

# Metropolitan Labour Markets, Peripheral Labour Markets and Socio-economic Outcomes among Immigrants to Israel<sup>1</sup>

---

Moshe Semyonov\*, Noah Lewin-Epstein\* and Anat Yom-Tov\*

## ABSTRACT

This article focuses on the impact of the local opportunity structure on socio-economic outcomes of recent immigrants to Israel. Specifically, it examines the extent to which metropolitan labour markets versus peripheral labour markets differentially affect socio-economic incorporation of recent "Russian" immigrants who arrived in Israel after the collapse of the former Soviet Union in 1989.

Using the 1995 Israeli Census of Population, the analyses address the following questions: (1) were recent immigrants differentially sorted to local labour markets; (2) do local labour markets differentially affect socio-economic attainment; and (3) do modes of socio-economic attainment and patterns of ethnic inequality differ across metropolitan and peripheral labour markets?

The analyses reveal that immigrants from the European republics and of lower education are more likely to settle in peripheral labour markets than in metropolitan labour markets. Peripheral labour markets, compared with metropolitan labour markets, have detrimental consequences for the socio-economic outcomes of immigrants.

The data do not provide strong support for the thesis that patterns of socio-economic attainment and inequality differ much across labour markets. The rules according to which socio-economic attainment of immigrants is determined are, for the most part, similar across labour markets. In general, occupational status and earnings of immigrants are likely to increase with the passage of time, education, European origin; and to decline with age regardless of type of the local labour market. However, the socio-economic

---

\* Faculty of Social Sciences, Tel Aviv University, Israel.

outcomes of immigrants are considerably higher in the metropolis than in the periphery.

The findings suggest that the local labour market plays a major role in the determination of immigrants' socio-economic rewards and outcomes.

## INTRODUCTION

Students of international migration and socio-economic inequality have long studied immigrants' incorporation into the labour market of the host society. Literature on the topic has arrived at a two-fold conclusion. First, most immigrants experience hardship in the transition from the labour market of origin to the labour market of destination. Second, the hardship is most pronounced upon arrival, but tends to decrease over time. As immigrants gain better knowledge of the labour market of the new society, they experience upward occupational and economic mobility. This basic pattern has been observed repeatedly in immigrant societies such as the US, Canada, Australia and Israel (e.g., Bailey, 1987; Long, 1980; Chiswick and Miller, 1988; Evans and Kelly, 1991; Semyonov, 1997; Chiswick, 1982; Portes and Rumbaut, 1990; Jasso and Rosenzweig, 1990; Bloom and Gunderson, 1990).

Although the literature on labour market incorporation of immigrants has become substantial, little attention has been given to the impact of local opportunity structures on the socio-economic outcomes of immigrants. This neglect is unfortunate since the local opportunity structure is viewed as a major source of socio-economic inequality (Blau and Duncan, 1967; Spilerman and Habib, 1976; Lewin-Epstein and Semyonov, 1992; Semyonov, 1981). More specifically, stratification literature suggests that socio-economic achievements and outcomes of individuals are dependent both on their human resources and the characteristics of the local labour market in which they work. For example, opportunities for socio-economic success are greater in large urban labour markets than in small rural communities (Blau and Duncan, 1967). As a result, part of the socio-economic disparities among population groups can be attributed to the local opportunity structure.

In this article we study the impact of the local opportunity structure on socio-economic outcomes of recent immigrants who arrived in Israel after the downfall of the former Soviet Union in 1989. Specifically, the analysis addresses the following questions: (1) were recent immigrants differentially sorted to metropolitan and peripheral labour markets; (2) to what extent does the local labour market affect socio-economic attainment; and (3) whether, and to what extent, modes of socio-economic attainment and patterns of socio-economic inequality differ across metropolitan and peripheral labour markets? By so doing, we will be in a position to examine theoretical propositions

regarding the effect of the local labour market on immigrants' socio-economic success and labour market incorporation in host societies.

## THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Most immigrants tend to enter the host society at the bottom of the labour market. Lack of language skills and limited knowledge of the labour market forces many new immigrants to take less desirable jobs and to compromise for less rewarding occupations. As a result, many immigrants experience downward occupational mobility and receive low returns on human capital resources compared with the native-born population. With the passage of time, however, immigrants acquire language proficiency, gain cultural skills, and obtain better access to information sources and networks. Consequently, with length of residence, immigrants improve monotonously their relative position in the labour market and hence their socio-economic outcomes (Long, 1980; Bailey, 1987; Semyonov, 1996; Bloom and Gunderson, 1990).

Notwithstanding wide support for the linear view of immigrant incorporation and assimilation into the labour market of the host society, studies have revealed that not all groups experience similar rates of socio-economic success. Some are more successful than others. For example, while immigrants of European origin fare well in the US, Mexican immigrants (whether documented or not) lag behind even after many years of residence in the new country (Borjas, 1982; Borjas and Tienda, 1993; Portes and Rumbaut, 1990). In Canada and Australia, immigrants from Southern European or Mediterranean origin are socio-economically disadvantaged compared with other immigrants (Boyd et al., 1980; Chiswick and Miller, 1988; Jones, 1992; Evans and Kelley, 1992). In Israel, Jewish immigrants from North Africa and the Middle East are disadvantaged compared with immigrants from Europe or America, even after many years in the country (Semyonov, 1997; Haberfeld, 1993; Semyonov and Lerenthal, 1991).

Researchers have pointed out that period of migration is also an important determinant of future success in the host society. Period represents a "vintage effect" or "the context of reception" (Portes and Bach, 1985; Semyonov and Lerenthal, 1991; Light et al., 1993; Lee, 1996; Rajman and Semyonov, 1998). In other words, the conditions that exist at time of immigration tend to influence opportunities for employment, occupational mobility, and earning capacity. These may have long-lasting effects: immigrant groups that arrive during periods of economic growth are more successful economically than immigrant groups that arrive during periods of economic decline.

