Historia Agraria, 67 • Diciembre 2015 • pp. 143-178 • ISSN: 1139-1472 © 2015 SEHA

The occupational mobility of rural-urban migrants: Madrid in the 1950s

Javier Silvestre

1. INTRODUCTION

Internal and international migration flows in Europe resumed after a hiatus during World War II, and almost all rural areas of Western Europe were affected by out-migration (Clout, 1976). The pace and intensity of rural area depopulation varied among European countries (Collantes & Pinilla, 2011). In Southern countries, such as Italy and Spain, where industrialization had arrived relatively late, rural out-migration peaked in the 1950s and 1960s.

Migration systems in Spain were abruptly dismantled by the Civil War (1936-1939) and by its economic and social consequences, including the establishment of the Franco dictatorship (Ortega & Silvestre, 2006). Rural out-migration, however, may have resumed from the late 1940s, when the economy slowly began to recover, and then intensified up to the early 1970s (Simpson, 1995; Reher, 2003; Clar & Collantes, 2009). Economic expansion and a new industry-oriented policy model had an impact on rural areas during the third quarter of the 20th century. In comparison with earlier and later periods, the period 1950s-1970s was the high point of unskilled migration from rural areas to growing

Received: 2013-12-21 • Revised: 2014-09-10 • Accepted: 2014-09-15

Javier Silvestre *is Profesor Titular de Historia e Instituciones Económicas at the University of Zaragoza. Address: Facultad de Economía y Empresa (Campus Paraíso), Universidad de Zaragoza, c/ Gran Vía 2, 50005, Zaragoza (Spain). E-mail: javisil@unizar.es*

urban and industrial destinations within Spain (Paluzie *et al.*, 2009; Silvestre & Clar, 2010).

The aim of this article is twofold. First, it examines rural-urban migration during the 1950s, one of the least-known decades in the history of internal migrations in Spain. There is abundant research on the pre-industrial and early industrializing (before the Civil War) periods. There are also some estimates of main routes during the war, and data from the 1940s. The consolidation of the «rural exodus» of the 1960s and early 1970s has been extensively studied, as have the changes in the migration model that took place from the 1970s to the beginning of the 21st century. However, little attention has been paid to the middle years of the 20th century, whose importance lies in the fact that those years represent the beginning of the greatest spatial redistribution process of the Spanish population in recent history[1].

Second, this article analyzes the occupational mobility of rural migrants in an urban labour market. Prior empirical research in Spain has usually focused on the causes and (to a much lesser extent) the effects of migration on sending and receiving areas (for the 1960s onwards, see the review by Ródenas, 2008; for the pre-Civil War period, see Silvestre, 2005), but little work has been done on the process of migrant incorporation into a new labour market[2]. The process of migrant assimilation in a new labour market is important from both economic and social perspectives. The success of migrants strongly determines their contribution to the economic growth of the destination centres. Furthermore, a failure to integrate may lead to exclusion and, hence, to a deterioration of social cohesion.

This article focuses on in-migrants, particularly whether, or not, they experience some degree of occupational mobility upon arrival and, especially, over time (see e.g. Chiswick, Lee and Miller, 2005; Akresh, 2008). Another strand of the literature compares the labour market performance of migrants and natives (see recent reviews of methods and results in Okkerse, 2008; Hatton, 2010; Lozano and Steinberger, 2012; Abramitzky, Boutan and Eriksson, 2014; Alba and Nee, 1997; Borjas, 1999). However, the main data source used here does not include natives.

1. Research by social historians and historical demographers has described the causes, particularly socio-political causes, and the labour market assimilation process of migrants in specific cities during the 1940s and 1950s (Puig, 1995; Bustillo, 2005; Marín, 2006, 2009).

2. Recaño and Roig (2003), for example, refer to educational attainment. Tébar (2009) reviews different kinds of (not necessarily empirical) studies on the occupational attainment of migrants in Catalonia between 1939 and 1975 (such as Solé, 1982), and argues that a number of migrants had ascended the occupational ladder to some degree at the end of the period studied.

The level of attained education of migrants is a primary concern in both developing and developed countries (for a recent review, see Piracha and Vadean, 2013). In developing countries, for example, it has been shown that education enhances internal migrants' learning from experience in the labour market of the destination (Lall, Selod & Shalizi, 2006; on individual gains from migration, see also Mazumdar, 1987). China represents an interesting case, since rural-urban migrations have increased considerably in recent decades, and low-skilled migrants may face great difficulties in urban labour markets (Meng & Zhang, 2001; Kong, Meng & Zhanbg, 2010; Lee & Meng, 2010). These issues will receive attention in this article.

Studies in this and related fields normally use earnings, employment status, or occupation. This article uses occupation (and economic sector) and type of employment (permanent/temporary) as indicators of labour market position, via a new quantitative dataset derived from surveys. The original qualitative results are included in Miguel Siguan's 1959 work, *Del campo al suburbio. Un estudio sobre la inmigración interior en España* (From farm to the slums. A study of internal migration in Spain), edited by the Spanish National Research Council (Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas), and awarded the National Literature Prize for the best contribution to Political and Social Issues[3]. The present article takes advantage of the consolidation of the *mixed methods research* approach in social and behavioural sciences (including history), which encourages the combined use of qualitative and quantitative research elements for a better understanding of a phenomenon (for an assessment, see Johnson, Onwuegbuzie and Turner, 2007).

While the source has potential shortcomings (discussed below), it does permit the circumvention of the scarcity of statistics (even in the aggregate) before the 1960s, not to mention the almost complete lack of micro (i.e. individual) statistics, apart from registers of inhabitants, which are often inadequate. An additional feature of the survey is that it was administered to rural migrants resident in the capital city, Madrid, which has had the greatest attraction for internal migrants, not only in the 1950s, but also during a significant part of the period between the middle of the 19th century and present times. While in-migration has been studied in other major, but smaller, urban destinations such as Barcelona and Bilbao, the lack of research focusing on Madrid is surprising[4].

3. In Spanish, a *suburbio* does not have a positive connotation. It refers to a low-income area which may or may not be on the outskirts of a city. Migrants arrived in the 1950s tended to locate outside the centre of Madrid.

4. For the pre-Civil War period in Barcelona and Bilbao, based on register of inhabitants, see e.g. Oyón, Maldonado and Griful (2001); Silvestre, Ayuda and Pinilla (2015); García Abad (2005), and the works cited therein. The literature for Madrid and other cities in the same period is growing; see Pareja (2011).

The rest of the article is organized as follows. Section 2 portrays the evolution of migration in Madrid, in order to contextualize the period under study. Section 3 describes the labour market in Madrid in the 1950s. Section 4 introduces Miguel Siguan, summarises the qualitative evidence provided by his work, and compares his main conclusions with recent research in agricultural history. Section 5 presents the mixed method research approach and the quantitative dataset. Sections 6 and 7 specify the hypotheses and the empirical model of occupational attainment, and present and discuss the main and supplementary quantitative and qualitative results. Section 8 summarises the conclusions.

2. IN-MIGRATION IN MADRID

Although migration to Madrid increased during the 18th and 19th centuries, as in other cities or towns, by the end of the century the ability of the city to attract permanent migrants was still limited (Ringrose, 1983; Carbajo, 1985; Sarasúa 1994; Pallol, Carballo & Vicente, 2010). During the first three decades of the 20th century, the construction sector was a major employer of rural migrants (Byrne, 1993). The industrial sector grew and became more diversified (Nielfa, 1993). The extent of the incorporation of migrants to industry is, however, unknown.

TABLE 1
Migrants in the city of Madrid:
Residuals obtained from the inter-census balance method

	1900-1910	1911-1920	1921-1930	1931-1940	1941-1950	1951-1960	1961-1970
Migrants	75,940	179,921	238,435	121,917	272,125	425,642	456,403
Rates (per 1,000 inhabs.)	12.3	23.9	24.0	9.9	18.3	21.9	16.9

Note: The inter-census balance method consists of estimating the difference between census (total) population growth and the natural increase (births less deaths).
Source: García Barbancho (1967), for the period 1900-1970; own calculations based on the population censuses of 1960 and 1970 and annual statistical yearbooks, for the period 1961-1970.

The immediate impact of the Civil War (1936-1939) led to a reduction in the number of migrants arriving and residing in the capital city, as shown in Tables 1 and 2. Because of the war, the urban economy was badly damaged and a significant part of the city's population suffered from food shortages and energy restrictions. However, it has been argued that, in the first years of the Dictatorship, economic recovery in Madrid was faster than in other cities such as Barcelona and Bilbao, due to its geographic location (the centre of the country), its role as the seat of government of an extremely centralized state, growing public investment, and the expansion of international demand arising from World

War II (Catalán, 1995; Domínguez Martín, 2002; García Ruiz, 2007, 2011). As shown in Tables 1 and 2, Madrid in fact received a considerable number of migrants during the 1940s (see also Del Valle, 1959; Cabo, 1961; and Juliá, 1994). The demand for unskilled labour in the construction sector attracted many migrants shortly after the end of the Civil War (De Mingo & Lorite, 1993).

TABLE 2
Natives and migrants in the city of Madrid

	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970
Born in the city of Madrid	331,294	350,953	541,683	757,144	1,007,138	1,454,450
Born in the rest of the province	39,671	54,670	56,471	73,417	77,791	84,551
Born in the rest of Spain	353,426	526,592	477,891	767,397	1,095,697	1,517,091
Total population born in Spain	724,391	932,215	1,076,045	1,597,958	2,180,626	3,056,092
Born in other countries	13,347	18,007	12,602	20,124	35,371	64,850
Others /origin not available	13,158	2,610	0	353	43,369	0
Total population	750,896	952,832	1,088,647	1,618,435	2,259,366	3,120,942
Rate of in-migration, as percent of population born in Spain	**54.3**	**62.4**	**49.7**	**52.6**	**53.8**	**52.4**

Note: Thirteen nearby municipalities, accounting for 1,000,000-1,400,000 inhabitants, were absorbed, administratively, into Madrid proper between 1948 and 1954.

Source: Population censuses.

The general improvement was consolidated in the early years of the 1950s (Reher & Ballesteros, 1993; García Delgado & Carrera, 2001), and Madrid then underwent an intense process of economic, population, and territorial growth up to the early 1970s. (Population and economic expansion are discussed below). Migrants responded to employment opportunities and relatively high wages (Tables 1 and 2; see also Babiano, 1995; Reher, 2003).

