Residential mobility and foreign immigration settlement in the Metropolitan area of Barcelona
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Abstract:

Foreign immigration is a very recent phenomenon in Spain and Barcelona. Over the last few years, and especially since 2001, there has been strong growth in the number of non-EU immigrants changing the historical characterisation of Spain as a country of emigration, above all in the 1960s and 1970s. As in other countries with a high degree of foreign population, one of the principal consequences has been the transformation of the social structure, with a special focus in the larger cities. Barcelona, after Madrid, is the second principal area for settlement of this flux of immigration.

In 1999, in the Metropolitan Area of Barcelona (MAB) there were some 89,744 foreign inhabitants (2.09% of population) increasing to 531,040 such inhabitants (11.13% of population) in 2005. Clearly, this assumes a very strong change in the social composition in the metropolis generating new social dynamics unknown until today.

But in view of this new reality, the first question to be asked is where has this population settled?

To understand the settlement process and the dynamics of immigration in the MAB, consideration needs to be given to the suburbanization process and the residential mobility that have changed the metropolitan urban system over the last 20 years. These processes have generated huge vacancies in the dwelling stock, which in turn have been occupied by the foreign immigrants. This process is similar to others that have taken place in the past in other European cities, for example, Amsterdam.

The intention of this paper is to examine the relationship between the processes of suburbanization and residential mobility, and the settlement of immigrant population within the MAB.
0. Introduction

The Metropolitan Area of Barcelona (MAB) is (after Madrid) the second largest urban area in Spain as well as second urban area with the largest number of Non-EU foreigners. Thus its economic, urban and demographic weight is very important; it has a large labour market and a large, diverse and dynamic housing market. Those variables (labour market and housing) work as an attraction factor for international migration flows, becoming the metropolitan areas as principal settlement areas for those migration streams.

The actual MAB’s structure is the result of its historical development, above all from 1960, related with the economic and demographic growth, what produced a process of metropolisation. The main result has been the decentralization of population, economic activity and services (Carrera, 2002).

With regard to population decentralization, there are suburbanization and urban expansion dynamics. This decentralization has taken place as a result of the urban development of the periphery, which generated the new residential areas for those intra-metropolitan migrants. In short, its result (common to the most European and Western cities) was the emigration from the central areas toward the periphery, and population losses in these areas with population increases in the periphery. Sometimes, this central-periphery framework is not enough to understand the process and as will be seen later, for the MAB case, the biggest cities of the metropolitan system have suffered this emigration process, independently of their location.

1. Theoretical framework

Population mobility is the main variable to understand those processes, and is somehow the main demographic variable related with metropolisation dynamics. There are different types of population mobility: usual mobility, daily mobility, occasional mobility and residential mobility (Módenes, 1998). All of these are inter-related and have different functions in the general mobility process.

For the aim of this paper, we will focus on residential mobility. There are different theoretical frameworks and perspectives to understand and analyse it. Generally it is used to describe the definitive housing change of a person or household and sometimes would be understood as a migration. Although they are very close concepts, migration is use to describe the residential change which supposes a large distance and change in everyday habits, meanwhile residential mobility does not suppose a total change of one’s everyday habits (Módenes, 1998; Lewis, 1982). Thus, the correct term which links residential mobility and migration, is inter-municipal or intra-metropolitan migration.

On the other hand, residential mobility is completely related with the housing market, representing the new housing demand. That demand is generated due to the factors or reasons created by the mobility:
1. Life and family cycle evolution (new housing needs)
2. Social position improvement (new house related with better social position)
3. Emancipation and new households (new house for the newly formed household).

The first and second factors generate new housing demand but at the same time produce a supply; meanwhile the third only represents a new demand. This way, usually the residential strategy to gain access to a new house for the first and second groups is based upon selling or renting their actual house, to obtain economic profits and buy the new house. If their old house is located in the central urban areas, with the profits generated from the sale they could buy a better house in the periphery for the same price or less. Thus, they supply new dwellings to the second hand housing market (for purchase or rent) which has other purchase profiles. Inside this profile one can find the inhabitants with less economics resources, who cannot access the new housing market (as Non-EU foreigners) and the purchasers who are looking at a dwelling for its location (for example in the central city).

On the other hand, the youth emancipation produces new households and therefore housing demand, but not offer. Thus, they are housing consumers, in the new housing market as well as second hand market. Most of the young people who live in the central areas have to emigrate towards the periphery to create their household, because the market prices are very high in their own cities or there is simply an insufficiency in the supply of dwellings. Then, youth emancipation is becoming a suburbanization factor.

Having arrived at this point, what is the relationship between residential mobility and immigration settlement? Could the different dynamics generated by the residential mobility be used to explain immigration settlement in a metropolitan context? The main idea behind these questions is that the housing and migration dynamics produced by the residential mobility could have created the necessary urban context to enable the MAB to absorb the massive arrival of Non-EU foreigners over the last few years. This is also our hypothesis.

The logic of this reasoning rests on the needs of the city to have enough housing supply to absorb this massive immigration in a small temporal period. Being conscious that the Non-EU foreigners in the first stage of migration processes tend towards accommodation in conditions of overcrowding and have bigger household sizes, however, the growth in the MAB has been too intense. In our opinion this could have not possible without this housing supply, generate in part by the residential mobility.

On the other hand, if we analyse the literature relating to foreigners’ settlement in cities we can see the importance of the residential mobility and suburbanization processes creating the fit urban and housing context to absorb the mass migration. Amsterdam is an example; regarding the foreigners’ settlement Musterd and Deurloo state that “The sweeping suburbanisation in the 1970s and 1980s, comprising primarily Dutch nationals with higher and middle incomes, meant that most of the housing available for newcomers
was in the inner cities of the urban areas. Some of these sections now have major spatial concentrations of newcomers.” (Musterd, Deurloo, pp. 488, 2002).

In two case studies in cities in Catalonia, Rubi (within the MAB) and El Vendrell (inside the area influence of the MAB), one finds the relationships between the neighbourhoods which are losing population through the emigration (related with residential mobility) and the settlement of new foreigners (Roca & Fullaondo, 2004; Roca, Fullaondo & Massia, 2005).

2. Residential mobility and suburbanization in the MAB

There are different ways to define the MAB and its territory. In this paper we use the administrative definition; the General Territorial Plan of Catalonia defines the MAB as an area of 3,236 km2, comprising 7 administrative regions (Barcelones, Maresme, Valles Oriental, Valles Occidental, Alt Penedes, Baix Llobregat and El Garraf) which contain 164 municipalities and which concentrate 4,767,257 inhabitants (2005).

Independent of this administrative definition, the MAB is a dynamic urban area, which has been developing over recent years, growing and increasing its influence in the urban system. This process started some decades ago (above all from 1960s), through economic growth, the decentralization of economic and productive activities, new metropolitan infrastructures, urban development… (Carreras, 2002). In short, like other cities, Barcelona have experimented a large metropolisation process.

Following Oriol Nel-lo, three are the tendencies which characterised the MAB’s metropolitan urban development (Nel-lo, pp107; 2002):
a. **Dispersion**: The activities and population, after a long period of centralization, are now dispersing throughout the metropolitan space.

b. **Extension**: The urban area is expanding and the metropolitan area is increasing.

c. **Specialization**: The different areas which comprise this disperse city, are becoming more specialized in social and functional terms.

As explained previously, residential mobility is one of the factors that explains the metropolitan dispersion and extension. This process started in the early 1980s, disconcerting Barcelona and the neighbouring cities, losing population meanwhile the cities located in the second metropolitan ring were increasing in population (Módenes, 1998). In the 1990s, the process has been more or less similar, but since 1996 the tendency has changed slightly, towards the retention of population.


Taking migration balance as a residential mobility indicator, Map 2 shows a general tendency between 1991-1996: the central urban area (Barcelona and neighbouring cities) has negative balance, reaching -17%, meanwhile in the periphery the balance is positive. However, analysing the map in depth shows how the bigger metropolitan cities, some of them located in the second ring (Sabadell, Terrassa, Mataro, Granollers…) had a negative balance or a small positive balance.
Nevertheless the balances between 1996-2001 show a certain degree of retention; on the one hand positive balances are more moderate and on the opposite side are less negative. However the data which shows clearly that the change is a positive balance of the city relates to Barcelona, after two decades with negative balance. To understand these changes, it is necessary to place attention on the influence in the balance of international immigration, due to it probably being responsible for part of these changes. In any event, in the central area only the city of Barcelona has positive balance while other cities maintain negative percentages.