While immigrant economic assimilation is affected by macro-level factors, it is also influenced by the local labour market in which immigrants carry out

their economic activity. The local labour market defines the opportunity structure – the economic arena – faced by immigrants. Local labour markets differ in size and are often characterized by different industrial structures and occupational composition. Whereas large metropolitan centres are characterized by diversified and intensive division of labour and an abundant supply of lucrative jobs, peripheral and rural labour markets are characterized by a limited industrial base and restricted occupational opportunities (Duncan and Riess, 1956; Blau and Duncan, 1967; Spilerman and Habib, 1976; Semyonov, 1981; Lewin-Epstein and Semyonov, 1992). Thus, the local labour market is expected to affect socio-economic outcomes, namely the attainment of occupational status and earnings.

There are two ways in which the local labour market can affect socio-economic inequality among immigrants. The first is additive – the local labour market is an additional factor that affects socio-economic success of individuals. That is, individuals' socio-economic outcomes and rewards are determined not only by their human capital attributes, but also by the characteristics of the local labour market in which they are employed (Semyonov, 1981). The local labour market is viewed as an additional factor that determines labour market outcomes. The second way in which the local labour market can affect socio-economic outcomes and patterns of inequality is interactive. That is, the local opportunity structure interacts with immigrants' characteristics to produce divergent patterns of socio-economic attainment across labour markets. For example, one would expect that socio-economic returns to education (or other human-capital resources) would be higher in metropolitan labour markets than in peripheral labour markets. Similarly, one would expect that the effect of ethnicity (or other ascriptive characteristics) would be less pronounced in metropolitan centres than in peripheral communities.

## THE ISRAELI SETTING

Israel is a multi-ethnic society in which Jews constitute 80 per cent of the population and Arabs almost 20 per cent.<sup>2</sup> About 50 per cent of Israel's Jewish population are first generation immigrants and most of the others are second generation immigrants. Jews immigrated to Israel from many countries in several waves. Immigration to Palestine began at the turn of the century, mostly from Central and East European countries, but mass immigration began immediately after statehood (1948). This wave was characterized by European survivors of the Holocaust, along with refugees from Middle Eastern and North African countries. In less than five years the Jewish population in Israel more than doubled from 600,000 to 1.5 million. During the following decades (1960s to 1980s) immigration declined and was rather scattered and sporadic, being affected by political, economic and social conditions in countries of origin. However, immigration reached a new peak in 1989-1990 when, after the collapse

of the former Soviet Union, Jews began emigrating from their republics of origin. As a result, the population of Israel increased by almost 20 per cent during a five-year period<sup>3</sup> (Raijman and Semyonov, 1998; Doron and Kargar, 1993).

While early arrivals to Palestine (mostly of European origin) found residence in or near the urban centres, soon after the period of mass immigration (after the establishment of the State), a policy of population dispersion was enacted and immigrants (mostly from North Africa) were directed to newly-created development towns in peripheral regions. New labour-intensive industries that offered primarily low-paying jobs were established in these towns to provide employment for the immigrants. These peripheral towns are still characterized by limited industrial and occupational structures and a high concentration of immigrants from North Africa and their descendents.

Local opportunity structure, and especially the distinction between peripheral and urban labour markets, has been identified as a major source of socio-economic inequality in Israeli society, especially with regard to immigrants from Asia and North Africa who arrived immediately after statehood (Spilerman and Habib, 1975; Kraus and Weintraub, 1981; Semyonov, 1981; Lewin-Epstein and Semyonov, 1992). These studies suggest that socio-economic disadvantages of North African and Asian Jews are, at least in part, due to their overrepresentation in peripheral districts and development towns. The periphery differs from metropolitan districts in opportunity structure as well as in levels of socio-economic outcomes. These are largely a result of market processes than centralized state policies. In fact, considerable State efforts have been directed, with little success, to peripheral communities to stimulate the peripheral economy and narrow socio-economic gaps.

During the last decade Israel established a policy of "direct absorption" (Doron and Kruger, 1993). Under this policy, immigrants were provided a lump sum in cash and services (an absorption basket) to cover living expenses. They could decide regarding location of residence and purchase of housing. Consequently, recent immigrants from the former Soviet Union established residence both in the urban centres and in the peripheral communities (Raijman and Semyonov, 1998). This provides opportunity to examine the impact of the local labour market on socio-economic attainment of immigrants shortly after their arrival. In this article we evaluate whether and to what extent residence in the periphery still has detrimental impacts on opportunities for economic success.

## DATA AND VARIABLES

Data for the analysis were obtained from the 1995 Census of Population carried out by the Israel Central Bureau of Statistics. A 20 per cent sample provided individual-level information on demographic, social and labour force character-

istics. The population selected for analysis included male and female immigrants aged 25-65 years who arrived in Israel from the former Soviet Union after 1989 (hereafter recent immigrants).<sup>4</sup> This definition yielded a sample of 16,038 economically active immigrant men and 14,966 economically active immigrant women. We distinguished between residence in communities that constitute the three major metropolitan centres of Tel Aviv, Haifa and Jerusalem (hereafter metropolitan labour market), versus non-metropolitan and peripheral communities (hereafter peripheral labour market).<sup>5</sup>

The variables selected for analysis focus on two indicators of socio-economic outcomes: occupational status<sup>6</sup> and monthly earnings. Following the literature, seven variables were used as determinants of socio-economic outcomes. These include education, age, marital status, years since migration, hours of work, ethnic origin<sup>7</sup> and gender (for definition of variables see Table 1, page 112). