,440 children declared by 1,737 respondents; in Spain 8,771 children born abroad were declared by 4,933 respondents.¹²

⁹ Trajectoire et origines (TeO) - version réduite - 2008 - (2008) [fichier électronique]. INSEE [producteur].

Centre Maurice Halbwachs (CMH) [diffuseur]. For further information and first results of this survey consult Beauchemin & al. 2010, Borrel & Lhommeau 2010, as well as the institutional website (<http://teo.site.ined.fr/>).

¹⁰ The definition of immigrant in France adopted by the High Authority of Integration is the following: a person born abroad of foreign citizenship and residing in France.

¹¹ For European countries (incl. Turkey), signatories of the European social charter, the age limit was set to 21 years for dependent children; before the possibility for free movement for workers and their families, the age limit was established at 21.

¹² Only 7% of children born abroad were already 18 or older when their parents migrated to France; the proportion was 24% in Spain.

We will use these two data sources to examine how child and family characteristics and country-specific factors contribute to explaining the patterns of children migration in these two contexts.

Family related explanatory variables

A child's migration trajectory is necessarily linked to that of his parents but also siblings. Thus describing the patterns of children's migrations and their determinants requires looking simultaneously at those of the child's closest family members. The surveys described above were designed so as to allow researchers to analyze an individual migrant's behavior in different domains. Reconstructing family trajectories from an individual based dataset poses certain challenges to the researcher as will be described below.

As with most demographic surveys, the respondents in each survey are asked about their union and child histories, but no link is made between the two. In an ideal case, if a respondent's union history is complete, using information on the date of start / end of union and the child's date of birth, it is possible to indirectly identify the child's second parent. In the French survey, information was collected on the respondent's first and present union, and the method described above allowed indirectly "assigning" 87% of child observations to a second parent. Unfortunately, the Spanish survey does not include complete union histories and for current couples includes information only on the date of marriage (but not start of union), which limits the possibility of identifying the child's second parent and also to know whether the couple was formed before or after migrating. This lack of information implies that for respondents that are currently separated / divorced / widowed we know nothing about their union trajectories and cannot link their children to any second parent. In addition, there are many individuals in cohabiting couples who have never married (23% of respondents who declared to have a partner in 2007); unfortunately, it is impossible to know whether a child with a parent from this type of couples, does in fact "belong" to a different union, or the members of the couple are the two parents.

Despite these limits, using the available information made it possible to construct categories mostly comparable that summarize the main migration trajectories observed within couples with children, where at least one parent migrated to Europe (and was therefore present in one of the two surveys) (table 2). Using the following criteria – place of birth, immigrant status and year of migration of both spouses, as well as year of start of union/marriage – six migration trajectories were constructed. Joint couple migrations (1) consist of spouses whose union started prior to the first migration in a family and where both spouses migrated to Europe the same year. The next two groups consist of families where the pioneer migrant was the male, with a distinction between unions started before his migration (2) and after the migration with a spouse still residing in country of origin (3). Families with the first migrant a female constitute another category (4); it includes mainly women who were still in a union at time of migration; however, in France this category also includes some women who may have separated or divorced prior to it, whereas in Spain these type of women are in category 5 because we cannot know whether they separated/divorced before or after migration. Whereas the

first three categories describe similar parent migration trajectories in both countries, it is important to keep in mind that the “mother led migration” (4) and, especially, the “other immigrant parents” category (5) are not. Category 5 was constructed as a residual heterogeneous category in the Spanish context and includes couples that we were able to assign to a specific trajectory in the French context.¹³ The last category (6) includes couples (married or not) where only one spouse is an immigrant, and where the second spouse is a native of the host country (mixed couples).

The descriptive statistics include children of all of these parent couples. However the analysis of the child reunification process does not include children born in mixed couples for conceptual and practical reasons. Firstly, children in these couples often have the citizenship of the country they will (or not) be migrating to and thus do not fall into the same legislation as most other children of migrants. Secondly, since year of arrival to France is not available for natives of the country, it is not clear where the parents live at different points in time and reconstructing the family migration trajectory becomes impossible.

In each survey, respondents were asked to list all of their children with their sex, year and place birth, place of residence and year of arrival in France / Spain. The respondent’s child histories were then aggregated to reconstruct variables on the place of constitution, size and place of residence of the sibling group. As our analysis focuses on the children born abroad, the following variables were kept in the analyses:

- number of siblings residing in origin country: at any given year, this variable is the number of children born abroad and never having migrated internationally
- number of siblings having migrated to the destination country: at any given year, this variable gives the total number of siblings born in the origin country already having migrated to the destination country where one or both parents reside
- number of siblings born at destination: at any given year, this variable indicates whether new siblings have been born to the parent at destination

Given the structure of the data, all the children declared by a respondent have one common parent, but may in some cases have a different second parent.

Description of family migration trajectories

The migration trajectories of families settled in France and Spain differ in several ways, particularly their geographical origin and their period of arrival at destination. Despite this, the characteristics of the children of

¹³ If in the French survey we ignore information concerning previous unions for separated / divorced / widow people and concerning the date of start of the union for cohabiting couples, and re-classify individuals correspondingly, the proportion of respondents in the category “other immigrant parents” would go from 4% to 24%, much closer to the 36% this category represents in the Spanish survey. However it was decided to use the maximum of information available from each survey.

immigrant families in both countries and their migration trajectories appear similar in many of the migrant sub-groups.

Leaving aside the category “other immigrant parents”, which is not comparable across the two surveys as explained above, children born in couples where the father migrated first to Europe, after having formed a family at origin (“father married migrant”), represent 25% of children born to at least one immigrant parent in France, and 24% in Spain (table 3). And for around one out of five children both of their parents migrated at the same time to Europe (“joint couple migration”). Male migrants who arrived at destination while still single and formed a family with someone at origin are the second largest group in France (24%), but are a small group in Spain (5%). This difference reflects the distinct origin-mix in the two countries (there are more North Africans and especially Turks, who are known to participate more in this type of marriage migration, in France than in Spain), but also probably the younger profile of the 1.5 generation in Spain (21% compared to 36% in France), implying a greater proportion of these migrants still being single in Spain compared to France. Finally, mother led family migration account for 16% of the children in France and 9% in Spain. This is not completely at odd with conventional wisdom that female migration is much more frequent to Spain than to France (as it is actually the case), since many of these first-mover mothers in the Spanish case are classified in the category “other immigrant parents” due to incomplete information, as we explained before. In fact, a majority of the separated/ divorced /widow parents included in “other immigrant parents” are women (57%).

Children originating from the African continent are both concerned by international migration to Spain and France. Whereas in France this group is evenly composed of Maghreb (31%) and other African countries (20%), in Spain Moroccans represent by far the largest children African community (14% out of 19%). Asian immigrants are hardly present in Spain, whereas one out of six children in the French sample was born in Asia. Children from Turkey represent slightly less than half of this group; with China among others constituting the second half. Children from EU countries account for about 1/5 of children in both countries. But whereas in France they mostly come from the EU15 group, immigrants settled in Spain are often from the newest EU members, Bulgaria and Romania. Latin Americans represent 45% of the sample of children whose parents migrated to Spain, but is not a community that has settled in great numbers in France. This origin-mix very much reproduces what it is expected from the origin composition of the overall adult immigrant population in both countries that we described in section 2.

The migration histories of the two countries are particularly visible in the parent’s periods of arrival. Children whose parents migrated to France have come in a more or less steady way over the last decades; whereas in Spain almost two thirds of the children belong to families where the first migration took place since 2000. This is an important difference with potential implications for our analyses and their interpretation, as we discuss below.

Overall children reunification figures are higher in France compared to Spain: whereas 82% of children with at least an immigrant parent had migrated to France (whether with or later), the proportion is only 52% for Spain (table 4). In addition, children seem to migrate, on average, at a younger age to France than to Spain (7 versus 8 years). In light of these results, France appears to be closer to the settlement migration pattern, whereas Spain to the target earner one. The potential return bias we mentioned in the previous section, may play a role in these results, as it is likely that a proportion of the most recent immigrants to Spain with their children still abroad, will return to their country of origin. Thus they would not be covered by future surveys in Europe, and higher levels of reunification could be expected to be observed...

The parent's duration of stay at destination is an important determinant as organizing the relocation of a family usually takes time and residence criteria must be met to apply for family reunification. Indeed, for immigrants in France the proportion of reunified children is lowest among the most recent arrivals (77% for parents arriving since 2000 which still remains higher than the 54% for the same group in Spain). However the pattern is less clear in Spain. Only 30% of children with migrant parents that arrived before 1984 had reunified with them in Spain by the time of the survey (2007)¹⁴. For arrivals since 1984, we observe a higher proportion of reunified children by parents that arrived during the eighties and during the nineties than after 2000, suggesting a pattern similar as the one described for France.

In both countries migrants coming from Other Africa have the largest proportion of children still residing at origin: 1/3 of children whose parents settled in France and 2/3 of those in Spain. Moroccans match the average reunification rate in France, but appear to be among the flows with the highest reunification in Spain along with Bulgaria and Romania. However, reasons underlying this similarity is likely to respond to quite different reasons. Moroccans are the oldest settled group in Spain and they have had time to complete much of their reunification process, despite the relatively slow pace at which it proceeded. In contrast, the reunification process of Romanians (and Bulgarians to a lesser extent) whose arrival in Spain is much more recent, seems to be quicker.

The parent's migration trajectory seems to be clearly associated with their children's migration patterns. In both countries the largest proportion of migrant children is observed when the two parents migrated together (97% and 100% of children are already in France and Spain, respectively). Fathers that participated in traditional male led migration (leaving the wife and children behind, at least initially) present also relatively high rates of children's reunification (74% in France and 62% in Spain). In contrast, men who migrated single

¹⁴ However, it is necessary to look at the figures for this group of migrants with caution since they are a very particular group: migrants who migrated to Spain mostly during the dictatorship and who still reside there. In addition, one third of migrant parent in this group are people born in Morocco but whose mother tongue is Spanish, that is to say: 'false immigrants' (children of Spaniards who lived in Morocco during the Spanish Protectorate that ended in 1956).

and formed a family at a distance with someone at origin present seem quite different in their propensity to bring their children to Europe: in France, $\frac{3}{4}$ of their children have migrated there, whereas in Spain only half. In Spain, this type of marriage practice is particularly frequent among the Maghrebians, while in France apart from Maghrebians, Turks are the main group involved in marriage migration. In addition, in Spain, this type of families has become more common among the most recent cohorts of Moroccans (Capote et al....). The geographical proximity with the country of origin along with the more recent arrival to Spain of parents involved in this type of family formation strategy, help explaining the aforementioned difference in their children's migration rate to destination.

The last three categories substantially differ in their proportion of reunified children. Children born to families where the mother preceded the father in migration to Europe have mostly reunified with them in France (80%) but not so much in Spain (approx. 50%). This difference is also likely to be related to the much more recent arrival of these mothers to Spain. Children in the "residual category" (other immigrant parents) of the Spanish survey hides a great deal of heterogeneity, as breaking down its figures by sex shows (not shown here). In fact, within this group of "other immigrant parents", 57% were mothers and 56% of them were living in Spain with no partner, versus only 37% among fathers included in this group. What is more important for the issue at stake here, these non-cohabiting mothers have reunified with them in Spain approximately 40% of their children, whereas the corresponding percentage among not cohabiting fathers is only 11%. Among the cohabiting parents, in contrast, the percentage of reunified children is 40%. As regards mixed parental couples, nine out of ten children have already migrated to France, whereas only four out of ten did so in Spain. As it is not possible to construct in detail these families' migration trajectories, reasons for such differences need to be further explored in other directions.

Table 5 shows the timing of the children's migration with respect to that of their parents which show similar patterns across the two countries. When couples migrate jointly, they bring the majority of their children along them (86% in France and 73% in Spain) and at a relatively young age (average age of 6 years in France and 7 in Spain). Father migrants rarely bring any children with them to destination: only 1-2% of children migrate that same year. They tend to arrive later on with their mother (approx. $\frac{3}{4}$ of them) and are older at migration as well (9 years on average). Women, even if they are the pioneer migrant in the family, more frequently come accompanied by at least some of their children: in these families 39% of children came at the time of their mother in France and 23% in Spain, and approximately another $\frac{1}{4}$ of children in these families will migrate later on with the father. Unfortunately, the category "other immigrant parents" is not truly comparable across countries as we said before, but the observed figures confirm the fact that in Spain many not married couples are included here (12% of children came at the same time as the two partners, who are probably the children's two parents as well) and probably also more mothers in a second couple (which explains both the higher proportion of children coming with their mother and the lower percentage coming with the 'father' in Spain compared to France).

Finally, in both countries, the situation where children migrate accompanied by both of their parents seems to become more common with time, 30% of children whose parents migrated since 2000, came to France with both of their parents and 33% in Spain (compared to only 20% and 17% respectively in the period 1993-1999., and 17% and 10% in the period 1984-1993). Children joining a parent, but migrating by themselves (although they may be in a group with other siblings or relatives) represent a relatively common situation, on average: 29% of child migrations in France and 34% in Spain. However, this type of child migration has become less common over migrants cohorts in the two countries, probably reflecting the smaller size of families all over the world in comparison to past decades and maybe also the stronger protection of family reunification, in spite of all the recent restrictions.

Child reunification: event history analysis

Previous sections have shown the existence of the immigrant populations' compositional differences in both countries, and the likely importance of the residence duration in understanding the (non-)arrival of children at destination. Event history analysis takes into account the time dimension of this process and allows to estimate the specific factor of different variables, all other characteristics being held constant (Yamaguchi 1991). As we work on aggregated units – children within families – all estimations were clustered for the calculation of significance levels.

All children

As can be seen in Table 6, as the duration of separation from the first migrant parent increases, chances of the child to migrate to Europe do not increase, as it would be expected from both the NE approach and, especially, the NELM. In contrast, in both countries the probability of migrating and joining the parent(s) at destination becomes bleaker with time, with the effect being slightly bigger in Spain. In other words, child reunification is a relatively quick process in Spain, but has taken a longer time in France, with some children arriving after having been separated for a great number of years from their parents. This is consistent with the higher proportion of pioneer mothers and joint couple migration to Spain than to France, but also with the expected effect of the legislation discouraging staggered family reunification in France.

The descriptive statistics showed the variety of children's migration outcomes and timing of migration according to their parent's migration trajectory. Figures in annex 3 provide Kaplan Maier survival estimates for the first four categories of immigrant parents and confirm the patterns observed earlier. In order to combine this dimension with the effect of the second parent's arrival, and trying to keep the number of categories to a minimum, the decision was made to synthesize these trajectories into a variable describing which parent is at destination any given year for the EHA models. The importance of the parent's migration trajectory for the child's own migration is confirmed in the analyses and consistent with what was described previously: having the mother at destination, especially if the father is also already there (both parents at destination), substantially increases the child's chances of migrating to Europe in a given year, in comparison to those children whose only migrant parent is the father (ref. category).

Other sibling's migrations have a positive effect on a child's own migration and point to the fact, that once parents decide to relocate the children, they will probably proceed to do so with all of them, or at least those that still meet the age criteria. However the impact of other characteristics of the sibling group is not always so clear. The size of a sibling group, i.e. the total number of children younger than 18 in a family still residing at origin, does not seem to be an obstacle for a child's migration to France, whether it is the case in Spain: with each additional sibling, a child's own chances of migrating a given year decrease by almost 70%. In France, the right to family reunification has existed for a longer time and is an established procedure known to migrants. Criteria to be filled out are clearly stated, even though we may suppose that some part of arbitrary decisions exist. In fact, we already mentioned, the legislation promoted the reunification of all children at once (see above). Family size not being a criteria, and the sponsor's resources needing to be only marginally larger if a family is large,¹⁵ this variable may not be discriminatory in France. In Spain however, many families have more often had to organize their children's migration in an informal way with prices (and opportunity cost of) for bringing one, two or more children varying greatly. Once at destination, children allowances in Spain are relatively small, whereas they represent an important additional income for families in France and vary with the number of children (OECD 2011).

In the same way, the birth of a new sibling while the migrant parent(s) is (are) in Europe does not have the same effect on the children left-behind by parent migrants in France and Spain. In the first case, having a sibling at destination decreases one child's own migration chances, whether in the second case they are doubled. In order to understand this result, we may turn once again to the first parent migrant's characteristics. The situation described above – a new child being born in Europe while other children born previously are still at origin – more often occurs when the mother is at destination. While most first mother migrations in France consist of are women who are migrating on their own (single, separated or divorced), in Spain women migrants are more often in a couple, whether they arrive together or separately. Thus in the first case, a birth at destination often signals the start of a new union and a half sibling for the children at origin, whereas in Spain this birth does not alter the family structure and may in some cases, provide immigrant families with a stronger link to the destination country in social, but also legal terms.

Children's own characteristics also determine their migration outcomes. As previously, we can see common patterns, as well as differences across the two countries. Daughters are less likely to join their parents at destination compared to sons, confirming studies showing that the former are more protected by their parents who do not want them falling under the destination country's society's influence. Children who are older at the time the first migrant parent left, have lower probabilities of migrating to Europe. Children in their teenage

¹⁵ In 2010, a sponsor with a family of 2 to 3 members had to have earned the minimum wage over the last 12 months; the amount was +10% for a family of 4 to 5 members (<http://vosdroits.service-public.fr/F11168.xhtml#N10087>)

years have stronger emotional links with other relatives he/she may stay with, may be more reluctant to leave their school, friends, etc. If both parents migrate, leaving behind some of their children, they will also be most likely to be left in charge of other siblings. The birth position of a child, could have the same effect – the eldest being left to take care of younger children – but while the variable is significant in both countries, it illustrates different results in the two countries. Whereas in France the eldest children have greater chances of migrating, the opposite is true in Spain. In many cases, once both parents or the mother migrate abroad, children left behind are left in the care of older siblings or other relatives. Thus the eldest child (daughter) responsible for taking care of younger siblings, will only be able to migrate once all other siblings have been brought over to Europe. In the Spanish context, given the high proportion of joint couple and mother-led migration, the eldest siblings seem to take care of the younger ones, resulting in their smaller chances of migrating a given year. The opposite effect in France may be linked to specific family strategies among some migrant groups. For example, studies among Maghreb communities settled in France, have shown how the eldest child's migration, especially the son's, may be part of a family strategy, with children replacing their parents in the labor market, mainly fathers, at retirement age (Sayad 1991).

Families migrating in different contexts also have specific patterns as regards to children's reunification. In both cases, we observe that more recent cohorts of migrants carry them out quicker (annex 3). In France the border seems to lie between the cohorts arriving before 1974 and after that year; since the 1990s no significant differences have been observed among the migrant cohorts (table 6). In Spain, the last two groups of cohorts arriving starting from 1993 are significantly more rapid in carrying out their reunification projects than previous groups, which coincides with the increasing protection given to legal family reunification (since 1996) on the one hand, including the possibility of visa exemption for children reunified *de facto*, as well as with measures that shortened and eased the procedure (since 2001).

Annex 3 contains Kaplan Maier survival estimates by the child's origin. In France, 3 patterns can be distinguished: EU15, Other Asia and Other countries reunifying quickly; Turkey starting later but joining the levels of child reunification of the first group after 15-20 years; Maghreb and Other Africa having a slower and less complete reunification. In Spain two origins distinguish themselves from others: Bulgaria and Romania as the one with the quickest and Other Africa with the slowest child reunification. Other origins are in an intermediary situation, including Maghreb. Despite controlling for numerous variables, differences as to the children's reunification across origin groups remain (table 6). While in Spain, immigrants from Maghreb (reference category) were the fastest reunifying group with all the other groups presenting chances of migrating 40% to 55% lower, in France this same reference group was in an intermediary position: immigrants from EU15 and Turkey reunify at a significantly faster pace and Sub-Saharan are the slowest group. In both cases these results are mainly reflecting the sharply different migration patterns that dominate among immigrant parents across origin groups, as can be seen in Annex 1. In the Spanish case, before including the variables indicating the parents' location (only father at destination, only mother, both), children of immigrants from Bulgaria and Romania, from the rest of the EU and from Latin American were more likely to migrate to

Spain than the reference group (not showed). However, this effect reversed once parents' location is controlled for, which confirm the importance of the parental migration sequence to understand the process of children's migration, as well as the quite skewed distribution among the Maghrebian Spanish group towards the more 'traditional' forms of family migration (see Annex 1). In the French case, before introducing the parents' location, Maghrebians are significantly slower in their family reunification than all other groups, except Other Africa (not showed). Once controlling for this no significant differences appear with Asia and other countries. The Turkish group, despite having similar family migration trajectories with Maghreb, is still faster in its child reunification. The nuclearized character of the Turkish family, which tends to favor family reunification, has been noted in several studies (Tribalat 1995).

The unemployment rate a given year has a significant and negative impact in France, but doesn't appear to play a role for immigrants settled in Spain. For French residents, greater unemployment rates than for the majority population have been a fact for several decades. Unemployment leads to smaller financial resources for the sponsor (and not meeting the income criteria can be a reason for a negative response), but also less prospects of finding a job for the arriving parent leading families to postpone their reunification. Immigrants in Spain, especially between 2000 and 2007 (year of the survey), were not faced with serious unemployment problems. In addition, due to the strong segmentation of the Spanish labor market and the large size of the black economy that employs many migrants, the overall unemployment rate is not as reliable as in France to proxy the work and economic opportunities of migrants¹⁶.

Citizens generally enjoy easier conditions to reunify their non-national relatives, or at least some of them. Namely, French citizens have the right to bring in their spouse and dependent children and irrespective of any criteria; Spanish citizens, they can also bring their spouse children under 21 (or older but dependent on them) right away, but since 2007 relatives are nationals from countries that are required visa to enter to Spain, they still need to apply for it. However, this requirement did not exist in the past. Accordingly, it is not surprising that in both countries, the naturalization of one or both parents increases the chances of a child to migrate to Europe due probably not only to the much easier legal procedure but also because naturalization is associated with settlement intentions in most cases and better socio-economic integration.

A further test with Moroccan children

In this section, we try to improve our understanding of the universal and context-specific factors determining child reunification, by focusing on a specific migrant group. A brief description of the Moroccan immigrant population in France and Spain showed that despite their similar size in the two countries, the population dynamics in both locations were quite different, reflecting their distinct immigration history to each of these

¹⁶ During the eighties and the early nineties, high unemployment rates in Spain were widely compatible with increasing flows of mainly Moroccan workers who were frequently employed in the black economy and in seasonal activities in the agriculture and tourist sector (references).

two destinations. Indeed the profile observed in Spain today (unbalanced sex ratio, higher proportion of migrants under 15) is similar to that observed in France several decades ago, when the migration flow was still in an expanding stage. In order to control for this different historical timing of the migratory process, we introduce an additional observation of the Moroccan group in France, at an earlier stage of their migration, in the beginning of the 1990s, by using the *Mobilité Géographique et Insertion Sociale* (MGIS) survey. It was carried out by the National Statistical Institute (INSEE) and the National Institute of Demographic Studies in 1992. Information contained in the questionnaire allowed constructing the same categories and variables as for the two surveys already described. 80% of children's parents migrated before 1974 and in nine out of ten cases, the first parent migrant was the father (see annex 2)

The three Moroccan samples used in the comparison – current Moroccan communities in France and Spain and Moroccans present in France at the start of the 1990s – show results similar to the overall immigrant population in both countries (table 7). However some patterns seem specific to this flow evolving across national spaces, but also through time. As with the overall migrant population, the children's chances of migrating decrease with time, although the effect is null for France today. In both countries we see an acceleration of child reunification, with the oldest arrivals being reluctant about bringing their children to Europe and more recent arrivals more eager to do so. The presence of the parents is an important determinant: very few children arrive to join their father at destination, but only do so when their mother migrates as well and both parents are at destination. The daughter's prospects of migrating are significantly lower than the sons', especially at the start of the flow, as is the case of Moroccans in the older French survey and in Spain today. With the development of family migration and arrival of mothers (and the consequent development of wider female networks), the effect of the child's sex is weakened.

Being an eldest child in the sibling group has a strong positive and significant effect in the MGIS survey and may point to the specific migration of the eldest sibling to join or replace a father approaching retirement age, which was a common situation before the development of family migration (however, an interaction term between sex of the child and eldest should be included to properly test this hypothesis). This effect is not observed in Spain, whether it too is still in its pioneer worker migration stage. We may assume that the migrants residing in Spain, even those with children, are still relatively young and are not yet close enough to retirement to observe such a process.

However some results remain quite different, even when looking at a specific national origin and trying to "control" for its historical migratory process. This is the case of the size of the sibling group still residing at origin. In the Spanish case, as for other migrant groups it is negative and significant, indicating a greater difficulty in relocating a bigger family. The opposite situation is observed for the earlier Moroccan migrants in France (MGIS) and no effect among the recent arrivals (TeO). This effect is surprising and no explanations are readily available. It may be possible that a larger group of children is harder to give into the care of a family member and the family thus, either relocates with all children or not at all.

Discussion and conclusion

This paper has addressed the topic of family related child migration. Although few theoretical and empirical studies have been carried out up until now on this topic, analyzing the process of child reunification would allow understanding the dynamics of a major component of international migration flows today, but also of the 1.5 generation's outcomes once they're at destination. By using comparable data sources in two major immigrant destination in Europe today, France and Spain, we sought to identify the universal and context-specific factors driving this process.

Immigrant parents in Spain seem to have been quicker in bringing their children to live with them at destination than immigrant parents in France. However, immigrant families in France seem to have completed the reunification process in higher proportions. In addition, staggered siblings' migration seem much more likely to occur in Spain than in France (through variable "siblings still at origin"). All this is consistent with our initial hypotheses concerning the effect of the higher proportion of mother led migration and joint couple migration to Spain, as well as with the potential effect of the legislation concerning family reunification in France (stronger protection for longer time and, in addition, explicit promotion of non-fragmented reunification of nuclear families), which is likely to delay the process.

Analyzing the same national group, Moroccans, across different countries brings into light certain context specific effects (birth position, number of siblings at origin), but also points to the limits of such an analysis. The migratory history of this group in the two countries is different, and even if we try to control for this by taking as a comparison group the Moroccan migrants in France two decades ago, differences between the two countries remain. Indeed the pioneer migrants coming to France in the 1960s and to Spain in the 1980s come from different origin countries. The country has undergone its demographic transition and modernized in many aspects. Prior to the 1960s fertility rates were high (TFR of 7.2), the population was in majority rural and had low levels of completed education. Nowadays the TFR is 2.6 and 60% of the population resides in cities and has a greater access to education (UNFPA 2007). Ultimately these migrants do not come from the same country, limiting the possibilities for comparison across space and time, especially for such a changing phenomenon as international migration.

The present paper also raises important methodological issues. As we work on aggregated units – individuals within families – we realize the interdependence of the events occurring within the group. In our attempt to identify the different determinants of child reunification, we distinguished a certain number of variables likely to have an effect such as the time since parent's migration, type of parent migration trajectory, age of child at first migration, size of sibling group, etc. However, it is not always possible to determine which is the cause / effect and many of them are strongly correlated. For example, this paper has taken the standpoint of immigrant's children and analyzed the different surrounding factors influencing their chances of migrating to Europe. It has shown that the presence of parents, and particularly the mother, is a necessary condition. However the relation could be reversed as the children group's characteristics surely determined which of the

parent's chose to migrate. In the same way the passing of time is correlated with many variables – time of separation, child's and his/her siblings' age, age of parents, etc. – but also has a more indirect effect on the likelihood of other events in the family such as an additional birth, separation of parents, etc., which in their turn will affect differently the outcomes of the different family members. Although we integrated as much as possible the collective dimension in the descriptive and event history analyses, they still do not allow taking into account the dimension of linked lives sufficiently and other more sophisticated methods may need to be explored. Thus, given the complexity of the family fabric and, despite the fact that each researcher seeks to find a simple way to present one's findings, this possibility seems out of reach (for now) for those working at the intersection of family and migration domains.

Figure 1. Sex ratio and age structure of the Moroccan immigrant population in Spain and France, 1982-2008




Table 1. Characteristics of the immigrant samples in TeO and ENI

	TeO		ENI	
	All immigrants	Immigrants aged 18 or more at arrival	All immigrants	Immigrants aged 18 or more at arrival
Immigrant sample	8259	5340	15119	11962
% arrived as minors (under 18)	36%	100%	21%	100%
Average (median) length of stay	21 (19)	16 (13)	13 (7)	9 (6)
Family situation				
% of never married at migration	68%	52%	74%	66%
% of single migrants having married a spouse residing in country of origin	23%	24%	6%	6%
Children born abroad				
% with least 1 child born abroad	21%	33%	29%	32%
Average number of children born abroad (among those with at least one)	2,1	2,1	2,3	2,3
<i>Source: TeO (2008). ENI (2007). Author's calculations. Weighted results</i>				

Table 2: Couples migration trajectories in TeO and ENI surveys

Type of parent migration	TeO	ENI
1. Joint couple migration	Union formed prior to first spouse migration. Both spouses migrated the same year.	Marriage took place prior to first spouse migration. Both spouses migrated the same year.
2. Father married migrant	Union formed prior to first spouse migration. Father migrated first.	Marriage took place prior to first spouse migration. Father migrated first.
3. Father single migrant	Single male migrates first. Union is formed after migration with a female residing in country of origin.	Single male migrates first. Marriage took place after migration with a female residing in country of origin.
4. Mother migrant	First parent migrant is the mother. Marriage took place prior to first spouse migration	First parent migrant is the mother. Marriage took place prior to first spouse migration.
5. Other immigrant parents	Union with both partners immigrants, and a) formed at destination; b) missing information concerning start / end of union or migration of either spouses.	Respondents not in a cohabiting couple at time of survey (single, separated, divorced, widowed), but also not married cohabiting immigrant couples for which date of start of union is unavailable
6. Mixed couple	One parent is an immigrant (respondent in the survey) and the second parent is a French native (non – immigrant). Both cohabiting and married couples included	One parent is an immigrant (respondent in the survey) and the second parent is a Spanish native (non – immigrant). Both cohabiting and married couples included