Data available from the 1954, 1956 and 1957 register of inhabitants, reported in Table 3, indicate that the main migrant origins were poor southern provinces, such as Toledo, Jaen, Ciudad Real, Caceres, Cuenca, Cordoba and Badajoz; while the remaining migrations came primarily from the province embracing the capital city of Madrid and the adjacent province of Guadalajara (García Fernández, 1956; Siguan, 1959; see also Gregory, 1978; Barciela and López, 2003; Montoliú, 2010). The 1960 census of population tends to confirm this pattern (see also Cabo, 1961).

The arrival and establishment of new migrants and their descendents led to the unplanned growth of small peripheral slums, or the emergence of new ones (Del Valle, 1959;

Cabo, 1961; Del Campo, Navarro & Tezanos 1977). New residential and industrial areas were often close to each other (Babiano, 1995; Fernández Gómez, 2008). In the 1950s, *suburbios* included peripheral areas such as Villaverde, Carabanchel, Vallecas, Ventas, Tetuán and Chamartín, which accounted for about 60 percent of the new population, and more central neighbourhoods such as Arganzuela and Retiro-Mediodía (García Fernández, 1956). At the end of the decade, thirty new population nuclei had been identified, accounting for 450-600,000 inhabitants, or around 20 percent of total population in Madrid (Del Valle, 1959; Babiano, 1995). A statute was enacted in 1957 to restrict migration flows and the concentration of migrants in outer slums. Because of either difficulties in applying the *Ley de Urgencia Social* (Social Emergency Law) or changes in political economy and the ideological discourses of the Dictatorship, however, these measures were seldom applied (Siguan, 1959; Vázquez, 1959; Babiano, 1995; Boj & Aroca, 2009).

TABLE 3

Main provinces of origin for migrants to the city of Madrid, 1954-1957

Province (Region)	Percentage of all migrants	Province (Region)	Percentage of all migrants
1- Toledo (Castile-La Mancha)	14.4	6- Cuenca (Castile-La Mancha)	4.9
2- Jaen (Andalusia)	13.1	7- Cordoba (Andalusia)	4.6
3- Ciudad Real (Castile-La Mancha)	7.3	8- Badajoz (Extremadura)	3.8
4- Madrid	6.6	9- Guadalajara (Castile-La Mancha)	2.5
5- Caceres (Extremadura)	5.3	10- Rest of provinces	37.4

Note: Original figures refer to registrations in the register of inhabitants. Figures refer to 1954, the second semester of 1956 and the entire year of 1957. Total of migrants = 54,794 (19,903 for 1954; 34,891 for 1956-1957).

Source: Own calculations based on the information provided by García Fernández (1956) and Siguan (1959).

3. THE LABOUR MARKET IN MADRID IN THE 1950s

Demographic and economic conditions in Madrid, and their changes throughout the 1950s, shed light on the attractiveness of its labour market for migrants. Data from population censuses and statistical yearbooks show that net migration accounted for two-thirds of population growth in Madrid in the 1950s (annual rates of growth per 1,000 inhabitants were: Population: 33.1; Natural increase: 11.2; Net migration: 21.9). Women predominated among the migrant population. In 1960, for example, women accounted for 54.5 of the population born outside the province of Madrid (shown in Table 4). Female migration is a significant part of the common pattern among cities of different sizes, in different epochs, with diversified labour markets (Sarasúa, 1994; Borderías, 2002; on push

factors, see Collantes and Pinilla, 2011, and the works cited therein). Table 5 suggests the predominance of migration at relatively young ages (see also Babiano, 1995)[5].

TABLE 4
Male and female native and migrant populations in the city of Madrid, 1950 and 1960

	1950			1960		
	Male	Female	% Male	Male	Female	% Male
Born in the city of Madrid	369,059	388,085	48.7	489,562	517,576	48.6
Born in the rest of the province	30,489	42,928	41.5	33,621	44,170	43.2
Born in the rest of Spain	330,112	437,285	43.0	496,140	599,557	45.5
Total population born in Spain	729,660	868,298	45.7	1,019,323	1,161,303	46.7
Born in other countries	8,827	11,297	43.9	16,311	19,060	46.1
Others /origin not available	139	214	39.4	199,949	25,420	44.0
Total population	738,626	879,809	45.6	1,055,583	1,203,783	46.7
Rate of in-migration, as percent of population born in Spain	49.4	55.3		52.0	55.4	

Note: See Table 2.

Source: Population censuses.

Economic indicators seem to confirm the importance of pull factors of migration to a large city. The overall activity rate (active population/total population) for men remained relatively stable between 1950 and 1960: 64.9 and 62.6 percent, respectively. The figures for women, as is well known, are barely credible. (Rates obtained from the censuses are 18.9 and 20.3 percent, respectively)[6]. Tables 6, 7, and 8 report additional economic characteristics. Perhaps the most remarkable features are the contributions of salaried work to the labour force, and the development of a great number of industries: metalworking, transport, woodworking, chemicals, electricity generation, electronics, textiles, footwear, and food processing (Del Valle, 1959; Tamames, 1962; Babiano, 1995; García Delgado & Carrera, 2001; García Ruiz, 2007; Montoliú, 2010). As reported in Table 8, manufacturing industries increased, and the construction sector continued to grow (see also Fernández Asperilla, 1993; and Nicolau, 2005, to confirm the size of construction in comparative terms).

5. Marriage rates increased in Madrid between 1950 and 1960. (Men: 38.9 and 42.2 percent, respectively; women: 32.3 and 37.6 percent). The precise contribution of married migrants is an issue not addressed in this article.

6. Unemployment figures may also be unreliable (Gálvez, 2010). For example, 16,775 men and 1,237 women declared to be unemployed in 1950.

TABLE 5
Main age groups in the city of Madrid

	1950		1960	
	Population	%	Population	%
Male				
<15	181,398	24.6	280,636	26.1
15-24	161,231	21.8	201,091	18.7
25-34	118,904	16.1	182,708	17.0
35-44	110,067	14.9	140,777	13.1
45-54	85,533	11.6	115,928	10.8
55-64	50,715	6.9	79,355	7.4
>64	30,279	4.1	74,171	6.9
Unspecified	499	0.1	1,960	0.2
Total	738,626	100	1,055,583	100
Female				
<15	176,308	20.0	274,451	23.5
15-24	174,485	19.8	190,189	16.3
25-34	155,576	17.7	207,817	17.8
35-44	131,501	14.9	172,673	14.8
45-54	105,723	12.0	144,439	12.4
55-64	70,917	8.1	106,999	9.2
>64	64,781	7.4	71,784	6.1
Unspecified	518	0.1	1,012	0.1
Total	879,809	100	1,203,783	100

Source: Population censuses.

TABLE 6
Job categories in the Madrid labour market

	1950		1960	
	Workers	%	Workers	%
Male				
Employers	37,012	7.7	53,569	8.1
Salaried workers	410,926	85.8	59,447	84.8
Self-employed workers	12,726	2.7	13,192	2.0
Non-salaried family workers	7,580	1.6	3,947	0.6
Not available / others	10,823	2.3	29,845	4.5
Total	479,067	100	661,000	100
Female				
Employers	5,707	3.4	6,695	2.7
Salaried workers	150,442	90.5	196,028	80.1
Self-employed workers	5,094	3.1	4,570	1.9
Non-salaried family workers	1,363	0.8	1,340	0.5
Not available / others	3,584	2.2	36,170	14.8
Total	166,190	100	244,803	100

Source: Population censuses.

TABLE 7

Main occupational categories in the Madrid labour market

	1950		1960	
	Workers	**%**	**Workers**	**%**
Male				
Medium and skilled workers	33,930	7.1	50,386	7.6
Medium and skilled workers, service	87,467	18.3	105,229	15.9
Vendors	46,546	9.7	75,854	11.5
Agricultural (and others)	12,876	2.7	13,060	2.0
Mining and quarrying	798	0.2	1,075	0.2
Transport and communications	21,244	4.4	50,044	7.6
Artisans and labourers	198,665	41.5	259,987	39.3
Service	40,084	8.4	49,503	7.5
Professional military	19,957	4.2	27,708	4.2
Unspecified activities	17,500	3.7	28,154	4.3
Total	479,067	100	661,000	100
Female				
Medium and skilled workers	12,397	7.5	26,946	11.0
Medium and skilled workers, service	26,888	16.2	38,515	15.7
Vendors	6,184	3.7	14,334	5.9
Agricultural (and others)	234	0.1	221	0.1
Mining and quarrying	0	0.0	0	0.0
Transport and communications	0	0.0	2,740	1.1
Artisans and labourers	26,216	15.8	36,475	14.9
Service	92,167	55.5	100,872	41.2
Professional military	0	0.0	0	0.0
Unspecified activities	2,104	1.3	24,703	10.1
Total	166,190	100	244,803	100

Note: Service includes protection services (non-military), domestic service, and others.

Source: Population censuses.

TABLE 8
Working population employed by sector in the Madrid labour market

	1950		1960	
	Workers	**%**	**Workers**	**%**
Male				
Agricultural	12,686	2.6	12,683	1.9
Mining and quarrying	997	0.2	911	0.1
Manufacturing	113,159	23.6	168,306	25.5
Construction	65,346	13.6	94,024	14.2
Electricity, gas and water	7,899	1.6	5,217	0.8
Transport, storage and communications	48,930	10.2	64,923	9.8
Commerce	77,416	16.2	108,218	16.4
Official and personal activities	112,062	23.4	159,977	24.2
Unspecified activities	40,572	8.5	46,821	7.1
Total	479,067	100	661,000	100
Female				
Agricultural	243	0.1	209	0.1
Mining and quarrying	49	0.0	104	0.0
Manufacturing	24,259	14.6	40,523	16.6
Construction	565	0.3	1,440	0.6
Electricity, gas and water	448	0.3	425	0.2
Transport, storage and communications	5,395	3.2	6,343	2.6
Commerce	11,647	7.0	21,419	8.6
Official and personal activities	118,062	71.0	143,445	58.6
Unspecified activities	5,522	3.3	30,823	12.6
Total	166,190	100	244,803	100

Source: Population censuses.

A further key issue is the education level of the labour force. Table 9 reports the large numbers of individuals who had completed primary education. Secondary education grew in the 1950s in relative terms, albeit only for men. As is discussed below, a number of migrants may have suffered from an educational mismatch due to under-education, which probably hindered improvement once in Madrid.

With regard to industrial relations, the Spanish labour market differed from those of democratic European countries after World War II (Vilar, 2009; Gálvez, 2010). Free unions, for example, were prohibited and employment relations were strictly regulated by means of numerous and intricate laws. However, there were ample possibilities to circumvent the rules, particularly in small companies (Babiano, 1995, 1998; Folguera *et al.*,

2002; Soto, 2003; Fernández Gómez, 2004; Vilar, 2009). Employers tended to impose strong discipline (paternalism was also applied) and they were often given free powers of decision-making regarding employee issues (a timid collective bargaining agreement law was enacted in 1958).

TABLE 9
Education level of the population in the city of Madrid

	1950		1960	
	Population	**%**	**Population**	**%**
Male				
Illiteracy rate (>10 years of age)		1.7		6.6
Level of completed education				
Incomplete / not studying	176,122	23.8	255,637	24.2
Primary	450,931	61.0	643,829	61.0
Vocational	36,403	4.9	27,297	2.6
Secondary	40,073	5.4	83,480	7.9
Tertiary	29,462	4.0	43,680	4.1
Not available	5,635	0.8	1,660	0.2
Total	738,626	100	1,055,583	100
Female				
Illiteracy rate (>10 years of age)		6.2		7.3
Level of completed education				
Incomplete / not studying	213,257	24.2	303,768	25.2
Primary	613,311	69.7	834,292	69.3
Vocational	14,501	1.6	19,867	1.7
Secondary	29,352	3.3	37,162	3.1
Tertiary	4,090	0.5	5,095	0.4
Not available	5,298	0.6	3,599	0.3
Total	879,789	100	1,203,783	100

Source: Population censuses.

Base salaries were very low and real incomes were eroded by inflation[7]. It is true nonetheless that workers could be eligible for a complex variety of additional incomes, such as family supplements, seniority, productivity and extraordinary bonuses, piecework, overtime, night work and dangerous work payments, profit-sharing and regional supplements (Babiano, 1995, 1998; Fernández Gómez, 2004; Vilar, 2009). Social insurance included health, accident and illness worker compensation, and retirement schemes (unemployment insurance was dismantled during the first years of the Dictatorship, though re-enacted in 1961). The payment of social insurance, however, was only partly compulsory and a number of base wage limits, coverage restrictions and benefit limitations applied

7. Regulated minimum base salaries were increased in 1956 to partially compensate for the loss in purchasing power (Soto, 2003; Vilar, 2009). Low base wages were partly offset by dismissal restrictions.

(Fernández Gómez, 2007; Gónzalez Murillo, 2008; Alvarez Rosete, 2009; Vilar, 2009; Pons, 2010, 2011). Serious limitations of social insurance coverage and benefits led to the establishment of a supplementary welfare system based on mutual insurance organizations *(mutuas laborales)* (see De la Calle, 2010).

The main division in the labour market was probably between formal and informal work, rather than among differences in the extent of labour standards in formal employment relationships[8]. In this regard, formal, i.e. better, employment was first available in the construction sector by means of promotion from day labourer *(peón eventual)* to permanent, specialized bricklayer. Informal employment relations, however, were predominant in construction. As shown in a number of studies, the road to formal employment seemed more secure in industry (and in qualified jobs in the services sector), where there tended to be a) more permanent, and often, better paid jobs, and less variation in labour demand – according to Siguan, for example, the average monthly wage in construction and industry was around 1,600 and 2,500 pesetas, respectively; b) greater chances of promotion or skills formation inside companies, still common during the 1950s; c) better labour standards (e.g. less subcontracting and informal work) and easier access to welfare benefits; and d) better workplace conditions – for example, a lower accident rate (Siguan, 1959: 235-248; 1971: 155; Miguelez, 1990; De Mingo & Lorite, 1993; Soto, 2003; Fernández Gómez, 2004, 2007; Tébar, 2009; Vilar, 2012).

A number of rural migrants, however, were concentrated in the informal, construction sector, as recognized by labour authorities. Research has indicated that migrants tended to be young (i.e. to have little work experience), had accumulated little human capital, which usually did not match urban requirements, and used construction as the main gateway to the new labour market (De mingo & Lorite, 1993; Babiano, 1995, 1998; Soto, 2003; Fernández Gómez, 2004, 2008). Contemporary evidence refers to the abundance of unskilled recent rural migrants working in construction, who often were hired on the spot (Siguan, 1959; Vázquez, 1959).

4. MIGUEL SIGUAN AND HIS WORK ON RURAL AREAS AND RURAL MIGRATION IN LIGHT OF THE RECENT LITERATURE ON AGRICULTURAL HISTORY

Miguel Siguan i Soler (1918-2010) was an eminent Spanish industrial psychologist and human resources expert, who later went on to work in child psychology and linguistics

8. The institutional framework that discriminated against women is not addressed in this article (see Vilar, 2009; Gálvez, 2010).

(on the author, see e.g. Siguan, 1985; Carpintero *et al.,* 1998). A lesser known feature of Siguan's career is that he developed an interest in social and economic aspects of rural areas and rural-urban migration. The author advised on the viability and effects of the creation of new colonization villages associated with state irrigation projects initiated in Extremadura in 1952 (Plan Badajoz) (he also supervised research in this regard), and land concentration programs in Castile and Eastern Andalusia (Siguan, 1966, 1971). He was also appointed counsellor on social issues in relation to development plans (Planes de desarrollo) implemented in Spain from 1959 onwards. On migration, he principally published *Del campo al suburbio*, in 1959 (Siguan, 1959).

This work is an account of a survey of rural families resident in Madrid. The questionnaire includes around sixty questions on a) the socio-demographic characteristics of each household member, place of origin characteristics, and migration trajectories; b) for head of households, the last job before migration and first and current jobs in Madrid; c) family income; d) housing and neighbourhood characteristics; e) education/work of children; f) welfare aid and social insurance; g) education and leisure time; h) intention to return to the place of origin; i) other features of integration (such as relationship with coworkers, reaction to city life, etc.).

Unfortunately, most of this information is neither systematic nor homogeneous across the families included in the survey and details are abundant for some families but not for others. Wives' characteristics, furthermore, are more poorly reported than husbands'. In addition, open-ended questions are sometimes difficult (or impossible) to quantify unless unsubstantiated assumptions are made. The focus of this article, therefore, will be on attributes associated with the occupational trajectories of males.

Siguan offers a qualitative analysis of some of the survey results. Regarding causes and the migration process, the typical rural out-migrant heading for Madrid is a male, underpaid agricultural labourer located in the south of Spain, who is able to find employment for only a part of the year (see also Cabo, 1961). Migration to Madrid is usually a considered decision, although *push* factors (for example, farm mechanization) may precipitate the process.

Recent studies permit the enrichment of these findings (e.g. Simpson, 1995; Naredo, 1996; Barciela & López, 2003; Cobo & Ortega, 2004; Gálvez, 2010; Infante-Amate, 2011; Christiansen, 2012). Some of this work has focused on the southern provinces, which were among the main origins of rural migrants to Madrid. It has been shown that real wages in the agricultural sector decreased until 1953 and only began to increase significantly from 1957 onwards (based on data by Martínez Alier, 1968). There was also a fall in the

demand for labour (for example, in cereal production) mainly due to an increase in direct cultivation by landowners and land concentration. For example, according to one estimate, the regions of Andalusia, Extremadura and Castile-La Mancha, areas in which Madrid had been traditionally the main migrant destination, accounted for 82 percent of unemployment in the Spanish agricultural sector in the early 1950s (Giménez Mellado, 1956)[9]. Further incentives to migrate may have been related to the demise of the *jornalero* movement and the great strengthening of landowner bargaining power (e.g. Simpson, 1995; Barciela & López, 2003; Cobo & Ortega, 2004).

Expected higher wages and better occupations, discussed above, seem to be the main *pull* factor according to Siguan (on low expectations in the places of origin, see also Barciela and López, 2003), who also argues that the rural penalty in living standards (access to medical care, cultural amenities, etc.) may also have contributed to the migration decision (see also Collantes and Pinilla, 2011, who claim that the gap became larger after 1950). Descriptions of city life by established migrants can also create incentives for others to migrate. Some individuals included in the survey mention an oppressive social ambience (for example, living with their parents) as a supplementary reason.

Very few migrants return (see also Siguan, 1971)[10]. A number of migrants refer to their children's education and life prospects as motives for staying in Madrid (see also Collantes and Pinilla, 2001, and the works cited therein). In the incorporation process, relatives, friends or acquaintances had often migrated earlier and may have provided a temporary place to stay (see also e.g. Capel, 1967; Silvestre and Serrano, 2012). City adaptation, however, may be difficult. Increasing migration causes competition in the labour market, and it may take a while to find the first job. A number of migrants, nevertheless, end up joining the, often informal, construction sector. At that point in time, Siguan (1959: 303) emphasizes, the main aim of migrants is upward mobility (for Catalonia, see Tébar, 2009).

5. MIXED METHODS RESEARCH, SURVEY CHARACTERISTICS AND FINAL DATASET USED

Mixed methods research approaches knowledge by considering both qualitative and quantitative viewpoints. In this article, the mixed perspective permits gaining a fuller picture of the integration process of migrants than that provided by the qualitative and descrip-

9. The estimate includes the province of Murcia.
10. With some exceptions, (rural-urban and rural-rural) temporary migration rates in Spain probably began to decline in the 1950s or early 1960s (see Silvestre, 2007: 563, and the works cited therein).

tive methodology used by Siguan. The interest in causation in this article results in the use of regression analysis, which approach involves three stages (Leech & Onwuegbuzie, 2009). First, relevant information from the interviews included in *Del campo al suburbio* is extracted to generate quantitative dependent and explanatory variables (on historical sources in mixed research, see Axinn and Pearce, 2006). Second, regressions are estimated to disentangle the relative contributions of determinants of occupational attainment. Finally, quantitative results are used to identify particular cases (of migrants) in which the main determinants of occupational mobility (as detected in regressions) play a significant role.

In the literature on the economic assimilation of migrants (internal or international), the evidence usually (though not always) relies on cross-sectional data (for a review, see Hatton, 2010). However, the key issue of the *evolution* of the labour market status of migrants is difficult to assess precisely unless the information is available from different points in time (before and after migration). Lacking the appropriate data, very few investigations have been able to follow this approach. The strategy used in this article is in line with two recent longitudinal studies for Australia and the US (Chiswick, Lee & Miller, 2005; Akresh, 2008) and an important feature of the source is that it is a «true longitudinal» survey.