Figure 1 shows that city location is not the only factor which influenced the migration balance and the importance of city size. The suburbanization process favours smaller cities growing in population, meanwhile as the city size is bigger the migration balance is smaller or negative. This way the biggest metropolitan cities (>100,000 inhabitants) have been with negative balances from 1980s, as opposed to medium and smaller cities (<100,000 inhabitants) with positive balances.
In short, the central and bigger cities have experienced greater population losses and consequently would have been able have more vacant dwellings. Different authors have linked this process with the metropolitan residential development; as Nel·lo who says in relation it “El fenomen davant el cual ens trobem no es simplement el d’un desplacament des de el centre cap a la periferia metropolitana, sino d’un verdader process de dispersion de població i activitats sobre el territory, mitjancant el queal la practica totalitat dels nuclis als major població i densitat (independentment de la seva localitzacio) tendeixen a cedir pes relatiu i, en molts casos, població en termes absoluts cap a alters localitats mes disperses i de menor densitat” (Nel·lo, pp. 109; 2002). On the other hand, when Roca, Clusa and Mur analyse the housing market of the Barcelona region and the MAB, after studying the migration processes they arrive to the conclusion that the residential configuration of the MAB is its consequence “La reconfiguració residencial de la residència a escala metropolitana i regional es, en conseqüència de tot l’anterior, un element caracteritzador essencial de la forma actual del desenvolupament urbà i immobiliari. La ciutat metropolitana continua descentralitzant-se, tot i abastant territoris cada cop més estesos. Fet que determina l’impuls del mercat de sòl i Habitatge cap a la perifèria d’un àrea metropolitana que ha desbordat ja els límits mateixos de l’àmbit de les set comarques de planejament territorial” (Roca, Clusa and Mur, pp. 11; 2003).

3. Non-EU immigration in the MAB

The Non-EU immigration is a relatively new phenomenon in the MAB and also in Spain. Until the 1980s Spain was considered as a country of emigration, above all around the 1960s and 1970s, with the mass emigration toward northern and central Europe countries. Nevertheless from the 1980s the migration flows started changing towards southern Europe (King, Fielding & Black, 1997). In Spain, the Non-EU immigration started being relevant during the last years of the 1990s and especially from 2001, which represents the inflexion year and the beginning of mass migration.

That mass migration happened when the economy was growing and generating a lot of jobs. On the other hand, as in other western countries, Spain and the MAB were in a process of demographic recession from the early 1980s, producing a big imbalance in the demographic pyramid, which generates labourer supply needs to maintain the economy growth. These two factors (the economic and demographic) have created the suitable condition to attract international migration flows towards the MAB, linked to the social and economic crisis in the flows from the countries of origin and the international differences in general.
Table 1. Non-EU foreigners, number, % of all population and variation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>388,930</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>4.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>138.60</td>
<td>120.06</td>
<td>41.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalonia</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94,923</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>6.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>106.67</td>
<td>130.07</td>
<td>47.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAB</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65,182</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>7.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>104.43</td>
<td>143.36</td>
<td>42.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: INE

Table 1 shows the fast growth of the Non-EU immigration in Spain, Catalonia and MAB. In 1999, with 65,182 persons, these only represented just 1.52% of all the MAB population, meanwhile in Catalonia the same sector accounted for 1.53% and in Spain 0.96% of the respective populations. However, from 2001 the migration stream is more intense; in the MAB between 1999-2001 the variance was 104.43% and between 2001-2003 this was 143.36%, as well as Spain and Catalonia. The more recent years are more stable and between 2000-2005 the growth in the MAB was 42.23%. In short, in six years, the MAB has absorbed 400.000 Non-EU foreigners, representing an increase of 8.15% in their share of the population.

Map 4. Number of Non-EU foreigners by municipality. 2005

The foreigners’ settlement has more or less followed the same patterns of general population distribution; in this way, the correlation between general and foreigners’
distribution has a 0.996 Pearson correlation. Most of them are settled in Barcelona and the central area, but there are also a large proportion of them in the biggest metropolitan cities such as Terrassa, Sabadell, Mataro…

Map 5. Percentage of Non-EU foreigners of all population by municipality. 2005

Looking at the percentage of all population, most of the bigger cities have a similar or bigger percentage as the MAB (9.67%). Barcelona and the central area are the main areas with high percentage as well as the main metropolitan cities, although the coastal municipalities also have high percentages.