Table 3. Distribution of children by family's migration trajectory

	TeO		ENI	
	Sample size	% col.	Sample size	% col.
Total	3440	100	8771	100
Type of parent migration				
Joint couple	734	20	1189	17
Father married migrant	862	25	2052	24
Father single migrant	759	24	399	5
Mother migrant	566	16	833	9
Other immigrant parents	118	4	3140	37
Mixed couple	401	12	1158	8
Origin				
Maghreb	806	31	1350	15
- Morocco	391	15	1157	14
Other Africa	909	20	371	4
Turkey	356	7	0	0
Asia	360	9	266	4
UE15. Suisse. AELE	605	20	915	10
Bulgaria & Romania	0		1051	12
Latin America	0		4168	46
Other	404	14	750	8
Period of first parent's arrival				
Before 1974	569	20		
1974-1983 (FR) / Before 1984 (SP)	709	19	698	8
1984-1992	733	19	803	10
1993-1999	524	15	1600	18
2000-2008	898	27	5670	64
<i>Source: TeO (2008). ENI (2007). Author's calculations. Weighted results</i>				

Table 4. Proportion of children having migrated to Europe and average age at migration by family's migration trajectory

	TeO		ENI		TeO	ENI
	<i>N migrant obs.</i>	<i>% migrants</i>	<i>N migrant obs.</i>	<i>% migrants</i>	<i>Average age at migration (years)</i>	<i>Average age at migration (years)</i>
Total	2850	82%	4588	55%	7.1	8.4
Type of parent migration						
Joint couple	714	97%	1189	100%	6.1	7.0
Father married migrant	666	74%	1289	62%	8.7	9.6
Father single migrant	564	75%	205	50%	6.7	7.3
Mother migrant	456	80%	408	48%	8.6	9.5
Other immigrant parents	89	70%	1029	34%	5.4	9.0
Mixed couple	361	91%	468	45%	5.6	7.7
Origin						
Maghreb	670	80%	783	66%	7.6	9.1
- Morocco	339	84%	736	55%	8.2	9.4
Other Africa	586	63%	99	24%	8.8	7.0
Turkey	345	97%			7.8	
Asia	341	93%	133	54%	7.6	9.4
UE15. Suisse. AELE	541	88%	437	55%	5.0	5.7
Bulgaria & Romania			694	67%		9.3
Latin America			2087	51%		8.1
Other	367	88%	355	52%	6.7	9.8
Period of first parent's arrival						
Before 1974	486	84%			7.5	
1974-1983 (FR) / Before 1984 (SP)	619	84%	444	30%	5.4	9.8
1984-1992	629	86%	134	61%	7.0	8.6
1993-1999	417	79%	1001	66%	8.0	8.6
2000-2008	692	77%	3009	54%	7.7	8.2
Source: TeO (2008). ENI (2007). Author's calculations. Weighted results						

Table 5. Timing of children's migration to Europe by family's migration trajectory

	TeO				ENI			
	<i>With which parent does the child migrate?</i>				<i>With which parent does the child migrate?</i>			
	<i>Both parents</i>	<i>Only mother</i>	<i>Only father</i>	<i>Without parents</i>	<i>Both parents</i>	<i>Only mother</i>	<i>Only father</i>	<i>Without parents</i>
Total	17%	46%	8%	29%	26%	35%	5%	34%
Type of parent migration								
Joint couple	86%	0%	0%	14%	74%	0%	0%	26%
Father married migrant	0%	75%	2%	23%	0%	72%	1%	27%
Father single migrant	0%	66%	1%	33%	0%	67%	0%	33%
Mother migrant	0%	39%	24%	37%	0%	23%	28%	49%
Other immigrant parents	0%	24%	19%	58%	12%	37%	7%	44%
Mixed couple	0%	40%	23%	36%	0%	31%	13%	56%
Origin								
Maghreb	5%	60%	6%	30%	6%	68%	1%	25%
- Morocco	2%	67%	3%	27%	3%	70%	1%	26%
Other Africa	4%	44%	13%	40%	22%	24%	3%	51%
Turkey	13%	67%	1%	18%				
Asia	38%	39%	5%	18%	17%	44%	4%	35%
UE15. Suisse. AELE	30%	33%	9%	27%	56%	22%	6%	16%
Bulgaria & Romania	0%	0%	0%	0%	24%	30%	2%	44%
Latin America	0%	0%	0%	0%	23%	19%	9%	49%
Other	33%	32%	10%	24%				
Period of first parent's arrival								
Before 1974	1%	59%	2%	37%				
1974-1983 (FR) / Before 1984 (SP)	13%	45%	5%	38%	1%	36%	3%	60%
1984-1992	17%	46%	7%	30%	10%	51%	4%	35%
1993-1999	20%	45%	12%	23%	17%	35%	5%	43%
2000-2008	30%	39%	14%	18%	33%	32%	5%	30%
<i>Source: TeO (2008). ENI (2007). Author's calculations. Weighted results</i>								

Table 6. Discrete-Time Logit Estimates: Odds of a child migrating to joint a parent in Europe

	TeO	ENI
Time	0.850***	0.769***
Mother respondent	1.289*	1.260***
Female child	0.829*	0.800**
Child born after 1st migration	0.671*	0.714**
Ref. Child's age under 6 at first migration		
Child's age 6 to 11 at first migration	0.506***	0.746***
Child's age 12 to 17 at first migration	0.232***	0.451***
Eldest child	1.549***	0.642***
Only child	1.137	1.238*
Number of siblings at origin at t-1	0.931	0.321***
Number of siblings migrated to destination	3.471***	7.545***
Number of siblings born at destination	0.545***	2.184***
Ref. only Father at destintation		
Both parents at destination	60.41***	45.18***
Mother only at destination	15.90***	5.678***
Ref. Traditional marriage		
Parent's union formed at a distance	2.148***	2.024***
Married in Spain		0.539***
Others (div, sep, wid, cohab.)		0.500***
1st arrival before 1974	0.317***	
Before 1984	0.643*	0.354**
Ref. 1st arrival 1984-1992		
1st arrival 1993-1999	0.955	1.434*
1st arrival 2000-2008	1.289	1.702**
Ref. Magreb		
Other Africa	0.261***	0.544**
Turkey	1.876**	
Asia	0.935	0.503**
EU15	1.498*	0.529**
Bulg+Rom		0.431***
Latin America		0.425***
Other	1.135	0.449***
Respondent's education secondary or higher	1.250	0,982
Unemployment rate in France / Spain	0.935*	1
Parent's naturalisation	2.157*	1.468**
pseudo R2	0.572	0,575
N (person-years)	15,328	20,843
Exponentiated coefficients : * p<0.10, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001		
<i>Source: TeO (2008). ENI (2007). Author's calculations</i>		

Table 7. Discrete-Time Logit Estimates: Odds of a child born in Morocco migrating to join a parent in Europe

	MGIS	TeO	ENI
Time	0.825***	0.980	0.878***
Mother respondent	0.726	3.796**	1.098
Female child	0.544*	0.660	0.442***
Child born after 1st migration	1.547	0.793	2.478**
Ref. Child's age under 6 at first migration			
Child's age 6 to 11 at first migration	0.130***	0.316*	0.601*
Child's age 12 to 17 at first migration	0.0353**	0.425	0.802
Eldest child	4.221***	1.463	0.696
Only child	0.513	1.908	0.551
Number of siblings at origin at t-1	1.406***	0.979	0.464***
Number of siblings migrated to destination	2.497***	3.030***	2.973***
Number of siblings born at destination	0.234***	0.765	1.528
Ref. only Father at destination		.	
Both parents at destination	523.8***	204.8***	68.79***
Mother only at destination	32.24***	6.173***	6.811**
Ref. Traditional marriage			
Parent's union formed at a distance	1.025	2.994*	1.051
Married in Spain			0.494
Others (div, sep, wid, cohab.)			1.029
1st arrival before 1974	0.365	0.0706***	
Before 1984	0.411	0.233**	0.356**
Ref. 1st arrival 1984-1992			
1st arrival 1993-1999		2.140	1.699**
1st arrival 2000-2008		1.341	4.658***
Respondent's education secondary or higher	1.226	0.474*	1.036
Unemployment rate in France	1.053	0.688***	0.945
Parent's naturalization	8.351***	1.988	1.025
Pseudo R2	0.763	0.694	0.709
N (person-years)	16092	3064	5108
Exponentiated coefficients: * p<0.10, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001			
<i>Source: MGIS (1992). TeO (2008). ENI (2007). Author's calculations</i>			

References

- Beauchemin, C., C. Hamel, et al. (2010). Trajectoires et origines : enquête sur la diversité des populations en France. Premiers résultats. Documents de travail. Paris, Institut national d'études démographiques 168.
- Bledsoe, C. H. and P. Sow (2011). "Back to Africa: Second Chances for the Children of West African Immigrants." Journal of Marriage and Family 73(4): 747-762.
- Boyd, M. (1989), 'Family and Personal Networks in International Migration. Recent Developments and New Agendas', International Migration Review 23: 638-670.
- Borrel, C. and B. Lhommeau (2010). "Être né en France d'un parent immigré." Insee Première 1287.
- Breuil-Genier, P., Borrel, C. and B. Lhommeau (2012) (Les immigrés, les descendants d'immigrés et leurs enfants », France, portrait social - Insee Références, Edition 2011.)
- Capote Lama, A. (2011). Inmigración marroquí en Andalucía: dinámicas de movilidad espacial y condiciones de inserción en distintos contextos locales. Cuadernos Geográficos, 48 (1): 281-291.
- Cebolla, H. y M. Requena. 2009. "Los inmigrantes marroquíes en España". Pp. 251-287 en D. Reher y M. Requena (eds.), Las múltiples caras de la inmigración en España. Madrid: Alianza Editorial
- Cebolla-Boado, H. and A. González-Ferrer (2007). La inmigración en España (2000-2007). De la gestión de flujos a la integración de los inmigrantes. Madrid: Centro de Estudios Políticos y Constitucionales.
- Chedal A. (2008), La transposition française et espagnole de la directive 2003/86/CE sur le regroupement familial et le droit fondamental au respect de la vie familiale
- Cortina, C., A. Esteve & A. Domingo (2008), 'Marriage patterns of foreign born population in a new country of immigration: the case of Spain'. International Migration Review, 42 (4): 877-902. INED, http://www.ined.fr/fr/pop_chiffres/france/flux_immigration/
- ENI (Encuesta Nacional de Inmigrantes [National Immigrants Survey]). 2007. Available from <http://www.ine.es> (accessed 2 March 2012).
- González-Ferrer, A. (2006). Family and labor strategies in migration. Family reunification, marital choices and labour participation of immigrants in the host country. Madrid: Instituto Juan March de Estudios e Investigaciones. Available from <http://digital.march.es/ceacs-ir/es/fedora/repository/ir%3A1461> (accessed 20 April 2012)
- González-Ferrer, A. (2007). The process of family reunification among original guest-workers in Germany. Zeitschrift für Familienforschung [Journal for Family Research] 19 (1): 10–33.

González-Ferrer, A. (2010). 'Incidència, ritme i conseqüències del reagrupament familiar a Catalunya', en *Incidència, ritme i conseqüències del reagrupament familiar a Catalunya, una aproximación cuantitativa*. Barcelona: Fundació Jaume Bofill. Pp.11-35.