A team of female graduates, and other students in social work, collected the information during 1957. Between six and twelve months was needed to undertake individual, in-depth life story interviews (financed by the Spanish National Research Council). The retrospective survey was administered to one hundred rural migrant families who had been in Madrid for more than one year. Working heads of household qualified for participation in the survey. These data are appropriate for the study of the *beginning* of labour market adjustment, although it should be borne in mind that («true») longitudinal surveys capturing long-run integration trajectories may be very difficult to finance and accomplish. Therefore, observation in this kind of research is usually cut off too soon[11].

The source has two main potential shortcomings[12]. First, the number of observations is low. In addition, nine observations had to be excluded to maintain the homogeneity of the sample used in the empirical analysis (a key issue, explained below). The final dataset of 91 observations refers to male-head households. Individuals married before migration – as an exception, a couple that married in Madrid is presented in Section 7. Ex-

11. Time intervals reported in the Appendix of this article («Years in Madrid») are very similar to those reported by Chiswick, Lee and Miller (2005) and Akresh (2008).
12. An additional feature of surveys that require face-to-face interaction is *interviewer effects*, which can lead to response bias. This possibility is not considered here (Siguan remains silent on this).

clusions refer to families in which the head of household is a widow, the husband has left home, or only the husband or children (in their twenties) are residing in Madrid at the time of the survey (# 17, 18, 20, 55, 88 and 97). Two further families (# 98 and 99) were excluded because of return migration. Family number 100, in reality, does not correspond to the survey.

Second, the survey may be not representative of the migrant pool in Madrid. The survey concentrates on married individuals working in the construction and industrial sectors. It should be noted that married (with children) individuals tended to be more deeply involved in the labour market and work in construction and large industrial companies, than younger singles, who often worked for smaller companies, had jobs in commerce, were self-employed or were unemployed for longer periods (Siguan 1959: 44)[13]. Regressions, therefore, may provide upward-biased estimates.

Migrants who came from southern provinces predominate in the survey, as shown in the Appendix of this article. The gap between theoretical (representative) and actual distributions of individuals across sending provinces, however, seems not to be significant, as suggested by Table 3. This is confirmed by the correlation (based on fourteen observations) between the two distributions, which is 0.76[14].

As recognized by Siguan, the survey was «insufficient». A more representative study would have required, for example, an updated *cadastre*, not to mention a better knowledge of the characteristics of the migrant population in Madrid. The sampling strategy followed by Siguan and his collaborators may be characterized as *purposive* (individuals are selected to maximize understanding of phenomena, rather than randomly), *homogeneous* (individuals possess similar characteristics) and *theory-based* (the selection of individuals helps to develop or confirm a theory) (Teddlie & Yu, 2007; Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2007). In this approach, the (relative) lack of focus on sample size and representativeness is sound if it is assumed that the main goal of the research is not generalization.

In short, an examination of *overall* patterns of integration of rural migrants is not possible in this article. However, according to the growth in the stock of migrant families in the 1950s and 1960s in Madrid, who settled there thanks to construction and industrial jobs (as described above), the combined use of Siguan's dataset permits an insight into

13. A further peculiarity of married workers is usually that they tend to have better jobs than singles. Reasons given by researchers include positive selection into marriage and/or productivity-enhancing effects of marriage (Antonovics & Town, 2004). Siguan (1959: 251-256) refers largely to the positive effects of marriage on husbands.
14. Siguan only reports the main sending provinces; a 'rest of provinces' category has been constructed.

the (probably) most numerous and successful group of rural migrants (see also Siguan, 1971: 151-56).

6. HYPOTHESES, MODEL SPECIFICATION AND QUANTITATIVE RESULTS

The key issue in this analysis is the distribution of migrants across occupations (and/or sectors) and its evolution (Chiswick, Lee & Miller 2005; Akresh, 2008). As described above, the construction sector was usually the gateway to the new urban labour market. For a number of migrants, this type of job was a major improvement over their (often agricultural) occupation in their places of origin. Others, such as (small) landowners and those working in non-agricultural occupations in the sending areas, however, may have experienced some degree of occupational downgrading upon arrival (Siguan, 1959). In either of the two cases, potential subsequent upward mobility in Madrid was associated with a better, permanent job offer in the construction sector (day labourer → specialist) or, especially, in the industrial sector, in which conditions tended to be better and where ascending the occupational ladder (day labourer or apprentice → official) may have been more feasible.

The extent of the assimilation process firstly depends on the level and type of human capital at the time of arrival. Beyond unskilled tasks in the construction sector, skills acquired in predominantly agricultural sending areas may not be fully transferable to urban occupations. Moreover, recent migrants usually have less information about the city in general, and its labor market in particular. Urban employers may also not have enough information about the characteristics of new migrants. The labor market position of migrants, however, may improve as time of residence in Madrid extends. Migrants would be able to acquire experience and adapt their stock of human capital to the requirements of more-skilled jobs, and they would also obtain information about other opportunities in the labor market, for example by means of «migration networks». Furthermore, employers would be able to acquire information about migrants' characteristics.

Detailed migrant life stories (of around one or two pages each) based on the questionnaire are reported in Siguan's book, and have been used to construct variables used in the regression models. Criteria and summary statistics for dependent and explanatory variables are reported in the Appendix of this article.

Three main outcome variables have been considered. The source does not provide information on job attributes (such as wages, prestige, or education) to obtain an exhaus-

tive ranking of occupations. Simpler binary «agricultural/non-agricultural» and «construction/other sectors» classifications of occupations are used instead.

Regarding *First occupation in Madrid*, 20 of a total of 91 individuals have been assigned to the industrial and qualified services sector (dummy variable set to 1)[15]. The remainder are construction workers. In reference to *Occupation in 1957*, the number of non-construction workers had risen to 32[16]. Information on occupation in the two periods is also used to estimate a third dependent variable, *Trajectory between first and 1957 occupation*. Thirty individuals experienced upward mobility. Life stories narrate how the migrant has been promoted in the same company or has moved to a better job within the same industry (see, for example, migrants # 15, 26, 39, 51, 66, 75, 82 and 86). The shortage of skilled and semi-skilled labour also facilitated worker mobility between companies, to some degree (Fernández Gómez, 2004; see also Vilar, 2012). It has also been considered that the individual experiences upward mobility when the worker moved from construction to the industrial sector. Downward mobility has been assigned to only two cases[17]. Neither upward nor downward mobility was considered to be experienced by 59 individuals, who declared exactly the same occupation in both moments[18]. Cases belonging to these two latter categories were put together in the same «no change or downward» category[19].

The determinants of occupational attainment in the regression models include human capital attributes, a set of moving and integration costs, and regional origin. The accumulation of transferable human capital is expected to facilitate integration in the industrial and services sectors[20]. *Occupation before migration* refers to having an agricultural occupation at the place of origin (dummy variable set to 1). Some respondents combined agricultural and non-agricultural work. Life stories were used as criteria. Individuals were assigned to categories according to their *main* occupation. For example, the sale of own agricultural produce or work as agricultural labourer, complemented main work in

15. A low-skill services job (shoe-shiner) was assigned to the other category (although this job is not related to construction).
16. Based on life stories, two unemployed individuals at the time of the survey have been assigned to the construction category.
17. One day labourer moved from manufacturing to the construction sector. Another individual, working as night watchman upon arrival, was unemployed in 1957.
18. The skill premium tended to decrease, both in the construction and industrial sectors, during the 1950s (Vilar, 2009). Some individuals who remained in the same unskilled (skilled) category, therefore, may have experienced a de facto upward (downward) mobility. This possibility cannot be incorporated into the analysis.
19. A limitation to be borne in mind when interpreting the evidence is that the source does not permit an estimation of the time period between access to first occupation in Madrid and occupation in 1957.
20. For a review of the effect of factors referred to in this and the following paragraph, see Piracha and Valdean (2013).

a warehouse or as an artisan (# 16 and 24). In further research, Siguan (1971: 84-95) confirms the advantages of non-agricultural jobs in places of origin. *First occupation in Madrid* refers to having acquired experience in other sectors than construction upon arrival. *Age* (in 1957) is used as a proxy for work experience (*age at arrival* was used as an alternate and the results were virtually the same). The expected positive effect of age is, however, not clear. Average age in the sample is 39. As reported by Siguan (1959: 240), for some individuals, such relatively old ages may have hindered access to industrial employment (see also Fernández Gómez, 2004).

Education may also be an important determinant of occupational attainment (Siguan, 1959: 239-240). The level of attained education is thoroughly described in life stories. *Literacy* is defined as the ability to read and write (dummy variable set to 1 for literate respondents). Illiteracy rates for the total population in 1950 in three of the four sending regions, Castile-La Mancha, Extremadura and Andalusia (the remaining region is Castile and León) were among the highest in Spain (16, 19 and 19 percent, respectively; the Spanish average was 7 per cent; Nuñez, 2005). In the final dataset used, 56 percent of individuals were illiterate (see Appendix)[21]. *Primary education completed* is included as an alternative indicator of the possession of human capital readily transferable to the labour market in Madrid. According to the information reported in migrant life stories, the potential endogeneity of education variables appears to be irrelevant. That is, migrants in Madrid did not tend to acquire additional education (at least in their early years in the city).

Moving and integration variables are included to reflect possible strategies followed by migrants to reduce migration costs and risks. (Specific examples are provided in the next section). Among «Migration history» variables, *Previous stays in Madrid* is intended to capture the possible existence of a «learning-by-moving» process, in which individuals gain information (and/or experience in the labour market) by means of previous temporary stays. In the sample used, almost all prior experiences in Madrid are related to military service or hospital stays of relatives. An *Individual migration* variable reflects preceding mobility of the head of household to reduce risks associated with the entire (family) migration process (see Siguan, 1959: 207, 212)[22]. *Years in Madrid* is included to capture access to information and experience in the labour market upon arrival, as well as the creation of social and cultural ties within the host city.

21. It is not easy to know whether such a high figure accurately reflects reality for the total migrant population.
22. Previous stays in Madrid and individual migration seem to be decisions not necessarily related (r= 0.18).

Use of networks upon arrival refers to interpersonal ties that connect migrants and other groups (Portes, 1995); such networks may facilitate the integration process by providing access to information, assistance, and resources. Interpersonal connections based on references or recommendations may indeed have been important in a context in which the main part of the post-war political cleansing process was still very recent (Babiano, 1998; Vilar, 2009, 2012). To reflect this complexity, a three-category variable incorporates the establishment of relational (of any degree) ties, and acquaintance/friend ties, as well as the non-existence (or use) of networks. (Examples are provided in the next section). As argued in celebrated works by sociologist Mark Granovetter (1973), «strong» ties (in this case, family) tend to be less helpful than «weak» ties (in this case, based on non-relatives), because the former disseminate information that is likely to be very similar to the information one individual already has, while the latter open new information sources (for a review of works, see Van der Leij and Goyal, 2011)[23].

Finally, *Region of origin* variables should reflect possible differences in the labour market incorporation process related to specific place-of-birth characteristics not captured by the other variables included in the model. Places of birth were grouped into four main regions of origin (see Appendix)[24]. In comparison with migrants coming from the North, migrants coming from Southern regions were depicted as less skilled and poorer (Siguan, 1959).

The main results of the binary logit models are given in Table 10. Regressions are estimated using heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (and include an intercept term). For each explanatory variable, the table reports the marginal impacts on the likelihood of attaining an industrial and services occupation upon arrival in Madrid (columns 1 and 2) and at the time of the survey (columns 3 and 4), as well as the likelihood of moving upwards (columns 5 and 6). In the case of *Age in 1957* and *Years in Madrid*, two continuous variables, the value of the marginal impacts is computed when the variables increase by one unit. In the case of all the remaining dummy variables, the value of marginal impacts is computed when the variable changes from 0 to 1. Odds ratios, as well as additional regressions commented on but not reported, are available upon request.

The Wald test suggests that the hypothesis that the effects of all variables are simultaneously zero can be rejected for two of the three models reported (columns 3-4 and 5-6). For the first model (columns 1-2), however, the overall significance of the regressions may be questioned. The goodness of fit (pseudo R^2) of all models is relatively high. With

23. Adverse effects of networks (although possible) are not reported in the book.
24. A *Distance* variable was also considered. Distance was not significant at the usual levels. Moreover, this variable is highly correlated with dummy variables for regions of origin.

TABLE 10

Logit models of occupational attainment for male in-migrants (marginal effects)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	First occupation	First occupation	Occupation in 1957	Occupation in 1957	Trajectory between first and 1957 occupation	Trajectory between first and 1957 occupation
	1 = Industry and services 0 = Construction		1 = Industry and services 0 = Construction		1 = Upward mobility 0 = No change or downward	
Human capital						
[Non-agricultural occup. in origin]						
Agricultural	-0.18 † (0.10)	-0.12 (0.09)			-0.14 (0.09)	-0.10 (0.08)
[Construction occup. upon arrival]						
Industrial and services			0.75*** (0.09)	0.74*** (0.10)		
Age in 1957	0.06 (0.05)	0.08 (0.00)	-0.00 (0.01)	-0.00 (0.01)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)
Literacy	0.02 (0.09)		0.00 (0.16)		-0.01 (0.07)	
Primary education completed		0.40* (0.20)		0.15 (0.26)		0.18 (0.17)
Migration history						
Previous stays in Madrid	-0.02 (0.10)	-0.05 (0.09)	0.41* (0.19)	0.39 † (0.20)	0.30 (0.24)	0.25 (0.22)
Individual migration	0.29** (0.10)	0.33** (0.09)	0.25 (0.16)	0.28 † (0.16)	0.14 † (0.08)	0.15 † (0.08)
Years in Madrid	0.02 (0.02)	0.00 (0.02)	0.00 (0.07)	0.00 (0.06)	0.00 (0.02)	0.00 (0.02)
Use of networks upon arrival						
[No use of networks]						
Relatives	0.20† (0.11)	0.18 (0.11)	0.02 (0.14)	0.03 (0.14)	0.00 (0.07)	0.00 (0.07)
Acquaintances/friends	0.29 (0.22)	0.26 (0.22)	0.41* (0.19)	0.40* (0.19)	0.06 (0.12)	0.05 (0.11)
Region of origin						
[Castile and Leon]						
Castile-La Mancha	-0.18* (0.08)	-0.13 (0.10)	0.24 (0.24)	0.27 (0.24)	0.99*** (0.00)	0.99*** (0.00)
Extremadura	-0.22*** (0.05)	-0.19** (0.06)	-0.19 (0.18)	-0.17 (0.18)	0.97*** (0.00)	0.97*** (0.00)
Andalusia	-0.22* (0.11)	-0.16 (0.14)	-0.14 (0.16)	-0.12 (0.18)	0.99*** (0.00)	0.99*** (0.00)
Log pseudolikelihood	-37.99	-35.40	-32.89	-32.70	-46.33	-45.40
Wald Chi^2 (11):	18.91	17.15	34.13	42.52	732.65	432.61
Prob > Chi:	0.0628	0.1034	0.0003	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Pseudo R^2	0.21	0.26	0.44	0.44	0.19	0.21
N = 91						

† p < .1; * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001

Note: Standard errors between brackets. Reference categories for explanatory variables are in square brackets.

Source: See the Appendix.

regard to the significance of variables, it should be noted that only strong relationships are identified, due to the small size of the sample. The focus of the interpretation of certain results will be put on the sign of correlations, quite interesting in itself, rather than on significance.

Columns 1 and 2 report the results from the model predicting the first occupation in Madrid. Human capital indicators present the expected sign. In relation to migrants who worked in the non-agricultural sector in their sending areas, agricultural migrants are 12-18 percent less likely to be in the non-construction sector upon arrival in the destination labour market. On the contrary, age (as a proxy for experience), literacy and, particularly, primary education completed, increase that likelihood. A comparison of columns 1 and 2, however, indicates that experience in non-agricultural occupations seems to be less important than education. The predicted probability of belonging to the industrial and services sector is 40 percent higher for an educated (beyond literacy) migrant.

When observing the effect of moving and integration costs in the first two columns, regressions show that (prior) individual migration of head of household increases the likelihood of entering the industrial and services sector by about 30 percent. Other previous stays in Madrid by the head of household undertaken before the definitive (family) migration process do not seem to influence occupational attainment. Neither affects years since arrival in Madrid, perhaps due to the fact that migrants had resided for only a very few years in the capital city when the survey was drawn. The first model also shows that well-connected migrants tend to fare better in the labour market than migrants who do not use networks. In particular, family networks seem to be more relevant in facilitating access to a better first job (in column 2, *Relatives* is close to being significant at the 10 percent level; p value = 0.103).

To conclude the analysis of the first model, the estimated coefficients of the region of origin variables tend to be high and strongly significant. In comparison with individuals born in the northern region of Castile and León, migrants who come from the Southern regions are less likely to be in the industrial and services sector. As explained above, place-of-birth dummies for these regions, for example, may be reflecting a migrant's lower accumulation of transferable skills that is not captured by the other human capital variables available. In fact, when *Primary education completed* is included (in column 2), the importance of region of birth tends to weaken.

Columns 3 and 4 present the results from the model predicting the occupation in Madrid at the time of the survey. Consistent with expectations, having entered the industrial and services sectors upon arrival is the best predictor of belonging to the same sectors in

1957 (the probability increases by about 75 per cent). Among the other variables, columns 3 and 4 suggest that acquiring information about the urban labour market by means of different strategies was crucial to gaining access to industrial and services occupations. For example, individuals migrated previously to the capital city; once in Madrid they used networks based on acquaintances and friends (rather than on relatives). A further interesting result is that significant differences among migrants who come from the North and the South of Madrid disappear.

In short, strategies implemented to enter the urban labor force for the very first time (columns 1 and 2) tend to contrast with the pattern of access to the best occupations developed over time of residence in Madrid (columns 3 and 4). Access to better first jobs seems to be mainly based on reducing the costs and risks associated with movement. Individuals, therefore, migrate individually, and use «strong» (family) ties. Access to better jobs at the end of the process under study, however, may be mainly related to gaining pre- and post-migration information by means of prior stays in Madrid and «weak» (non-family) ties. As mentioned above, in a context of a still relatively weak recovery of the city's economy, and massive migration, good jobs in the industry and service sectors may well have been scarce.

Finally, columns 5 and 6 report the findings from the model predicting upward mobility in Madrid. The effects of human capital, and moving and integration costs, tend to be small and non-significant. In this context, the significant impact of individual migration is, in principle, not easy to interpret, since it would be fair to say that strategies based on acquiring information (as in columns 3 and 4), rather than reducing costs (as mainly in columns 1 and 2), should be more relevant to improving the situation once in Madrid (it could have been possible, nevertheless, that the most successful integration processes began before definitive family migration). Interestingly, upward mobility is, in practice, only determined by place of birth. This result suggests that the conditions of the more disadvantaged southern migrants tended to converge with those of their more skilled, northern counterparts.

To verify the robustness of the empirical findings using occupational dependent variables, a model using a permanent/temporary job in 1957 as dependent variable (mean = 0.46; s.d. = 0.50) was also carried out[25]. As described below, permanent jobs were more prevalent in the industrial (and services) sector than in construction[26]. Results in Table

25. The possibility of using additional indicators, such as having multiple jobs, was considered but eventually discarded due to the lack of information for all individuals.
26. The correlation between non-construction and permanent jobs is 0.66, and the correlation between upward mobility and permanent jobs is 0.56.

TABLE 11
Logit models of type of employment in 1957 for male in-migrants (marginal effects)

	(1)	(2)
	1 = Permanent job 0 = Temporary job	
Human capital		
[Construction occup. upon arrival]		
Industrial and services	0.45** (0.13)	0.41** (0.14)
Age in 1957	-0.00 (0.01)	-0.00 (0.01)
Literacy	0.03 (0.13)	
Primary education completed		0.24 (0.18)
Migration history		
Previous stays in Madrid	0.40** (0.13)	0.38** (0.12)
Individual migration	0.33** (0.12)	0.36** (0.12)
Years in Madrid	0.06 (0.05)	0.05 (0.05)
Use of networks upon arrival		
[No use of networks]		
Relatives	-0.09 (0.14)	-0.09 (0.14)
Acquaintances/friends	-0.05 (0.23)	-0.06 (0.22)
Region of origin		
[Castile and Leon]		
Castile-La Mancha	-0.21 (0.25)	-0.19 (0.28)
Extremadura	-0.21 (0.26)	-0.18 (0.28)
Andalusia	-0.36 (0.22)	-0.34 (0.25)
Log pseudolikelihood	-47.77	-47.10
Wald Chi^2 (11):	18.56	20.85
Prob > Chi:	0.0696	0.0350
Pseudo R^2	0.23	0.25
N = 91		

** p < .01

Note: Standard errors between brackets. Reference categories for explanatory variables are in square brackets.