Figure 2. Percentage of foreigners’ settlement by nationalities and distance from Barcelona. 2005

Source: INE
The degree of centrality is an important indicator in the metropolitan analysis and as figure 2 shows is an important differentiation factor in order to study settlement differences between the nationalities. This way, the main conclusion of that figure, is that Non-EU foreigners have a more centralized settlement than the whole population and on the other hand also there are important differences between nationalities. The Asians are the most centralized, most of them are located in Barcelona and the immediately adjoining cities (10-15km). By contrast there are Africans, with the most decentralized settlement. Less than 20% of the African population is located in the central city, with almost 20% at a distance of 20-25 km from Barcelona. At this same distance the representation of other groups is less than 10%. In the middle of these two extremes one finds the settlement of the Americans.
4. Residential mobility and immigration settlement

The main idea of this paper is the existence of the relationship between residential mobility and immigration settlement in the MAB, with regard to creating the necessary urban context for this settlement. To analyse residential mobility we have used the migration balance for different periods, and have showed the areas which have lost and gained population.

However, in order to see the relationship with immigration settlement, on the one hand we will analyse the relationship between the migration balance between 1991-1996 (suburbanization period) and the Non-EU foreigners percentage of all population in 2005 (after immigration wave), the population differences between 1991-2005 by nationalities and finally the settlement in relation to housing stock characteristics between 2001-2005 (immigration absorption period).

Migration balance and Non-EU immigration settlement

As seen previously with the migration balances, from the 1980s the MAB has experienced an important suburbanization process. Due to the data availability, it is only possible to have balances every 5 years, and being aware that between 1996-2001 there was a certain degree of retention, we have selected 1991-1996 as being representative of the suburbanization period.

Figure 3. Migration balance (1991-1996) and Non-EU foreigners’ % (2005) by municipality, MAB
The dispersion graph represented by the figure 3 shows the existence of a relationship between both variables. While the migration balances are positive and bigger, the Non-EU foreigner percentages are smaller, whereas while the balances are smaller or negative the foreigner percentage are bigger. On the other hand, the Pearson correlation between both variables is -0.363, then, the bigger the migration balance, the smaller the foreigner percentage. These outcomes suggest the existence of a tendency; the municipalities which have undergone growth by suburbanization have a smaller percentage of Non-EU foreigners and vice versa, but not a direct relationship.

On the other hand, the evolution of population by nationalities between 1991 and 2005, gives us an overall perspective of the process, from the suburbanization effects around the 1990s up until the foreign immigration absorption and stabilization, in 2005. Figure 4 shows clearly how over the last 15 years, the small and medium cities (0-50,000 inhabitants) increased a lot their population due to suburbanization (Spanish inhabitants migration), whereas the largest cities (>100,000 inhabitants) increased or reduced minimally their population, due to the foreign immigration. Those largest cities lost in these 15 years 348,659 Spanish inhabitants and gained 322,956 Non-EU foreigners, thus maintaining their city size due to the massive foreigners’ arrival. On the other hand, the cities with 50,000-100,000 inhabitants increased their population due to suburbanization as well as foreign immigration.

These two figures (3 and 4) show the complexity of the process; on the one hand, the relationship between the migration balances and foreigners’ settlement which follows our hypothesis as a tendency. On the other hand, the population evolution from 1991 to 2005 shows a clear population shift, from the largest towards the medium-sized and smaller cities, and population substitution in these largest cities by foreign immigration. Beginning with the relationship residential mobility – foreigners’ settlement is not symmetric; the cities carry out different roles based upon their metropolitan position:
• The largest central cities (Barcelona and the immediately adjoining cities, and Sabadell in the periphery) lose Spanish population and manage to maintain or lose less population thanks to foreign immigration (Spanish emigration and foreigner immigration).