González-Ferrer, A. (2011a). 'Explaining the labour performance of immigrant women in Spain: the interplay between family, migration and legal trajectories', *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 52 (1-2): 63-78

González-Ferrer, A. (2011b). The reunification of the spouse among recent immigrants in Spain. Links with undocumented migration and the labour market', in Albert Kraler, Eleonore Kofman, Martin Kohli, Camille Schmoll (Eds.) *Gender, Generations and the Family in International Migration*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press. Pp. 143-166.

González-Ferrer, C. Beauchemin and P. Baizán (2012, forthcoming). 'Child-parent Separations among Senegalese Migrants to Europe: Migration Strategies or Cultural Arrangements?', *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*.

Hondagneu-Sotelo, P. 1994. *Gendered transitions: Mexican experiences of immigration*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

INE (2011). Padrón Municipal de Habitantes. Available from:

INSEE (2001). [Recensement de la population de 1999] : population immigrée, population étrangère : tableaux thématiques : exploitation complémentaire

INSEE 2005. *Les immigrés en France - Édition 2005*, <http://www.insee.fr/fr/publications-et-services/sommaire.asp?codesage=immfra05>

INSEE (2005). Les immigrés, France, portrait social - Insee Références, Edition 2003/2005)

INSEE (2012). [Recensement de la population de 2008], exploitation principale.

Jasso, G., and M. R. Rosenzweig (1986), Family reunification and the immigration multiplier: U.S. immigration law, country of origin conditions and the reproduction of immigrants. *Demography* 23 (3): 291–311

Jasso, G. & M.R. Rosenzweig (1989), 'Sponsors, Sponsorship and the Immigration Multiplier', *International Migration Review* 23: 856-888.

Kofman, E. (2004), 'Family-Related Migration: A Critical Review of European Studies', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 30: 243-262.

Kraler, A. (2010). *Civic Stratification, Gender and Family Migration Policies in Europe*. Final Report. Revised and updated public version, Vienna: BMWF/ICMPD.

Ministry of Employment and Social Security (1993). *Anuario de Migraciones [Migrations Yearbook]*

OECD (2011), Family Database, www.oecd.org/social/family/database

- Oris, M., G. Brunet, et al., Eds. (2007). Les fratries : une démographie sociale de la germanité. Population, Famille et Société. Bern ; Berlin ; Bruxelles, P. Lang
- Quirós, A. 2006. La reagrupación familiar de extranjeros en España: régimen aplicable y propuestas. Ph Dissertation. Available from <http://www.tesisenred.net/handle/10803/10749> (accessed 20 April 2012).
- Sayad, A. (1991). L'immigration ou les paradoxes de l'altérité. Paris, Ed. Universitaires.
- Sjaastad, L. A. 1962. The costs and returns of human migration. *Journal of Political Economy* 70 (5, pt. 2): 80–93.
- Stark, O. 1991. *The migration of labor*. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.
- Suarez-Orozco, C., I. Todorova, et al. (2002). "Making up for lost time. The experience of separation and family reunification among immigrant families." *Family Process* 41(4): 625-643.
- Todaro, M. P. 1976. *Internal migration in developing countries: A review of theory, evidence, methodology and research priorities*. Geneva: International Labour Office.
- Trajectories and Origins (TeO) Survey. 2008. Available from http://teo_english.site.ined.fr/ (accessed 2 March 2012).
- Tribalat, M. (1995). Enquête "Mobilité géographique et insertion sociale" (MGIS) de 1992 : rapport final. Paris, Institut National d'Etudes Démographiques.
- UNFPA (2007), *The State of World Population 2007*, United Nations Population Fund, New York
- Velling, J. 1993. *Immigration to Germany in the seventies and eighties: The role of family reunification*. Zentrum für Europäische Wirtschaftsforschung Discussion Paper 18, Mannheim, Germany.
- Whitehead, A. and I. Hashim. 2005. *Children and migration: Background paper for DFID Migration Team*. Brighton, UK: Child Migration Research Network. Available from www.childmigration.net (accessed 4 January 2012).
- Yamaguchi, K. 1991. *Event history analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Zlotnik, H. (1995), 'Migration and the Family: The Female Perspective', *Asian Pacific Migration Journal* 4: 253-271.

ANNEXES

Annex 1. Distribution of children according to their parent’s migration trajectories by region of origin

	Maghreb	Rest of Africa	Turkey	Asia	EU15	Bulgaria and Romania	Latin America	Other	Total
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
France									
Joint parental migration	5%	7%	13%	41%	37%			37%	20%
Father married migrant	31%	23%	59%	21%	15%			13%	25%
Single father migrant	42%	24%	17%	10%	13%			10%	24%
Mother migrant	10%	25%	7%	15%	11%			27%	16%
Other immigrant parents	3%	6%	0%	1%	6%			3%	4%
Mixed parental couple	9%	16%	4%	11%	18%			10%	12%
Spain									
Joint parental migration	4%	6%		11%	29%	28%	18%	13%	17%
Father married migrant	51%	24%		32%	5%	37%	17%	11%	24%
Single father migrant	16%	22%		9%	2%	0%	2%	4%	5%
Mother migrant	3%	8%		16%	4%	6%	10%	17%	9%
Other immigrant parents	24%	35%		27%	40%	26%	45%	40%	37%
Mixed parental couple	2%	5%		4%	19%	2%	9%	15%	8%




Source: TeO (2008). ENI (2007). Author's calculations. Weighted results

Annex 2. Description of Moroccan born children sample

	MGIS		TeO		ENI	
	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>%</i>
Total	1984	100	391	100	1157	100
<i>Type of parent migration</i>						
Joint couple	56	3	10	2	33	4
Father married migrant	1200	59	151	37	620	55
Father single migrant	620	31	189	50	162	18
Mother migrant	63	4	27	8	45	3
Other immigrant parents	28	1	10	2	253	19
Mixed couple	17	1	4	1	44	0
<i>Period of first parent's arrival</i>						
Before 1974	1611	80	210	56		
1974-1983	322	17	112	27	172	13
1984-1992	51	3	29	6	324	35
1993-1999			14	4	329	26
2000-2008			22	6	332	26

Annex 3. Kaplan-Meier survival estimates of children’s reunification

FRANCE



SPAIN