Source: See the Appendix.

11 tend to confirm those reported so far. The major exception is the effect of networks, which are not significant predictors of having a permanent job. As explained when describing the functioning of the labour market, it may have been possible that, once wor-

king, employers' decisions were the key to improving working conditions such as permanency, rather than any other type of interpersonal contact.

7. A TURN TO A QUALITATIVE APPROACH: SELECTED CASE-STUDIES

Regression results tend to confirm descriptive findings by Siguan, with respect to the positive effect of the accumulation of suitable human capital on improving the economic outcome of rural migrants once they are in the city. Regressions also shed light on three important issues for the understanding of various migrant labour market trajectories that were insufficiently highlighted (or not properly reflected) in *Del campo al suburbio*. These issues are: a) prior stays in the city; b) effects varying according to the kind of migration network; c) the fast pace at which southern migrants converge with their northern counterparts. The rest of this section summarizes (relatively) successful examples illustrating the importance of these determinants in achieving better occupations.

Individuals gain information by means of prior stays in Madrid (eight cases). Almost all prior stays of migrants included in the survey are associated with either military service, or hospital stays of relatives (see also Capel, 1967; Salcedo, 1977). The following two cases provide examples:

> *Migrant # 23: Military service. Eloy worked as an agricultural labourer for low wages. He came to Madrid to serve in the military, where he assisted a Lieutenant Colonel […]. He returned to his village in 1955. Because his wages there remained low, he shortly returned to Madrid […]. His ex-superior in the army got him a job in a metallurgical company.*

> *Migrant # 63: Hospitalization of his mother. Francisco worked as an agricultural labourer […]. He had visited Madrid several times to bring his mother to the hospital. These stays induced him to leave his village: [e.g.] «in the village there is nothing» […]. He moved to Madrid in 1955. At first, he worked as a day labourer in the construction sector. However, after a few months he got a job as a skilled worker in a metallurgical company.*

Individuals make use of networks based on non-relatives (thirteen cases). These are less common than family networks (twenty-nine cases), as seen in the Appendix, but more helpful once in Madrid, according to the regression analysis. Friends or acquaintances often find jobs for migrants included in the survey. Recommendations are sometimes crucial (e.g. # 83).

In other instances, previously settled migrants provide accommodation (e.g. # 12, 70). Two further examples are:

> *Migrant # 72: Friends. Luis worked as a skilled carpenter in his village, but he was not satisfied with his work […]. He came to Madrid and, through a friend, found a job in a construction company as a carpenter. He was promoted shortly thereafter.*

> *Migrant # 79: Acquaintances. Rafael [who worked in the agricultural sector] sold a donkey, borrowed some money, and came to Madrid with his wife. Acquaintances in the city provided them with accommodation and offered him a job as a skilled worker in a metallurgical company. He achieved a permanent position in the company within six months.*

The process of convergence. Research cited in this article indicates that migrants from provinces south of Madrid tended to be particularly unskilled. In this regard, representations of southern migrants as being ignorant and unsophisticated are also common in novels, poetry, and journalistic essays on Madrid (e.g. Gómez-Porro, 2000). Regression analysis, however, suggests that, once in Madrid, the effect of migrants' characteristics related to their place of origin on occupational outcomes is not important[27]. Among many other experiences included in the survey, improvement is delineated in these two cases:

> *Migrant # 15: Castile-La Mancha. Antonio and his wife were born in Uclés (Cuenca). He came to Madrid two years ago […]. Antonio worked as a day labourer in the agricultural sector […]. He easily found a job in Madrid as a day labourer in the construction sector. His abilities set him apart from others and he was promoted to metal frames specialist.*

> *Migrant # 81: Andalusia. Gaspar and his partner were born in Linares (Jaén) […]. Gaspar worked as a labourer in the construction of a hydroelectricity plant and his wages were low […]. They came to Madrid in 1952 and Gaspar got a job as a day labourer in the construction sector […]. Because he was not married, he was not covered by social insurance […]. They got married and then Gaspar found a job in a precision instruments company, where he was trained and soon promoted.*

27. The initial advantage of northern migrants in the Madrid labour market, among other causes, may have been based on the establishment of migration networks even before the Civil War (when their presence was notable; Silvestre, 2001). However, the (positive or negative) effect of these early concentrations on the careers of subsequent post-Civil War same-origin migrants is difficult to ascertain.

8. CONCLUSIONS

This article has explored the occupational mobility of rural migrants in an urban destination. The study has focused on the main place of destination at the beginning of the greatest internal migration process in Spanish history. The aim is to contribute to a still scant historical research on the incorporation of rural migrants into large cities.

The study utilizes a rich source that more than compensates for the scarcity of statistics before the 1960s, providing individual information on occupation and temporary/permanent kinds of employment as indicators of labour market position, as well as a complete set of potential determinants of occupational attainment at different points of time. In line with *mixed methods research* paradigms in social and behavioural sciences, the contemporary qualitative exploitation of the source by sociologists has been completed, in this study, with a quantitative approach and an additional qualitative strategy. This multiple perspective leads to a better understanding of the integration process. Some early findings have been confirmed, while others have been added.

The lack of representativeness of the quantitative dataset derived from the original source, and the low number of observations, are limitations to be borne in mind when attempting to generalize the findings for the entire pool of rural migrants. Further work, perhaps based on selected registers of inhabitants *(padrones)*, would be needed to extrapolate conclusions.

Migrants contributed greatly to population growth in Madrid in the 1950s. They were incorporated in an increasingly dynamic labour market in its early stages of consolidated growth after the post-Civil war crisis. As in the pre-war period, relatively young rural migrants, of both sexes, were attracted by an urban diversified labour market. From here, three main conclusions can be drawn.

First, the achievement of better occupations in the urban labour market was influenced by the accumulation of transferable human capital in the place of origin, or upon arrival in Madrid (on the importance of migrant levels of education in Catalonia, see Solé, 1982). Rural migrants who worked in non-agricultural occupations or had completed their primary education were likely to have fewer problems in entering occupations more desirable than those prevalent in the construction sector, in which labour conditions tended to be worse than in other urban sectors. However, the possibilities to enroll in – and complete – primary education or above in places of origin were certainly low (for Andalusia, see Siguan, 1971). It was not until the second half of the 1960s that the education policy of the Franco dictatorship really began to invest in human capital, particularly in

primary education (Nuñez, 2003). Early experience, once acquired in Madrid in non-construction sectors, greatly improved the chances of continuing to work in those sectors in subsequent years (in line with other findings; Piracha and Vadean, 2013).

Second, individuals prepared for a potentially risky migration process with an array of strategies based on reducing moving and integration costs and acquiring (pre- and post-migration) information about the new labour market (as previously argued by, for example, Capel, 1967; and Silvestre and Serrano, 2012). Individuals often made use of interpersonal connections which, besides information, provided assistance and resources.

Finally, given the received view, one main result seems to be that the poorest and least-skilled migrants seemed to merge with other migrant groups. Upon arrival, unskilled rural migrants from Castile-La Mancha, Andalusia and Extremadura tended to suffer a disadvantage in the labor market, in comparison with migrants coming from the north of Spain. Although opportunities beyond the construction sector may have been scarce, the findings suggest that an improved economic assimilation for southern migrants occurred over time.

Expectations of upward occupational mobility, nevertheless, went unsatisfied for a number of rural migrants – as also confirmed by another of Siguan's books, *El medio rural en Andalucía oriental*. Clearly, their situation at home would probably have been much worse if they had not moved to an urban destination. Moreover, many of the new arrivals overcame their first concern, which was to find a job. But subsequent improvement was probably limited. This article points to migrants' educational mismatch as one of the potential main reasons. Indeed, education policy at that time was not helpful. Perhaps with the exception of construction, furthermore, the city may not yet have offered permanent employment and wage opportunities for all migrants, and it would be necessary to wait for the strengthening of the urban and regional economy in the following decade.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Special thanks are due to three anonymous referees of *Historia Agraria*, Fernando Collantes, Domingo Gallego, Vicente Pinilla, Marga Vilar and seminar participants at the University of Zaragoza. Methodological and bibliographical suggestions were received from M. Isabel Ayuda, Antonio Aznar, Eloy Fernández Clemente and Sònia Parella. David Reher and Blanca Sánchez-Alonso advised on libraries in Madrid. Helpful information was also provided by Margarita Torrejón at Caritas Library. The Ministry of Science

and Innovation (research project ECO2009-07796) and the Government of Aragon (research project S27) have provided financial assistance.

REFERENCES

Abramitzky, R., Boustan, L. P. & Eriksson, K. (2014). A Nation of Immigrants: Assimilation and Economic Outcomes in the Age of Mass Migration. *Journal of Political Economy*, *122* (3), 467-506.

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

Alba, R. & Nee, V. (1997). Rethinking Assimilation Theory for a New Era of Immigration. *International Migration Review*, (31), 826-874.

Alvarez Rosete, A. (2009). Elaborados con calma, ejecutados con prisa. El avance de los seguros sociales y la evolución del Instituto Nacional de Previsión en España entre 1936 y 1950. In S. Castillo & R. Ruzafa (Coords.), *La previsión social en la historia. Actas del VI Congreso de Historia Social de España* (pp. 235-263). Madrid: Siglo XXI.

Antonovics, K. & Town, R. (2004). Are All the Good Men Married? Uncovering the Sources of the Marital Wage Premium. *American Economic Review, Papers and Proceedings*, *94* (2), 317-321.

Axinn, W. & Pearce, L. (2006). *Mixed Method Data Collection Strategies*. Cambridge: CUP.

Babiano, J. (1995). *Emigrantes, cronómetros y huelgas. Un estudio sobre el trabajo y los trabajadores durante el franquismo (Madrid, 1951-1977)*. Madrid: Siglo XXI.

Babiano, J. (1998). *Paternalismo industrial y disciplina fabril en España (1938-1958)*. Madrid: Consejo Económico y Social.

Barciela, C. & López, I. (2003). El fracaso de la política agraria del primer franquismo, 1939-1959. Veinte años perdidos para la agricultura española. In C. Barciela (Ed.), *Autarquía y mercado negro. El fracaso económico del primer franquismo, 1939-1959* (pp. 56-93). Barcelona: Crítica.