• The large metropolitan cities (>50,000 inhabitants) gain Spanish as well as foreign population. In the general growth the foreigner influence is more important than Spanish. Some of those cities also have suffered the Spanish emigration but in recent years, due to economic decentralization and houses prices in the central cities, are attracting Spanish emigration flows from that area. For this reason, the percentage of foreigners of all the population is not so big (Spanish immigration, and foreigner immigration).

• The medium-sized metropolitan cities (10,000-50,000 inhabitants) increase in population, above all due to Spanish people. Most of them have become medium-sized cities over this period due to the suburbanization and metropolitan decentralization. In any event, they also attract foreign migration flows, above all due to their close location to economic activities.

• The small cities and villages (<10,000 inhabitants) increase their population by the suburbanization and do not attract foreign immigrants.

These different roles explain a part of that asymmetric relationship between residential mobility – foreigners’ settlement. There are cities which produced suburbanization and attract foreigners; but there are also cities which attract both flows and are located in the periphery, then the symmetric relationship is broke. However, the urban development produced by the suburbanization helps to understand in depth this complexity. This urban development in the periphery takes place in the medium-sized and small cities but also in large metropolitan cities, which have land available for urban development. As seen previously, this urban growth produces intra-metropolitan migration flows and residential mobility, but at the same time, also intra-municipal residential changes. Sometimes, local inhabitants change their residence in the same city, buying their house in the new neighbourhoods. However, they sell or rent their old house, generally to people excluded from the new housing market (as Non-EU foreigners).

The urban development linked to the suburbanization generates intra-metropolitan and intra-municipal residential mobility. The intra-municipal mobility does not produce emigration but can produce immigration by dwelling vacancies (intra-metropolitan, intra-municipal or international). This way, the correlation and tendency which have been seen before between general migration balance and foreigner percentage could have a bigger correlation using a more specific territorial level for the analyses. For this paper these data are not available, but in two case studies have been done before for two middle metropolitan cities (Rubi and El Vendrell), we saw clearly this relationship between the residential mobility and foreigners settlement (Roca & Fullaondo, 2004; Roca, Fullaondo & Massia, 2005). In Rubi, for example, one of the largest neighbourhoods built in the 1970s, experienced an important population shift towards the new
neighbourhoods, producing dwelling vacancies which have been occupied by foreigners and Spanish people.

**Residential characteristics and Non-EU immigration settlement**

Having seen the relationship between migration balances and immigration settlement, attention is now focused on analysing the settlement related with residential characteristics. To classify the MAB housing stock, a Principal Components Factorial Analysis has been carried out with some housing variables (date of construction, size, tenure and building conditions) and afterwards with main and more representative components, a cluster analysis has been carried out, classifying each census section.

**Map 5. MAB housing stock Clusters. 2001**

Cluster 1 represents the stock with similar characteristics to that of the MAB’s general stock, built above all in the 1960s and 1970s, in good conditions, owner occupied and medium-sized. Cluster 2 represents the newest stock, with a high percentage built from the 1980s and bigger size; in other words, it is the suburbanization urban development cluster. Cluster 3 represents the stock in worst conditions and of a small size; and finally Cluster 4 represents the stock with a high percentage in rent tenure and older built period.

This is the classification of the housing stock in 2001, the urban context which has absorbed 327,972 Non-EU foreigners between 2001 and 2005. In these years, most of those areas have become their social composition very fast, creating in some cases population substitution processes and concentration areas.

To analyse how those areas have absorbed this mass migration, with the data which are available from 2001 to 2005 by census sections, the population differences by
nationalities can only just be seen. Perhaps, it has not enough detail (in the absence of being able to determine the weight of the migration or evolution in natural population) but would give us a general vision about what has happened in the most recent period.

To link the population evolution by nationalities and stock, we have classified by groups each section by the evolution sense from 2001 to 2005, and calculated their distribution (%) for each stock cluster. These groups have been defined in terms of population increase or decline, and the weight of each nationality in this evolution.

Table 2. Population evolution groups for each housing cluster (%). 2001-2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population evolution sense</th>
<th>Cluster 1</th>
<th>Cluster 2</th>
<th>Cluster 3</th>
<th>Cluster 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1. Population growth. ▲ Spanish ▲ Non-EU</td>
<td>11.47</td>
<td>44.35</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3. Population growth. ▲ Non-EU ▼ Spanish</td>
<td>44.29</td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td>55.05</td>
<td>64.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 6. Population drop. ▼ Non-EU ▼ Spanish</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows clearly the different population evolution sense in the last years for each housing cluster. On the one hand, 44.29% sections of cluster 1 (which represent the general typology of the stock) have experienced population growth due to foreigners arrival and 26.37% population decreases but being less important also for foreigners. In short, 70% of the sections of cluster 1 are suffering a population substitution process, losing Spanish population and gaining in Non-EU foreigners. On the other hand, the population evolution of cluster 2 (newest stock) has the opposite sense, 44.35% of sections increase by Spanish population whereas the substitution groups (3 and 5) represents the 25%. However, for clusters 3 and 4 (worst and rent tenure stocks), in most of the section the general population is increasing due to the arrival of foreigners whereas are losing Spanish population.

This data shows the relationship between the residential characteristics of the MAB and foreigners’ settlement. The newest areas (cluster 2) have been developed by the suburbanization of these over the last 20 years, which have absorbed the intra-metropolitan migrations, in other words, the Spanish population. The consolidated urban areas, represented by the other clusters, are the areas which have generated the second hand housing market and have suffered Spanish population emigration. At the same time, these are the areas where the Non-EU foreign immigration of the last 5 years has settled. In short, the suburbanization areas’ growth has been due to the Spanish intra-metropolitan immigration; whereas the growth of the emigration areas (or reduced

1 Symbols represent the direction and the intensity of the evolution. ▲ more intensity, ▲ normal intensity
decline) has been due to the arrival of the foreigners. In other words, we have found the relationship between the residential mobility and the Non-EU foreigner settlement.

5. Conclusions

The aim of this paper has been to analyse the relationship between the residential mobility produced by the suburbanization in the MAB and the settlement of the mass arrival of Non-EU immigration over the last years. For that, we have studied; firstly, the suburbanization process by the migration balances; secondly, the Non-EU foreigner metropolitan settlement; thirdly, the relationship between these variables; and finally, the settlement relationship with the residential characteristics.

The migration balances for each municipality around different periods, shows how from the 1980s, the MAB have experienced an important suburbanization and metropolization process, being two the main dynamics: the mass emigration from the central cities towards the metropolitan periphery and the emigration from the largest metropolitan cities toward smaller cities. Thus, to understand the MAB’s suburbanization it is necessary to place attention on those two factors: the location and the city size.

On the other hand, the Non-EU foreigners’ metropolitan settlement follows more or less the general population distribution. However, if we compare it with Spanish inhabitants’ distribution, the largest and more central cities concentrate a bigger percentage of Non-EU foreigners. On the other hand, the different nationalities do not settle in same way. These broad differences have been highlighted.

The cross of migration balances (for the suburbanization period) and the Non-EU percentage of the whole population, have shown the relationship between metropolitan residential mobility and foreigners’ settlement, but have not indicated a direct relation. The municipalities which have gained Spanish population have a lower percentage of foreigners, whereas the cities that have lost Spanish population attract Non-EU migration flows. However, if the cross have would do with more detail territorial level, we expect that correlation would be bigger. Our analysis only compares inter-municipal migrations but not intra-municipal ones; some cases studied show the importance of intra-municipal residential mobility, which show a stronger relationship between residential mobility and immigrants’ settlement.

Nevertheless, the settlement analysis related to the residential characteristics, shows the same tendency, which follows our hypothesis. From 2001 to 2005 (mass foreign immigration period), while the newest residential growth has been due to the arrival of Spanish population, the older areas have grown due to foreigners. Thus, foreigners have settled in the second hand housing market areas, which have a different kind of stock: inferior conditions, high percentage of rental tenure or similar as well as MAB’s general stock. In these areas second hand house vacancies are produced by residential mobility, which in the MAB has a strong link with the suburbanization process, as has been seen in this paper.
By different analyses, we have found the relationship between residential mobility and Non-EU foreigners’ settlement, albeit that the relationship is not direct. Of course, international migration settlement is a complex phenomenon, with many different factors which influence it, and residential mobility is just one of them. However, the analytical perspective used in this paper, could be very useful, to understand social composition changes in the neighbourhoods which are becoming very diverse in a few years.
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