Boj, I. & Aroca, V. (2009). La repressió de la immigració: les contradiccions del franquisme. In M. Marín (Ed.), *Memòries del viatge, 1940-1975* (pp. 72-86). Sant Adrià de Besòs: MHIC.

Borderías, C. (2002). Women Workers in the Barcelona Labour Market, 1856-1936. In A. Smith (Ed.), *Red Barcelona. Social Protest and Labour Mobilization in the Twentieth Century* (pp. 142-166). London: Routledge.

Borjas, G. (1999). The Economic Analysis of Immigration. In O. Ashenfelter & D. Card (Eds.), *Handbook of Labor Economics. Vol. 3* (pp. 1697-1760). Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Bustillo, V. E. (2005). Bilbao 1940-1975: trabajo y desarrollo tras la Guerra civil. Un análisis demográfico. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Facultad de Ciencias Sociales y de la Comunicación. Universidad del País Vasco.

Byrne, J. (1993). La construcción durante el primer tercio del siglo xx. In D. Ruiz & J. Babiano (Eds.), *Los trabajadores de la construcción en el Madrid del siglo xx* (pp. 25-58). Madrid: Akal.

Cabo, A. (1961). Valor de la inmigración madrileña, *Estudios Geográficos*, (22), 353-74.

Calle, M. D. de la (2010). Mutualidades laborales en el régimen de Franco. *Revista de la historia de la economía y de la empresa*, (4), 209-224.

Campo, S. del, Navarro, M. & Tezanos, J. F. (1977). *La cuestión regional española.* Madrid: Cuadernos para el diálogo.

Capel, H. (1967). Los estudios acerca de las migraciones interiores en España, *Revista de Geografía*, (1), 77-101.

Carbajo, M. (1985). La inmigración a Madrid. *Revista España de Investigaciones Sociológicas*, (32), 67-100.

Carpintero, H., Dosil, A., Estaun, S. & Tortosa, F. (1998). Miguel Siguan en la psicología española. *Revista de Psicología General y Aplicada*, (51), 325-329.

Catalán, J. (1995). *La economía española y la segunda guerra mundial*. Barcelona: Ariel.

Chiswick, B., Lee, Y.L. & Miller, P. (2005). A Longitudinal Analysis of Immigrant Occupational Mobility: A Test of the Immigrant Assimilation Hypothesis. *International Migration Review*, (39), 332-353.

Christiansen, T. (2012): *The reason why. The post civil-war agrarian crisis in Spain*. Zaragoza: Prensas Universitarias de Zaragoza.

Clar, E. & Collantes, F. (2009). Rural Spain during the Franco Regime (1939-1975). In A. Bonoldi & A. Leonardi (Eds.), *Recovery and Development in the European Periphery (1945-1960)* (pp. 103-126). Bologna-Berlin: Palgrave.

Clout, H. (1976). Rural-Urban Migration in Western Europe. In J. Salt & H. Clout (Eds.), *Migration in Post-War Europe. Geographical Essays* (pp 30-51). Oxford: OUP.

Cobo, F. & Ortega, M.T. (2004). Hambre, desempleo y emigración. Las consecuencias sociales de la política agraria autárquica en Andalucía oriental (1939-1975). *Hispania*, (64), 1079-1114.

Collantes, F. & Pinilla, V. (2011). *Peaceful Surrender. The Depopulation of Rural Spain in the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Domínguez Martín, R. (2002). *La riqueza de las regiones. Las desigualdades económicas regionales en España, 1700-2000*: Madrid: Alianza.

Fernández Asperilla, A. I. (1993). El sector de la construcción y el desarrollo capitalista después de 1940. In D. Ruiz & J. Babiano (Eds.), *Los trabajadores de la construcción en el Madrid del siglo xx* (pp. 59-82.). Madrid: Akal.

Fernández Gómez, J. (2004). *Buscando el pan del trabajo. Sobre la industrialización franquista y sus costes sociales. Villaverde (Madrid), 1940-1965*. Madrid: Miño y Dávila.

Fernández Gómez, J. (2007). De la Guerra Civil a la Ordenanza General de Seguridad e Higiene del Trabajo (1939-1971). *Sociología del Trabajo*, (60), 77-111.

Fernández Gómez, J. (2008). Emigración interior e industrialización durante el franquismo. Estudio del caso de Villaverde (Madrid). In J. de la Torre & G. Sanz (Eds.), *Migraciones y coyuntura económica del franquismo a la democracia* (pp. 75-103). Zaragoza: Prensas Universitarias de Zaragoza.

Folguera, P., Díaz, P., Domínguez, P. & Gago, J. M. (2002). La identidad de los ferroviarios de RENFE, 1941-2001, a través de las fuentes orales. *Historia, Antropología y Fuentes Orales*, (28), 120-137.

Gálvez, L. (2010). Paro sin seguro de desempleo: la lucha contra la desocupación durante el primer franquismo (1939-1961). *Revista de la Historia de la Economía y de la Empresa*, (4), 251-282.

García Abad, R. (2005). *Historias de emigración: factores de expulsión y selección de capital humano en la emigración a la Ría de Bilbao (1877-1935)*. Bilbao: Universidad del País Vasco.

García Barbancho, A. (1967). *Las migraciones interiores españolas. Estudio cuantitativo desde 1900*. Madrid: Instituto de Desarrollo Económico.

García Delgado, J. L. & Carrera, M. (2001). Madrid, capital económica. In L. Germán, E. Llopis, J. Maluquer de Motes & S. Zapata (Eds.), *Historia Económica Regional de España. Siglos XIX y XX* (pp. 209-237). Barcelona: Crítica.

García Fernández, J. (1956). La atracción geográfica de Madrid. *Estudios Geográficos*, (27), 87-91.

García Ruiz J. L. (2007). La industria de la automoción en Madrid: ¿hubo oportunidades perdidas? In P. Pascual & P. Fernández Pérez (Eds.), *Del metal al motor. Innovación y atraso en la historia de la industria metal-mecánica española* (pp. 189-222). Bilbao: Fundación BBVA.

García Ruiz J. L. (2011). Madrid en la encrucijada del interior peninsular, c. 1850-2009. *Historia Contemporánea*, (42), 187-223.

Giménez Mellado, J. (1956). *El paro tecnológico y los movimientos de población en la actual coyuntura económica española*. Barcelona: Comision Nacional De Accion Social Patronal.

Gómez-Porro, F. (2000). *La conquista de Madrid. Paletos, provincianos e inmigrantes*. Madrid: Sílex.

González Murillo, P. (2008). El franquismo social: Propaganda y seguros a través del Instituto Nacional de Previsión (1939-1962). In S. Castillo (Ed.), *Solidaridad, seguridad, bienestar. Cien años de protección social en España* (pp. 89-124). Madrid: Ministerio de Trabajo e Inmigración.

Granovetter, M. S. (1973). The Strength of Weak Ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, *78* (6), 1360-1380.

Gregory, D. D. (1978). Migración y cambio demográfico en Andalucía. In W. A. Douglass & J. B. Aceves (Eds.), *Los aspectos cambiantes de la España rural* (pp. 137-171). Hospitalet de Llobregat: Barral.

Hatton, T. (2010). The Cliometrics of International Migration: A Survey. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, *24* (5), 941-969.

Infante-Amate, J. (2011). Temporeros del olivar. Una aproximación al estudio de las migraciones estacionales en el sur de España (siglos xviii-xx). *Revista de Demografía Histórica*, (29), 87-118.

Johnson, R. B., Onwuegbuzie, J. & Turner, L. A. (2007). Toward a Definition of Mixed Methods Research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, *1* (2), 112-133.

Juliá, S. (1994). Madrid, capital del Estado (1833-1993). In S. Juliá, D. Ringrose & C. Segura (Eds.), *Madrid, historia de una capital* (pp. 253-469). Madrid: Alianza.

Kong, S. T., Meng, X. & Zhang, D. (2010). The Global Financial Crisis and Rural Urban Migration. In R. Garnaut, J. Golley & L. Song (Eds.), *China: The Next Twenty Years of Reform and Development* (pp. 241-265). Canberra: Australian National University.

Lall, S. V., Selod, H. & Shalizi, Z. (2006). Rural-Urban Migration in Developing Countries: A Survey of Theoretical Predictions and Empirical Findings. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 3915.

Lee, L. & Meng, X. (2010). Why Don't More Chinese Migrate from the Countryside? Institutional Constraints and the Migration Decision. In X. Meng, C. Manning & L. Shi (Eds.), *The Great Migration: Rural–Urban Migration in China and Indonesia* (pp. 23-45). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Leech, N. & Onwuegbuzie, J. (2009). A Typology of Mixed Methods Research designs. *Quality & Quantity*, *43* (2), 265-275.

Lozano, F. A. & Steinberger, M. D. (2012). Empirical Methods in the Economics of International Immigration. In C. Vargas-Silva (Ed.), *Handbook of Research Methods in Migration* (pp. 163-185). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Marín, M. (2006). Franquismo e inmigración interior: El caso de Sabadell (1939-1960). *Historia Social*, (56), 131-151.

Marín, M. (2009). Las migraciones interiores hacia la Cataluña urbana vistas desde Sabadell (1939-1960). In J. de La Torre & G. Sanz (Eds.), *Migraciones y coyuntura económica del franquismo a la democracia* (pp. 177-196). Zaragoza: Prensas Universitarias de Zaragoza.

Martínez Alier, J. (1968). *La estabilidad del latifundismo*. Paris: Ruedo Ibérico.

Mazumdar, D. (1987). Rural-urban migration in developing countries. In E. S. Mills (Ed.), *Handbook of Regional and Urban Economics. Volume II* (pp. 1097-1128). Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Meng, X & Zhang, D. (2001). The Two-Tier Labor Market in Urban China. *Journal of Comparative Economics*, *29* (3), 485-504.

Miguelez, F. (1990). Trabajo y relaciones laborales en la construcción. *Sociología del Trabajo*, *9* (2), 35-54.

Mingo, J. A. de & Lorite, A. (1993). Las condiciones del trabajo en el sector: Madrid, 1939-1975. In D. Ruiz & J. Babiano (Eds.), *Los trabajadores de la construcción en el Madrid del siglo xx* (pp. 83-121). Madrid: Akal.

Montoliú, P. (2010). *Madrid bajo la dictadura, 1947-1959. Trece años que cambiaron una ciudad*. Madrid: Sílex.

Naredo, J. M. (1996). *La evolución de la agricultura en España (1940-1990)*. Granada: Universidad de Granada.

Nicolau, R. (2005). Población, salud y actividad. In A. Carreras & X. Tafunell (Eds.), *Estadísticas históricas de España. Siglos xix y xx. Volumen I* (pp. 77-154). Madrid: Fundación BBVA.

Nielfa, G. (1993). La economía de Madrid desde la crisis colonial hasta el final de la guerra civil. In A. Fernández García (Ed.), *Historia de Madrid* (pp. 665-679). Madrid: Complutense.

Nuñez, C. E. (2003). El capital humano en el primer franquismo. In C. Barciela (Ed.), *Autarquía y mercado negro. El fracaso económico del primer franquismo, 1939-1959* (pp. 27-53). Barcelona: Crítica.

Nuñez, C. E. (2005). Educación. In A. Carreras & X. Tafunell (Eds.), *Estadísticas históricas de España. Siglos xix y xx. Volumen I* (pp. 155-244). Madrid: Fundación BBVA.

Okkerse, L. (2008). How to measure labour market effects of immigration: a review. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, *22* (1), 1-30.

Onwuegbuzie, J. & Leech, N. (2007). A Call for Qualitative Power Analyses. *Quality & Quantity*, *41* (1), 105-121.

Ortega, J. A. & Silvestre, J. (2006). Las consecuencias demográficas. In P. Martín Aceña & E. Martínez Ruiz (Eds.), *La economía de la guerra civil* (pp. 53-105). Madrid: Marcial Pons.

Oyón, J. L., Maldonado, J. & Griful, E. (2001). *Barcelona 1930: un atlas social*. Barcelona: Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya.

Pallol, R., Carballo, B. & Vicente, F. (2010). Inmigración y mercado de trabajo en el Madrid de la segunda mitad del siglo xix. *Revista de Demografía Histórica*, (28), 131-166.

Paluzie, F., Pons, J., Silvestre, J. & Tirado, D. (2009). Migrants and Market Potential in Spain over the 20th Century: A Test of the New Economic Geography. *Spanish Economic Review*, (11), 243-265.

Pareja, A. (Ed.) (2011). *El capital humano en el mundo urbano. Experiencias desde los padrones municipales (1850-1930)*. Bilbao: Universidad del País Vasco.

Piracha, M. & Vadean, F. (2013). Migrant educational mismatch and the labor market. In A. Constant & K. Zimmermann (Eds.), *International Handbook on the Economics of Migration* (pp. 176-191). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Pons, J. (2010). El seguro obligatorio de enfermedad y la gestión de las entidades colaboradoras (1942-1963). *Revista de la historia de la economía y de la empresa*, (4), 227-248.

Pons, J. (2011). La gestión patronal del seguro obligatorio de accidentes de trabajo durante el franquismo (1940-1975). *Revista de Historia Industrial*, (45), 109-144.

Portes, A. (1995). Economic Sociology and the Sociology of Immigration: A Conceptual Overview. In A. Portes (Ed.), *The economic sociology of immigration. Essays on networks, ethnicity and entrepreneurship* (pp. 1-41). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Puig, A. (1995). La Guerra Civil espanyola, una causa de l'emigració andalusa en la dècada dels anys cinquanta? *Recerques: Història, economia i cultura*, (31), 53-69.

Recaño, J. & Roig M. (2003). Internal Migration and Inequalities. The Influence of Migrant Origin on Educational Attainment in Spain. *European Sociological Review*, (19), 299-317.

Reher, D. (2003). Perfiles demográficos de España, 1940-1960. In C. Barciela (Ed.), *Autarquía y mercado negro. El fracaso económico del primer franquismo, 1939-1959* (pp. 1-26). Barcelona: Crítica.

Reher, D. & Ballesteros, E. (1993). Precios y salarios en Castilla la Nueva. La construcción de un índice de salarios reales, 1501-1991. *Revista de Historia Económica*, *11* (1), 101-151.

Ringrose, D. R. (1983). *Madrid and the Spanish Economy, 1560-1850*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Ródenas, C. (2008). Migraciones interiores 1960-1985: Balance de investigación y análisis de las fuentes estadísticas. In J. De la Torre & G. Sanz (Eds.), *Migraciones y coyuntura económica del franquismo a la democracia* (pp. 75-103). Zaragoza: Prensas Universitarias de Zaragoza.

Salcedo, J. (1977). *Madrid culpable. Sobre el espacio y la población en las ciencias sociales.* Madrid: Tecnos.

Sarasúa, C. (1994). *Criados, nodrizas y amos. El servicio doméstico en la formación del mercado de trabajo madrileño*. Madrid: Siglo XXI.

Siguan, M. (1959). *Del campo al suburbio. Un estudio sobre la inmigración interior en España*. Madrid: CSIC.

Siguan, M. (1966). *El medio rural castellano y sus posibilidades de ordenación*. Madrid. Ministerio de Agricultura.

Siguan, M. (1971). *El medio rural en Andalucía oriental*. Barcelona: Ariel

Siguan, M. (1985). Autobiografía intelectual: De mi vida como psicólogo. *Anthropos*, (48), 15-29.

Silvestre, J. (2001). Viajes de corta distancia. Una visión espacial de las migraciones interiores en España, 1877-1930. *Revista de Historia Económica*, *19* (2), 247-283.

Silvestre, J. (2005). Internal migrations in Spain, 1877-1930. *European Review of Economic History*, *9* (2), 233-265.

Silvestre, J. (2007). Temporary Internal Migrations in Spain, 1860-1930. *Social Science History*, *31* (4), 539-574.

Silvestre, J. & Clar, E. (2010). The demographic impact of irrigation projects: A comparison of two case studies of the Ebro basin, Spain, 1900-2001. *Journal of Historical Geography*, *36* (3), 315-326.

Silvestre, J. & Serrano, E. (2012). La representación en el cine de la integración de los inmigrantes rurales en las ciudades: El pesimismo de Surcos (1951). *Ager. Journal of Depopulation and Rural Development Studies*, (12), 91-116.

Silvestre, J., Ayuda, M. I. & Pinilla, V. (2015). The Occupational Attainment of Migrants and Natives in Barcelona, 1930. *Economic History Review*, *68* (3), 985-1015.

Simpson, J. (1995). *Spanish Agriculture: The Long Siesta, 1765-1965*. Cambridge: CUP.

Solé, C. (1982). *Los inmigrantes en la sociedad y cultura catalanas*. Barcelona: Península.

Soto, A. (2003) Rupturas y continuidades en las relaciones laborales del primer franquismo, 1938-1958. In C. Barciela (Ed.), *Autarquía y mercado negro. El fracaso económico del primer franquismo*, *1939-1959* (pp. 217-245). Barcelona: Crítica.

Tamames, R. (1962). Los movimientos migratorios de la población española durante el período 1951-60. *Revista de Economía Política*, (32), 105-140.

Tébar, J. (2009). Immigració i treball a Catalunya, 1939-1975. In M. Marín (Ed.), *Memòries del viatge, 1940-1975* (pp. 87-115). Sant Adrià de Besòs: MHIC.

Teddlie, C. & Yu, F. (2007). Mixed Methods Sampling: A Typology with Examples. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, *1* (1), 77-100.

Valle, F. del (1959). La inmigración en Madrid. In *Los problemas de la migración española* (pp. 375-392). Madrid: Junta Nacional de Semanas Sociales.

Van Der Leij, M. & Goyal, S. (2011). Strong Ties in a Small World. *Review of Network Economics*, *10* (2), Article 1.

Vázquez, J. (1959). La inmigración en Madrid. In *Los problemas de la migración española* (pp. 393-414). Madrid: Junta Nacional de Semanas Sociales.

Vilar, M. (2009). *Los salarios del miedo. Mercado de trabajo y crecimiento económico en España durante el franquismo*. Santiago de Compostela: Fundación 10 de marzo.

Vilar, M. (2012). ¿De aquellas arenas estos lodos? El mercado de trabajo en España desde una perspectiva histórica. *Revista Galega de Economía*, *21* (1), 1-32.

APPENDIX 1

TABLE A1-1

Dependent and explanatory variables used in logit models

Variable	Description	Mean	Std. dev.	Min.	Max.
DEPENDENT VARIABLES					
First occupation in Madrid	1 = Industry and services / 0 = Construction	0.21	0.41	0	1
Occupation in 1957	1 = Industry and services / 0 = Construction	0.35	0.48	0	1
Trajectory between first and 1957 occupation	1 = Upward mobility (Construction → industry and services, or promotion within construction) / 0 = No change or downward	0.32	0.47	0	1
EXPLANATORY VARIABLES					
Human capital					
Occup. before migration	1 = Agricultural / 0 = Non-agricultural	0.70	0.45	0	1
First occup. in Madrid	[See dependent variables]				
Age in 1957	Years	38.9	8.60	24	68
Literacy	1 = Able to read and write / 0 = Not	0.56	0.49	0	1
Primary education completed	1 = Primary education or above / 0 = No	0.12	0.32	0	1
Migration history					
Previous stays in Madrid	1 = Yes / 0 = No	0.09	0.30	0	1
Individual migration	1 = Yes; 0 = Family (wife/children) migration	0.39	0.49	0	1
Years in Madrid	Years since arrival	2.59	1.32	1	7
Use of networks upon arrival					
No use of networks	[Reference]	0.52	0.50	0	1
Relatives	Provision of information/assistance/resources	0.32	0.47	0	1
Acquaintances/friends	Provision of information/assistance/resources	0.14	0.35	0	1
Region of origin	Provinces included				
Castile and León	[Reference. León (1 observation), Palencia (1), Salamanca (1), Santander (1), Segovia (1), Zamora (1)]	0.06	0.24	0	1
Castile-La Mancha	Albacete (1 observation), Ciudad Real (9), Cuenca (3), Madrid (3), Toledo (12)	0.30	0.46	0	1
Extremadura	Badajoz (6 observations), Caceres (7)	0.14	0.35	0	1
Andalusia	Cadiz (2 observations), Cordoba (5), Granada (1), Jaen (29), Malaga (3), Sevilla (4)	0.48	0.50	0	1

Note: Number of observations = 91. An additional dependent variable is used in a robustness check (see the text).
Source: Own calculations based on the information provided by Siguan (1959).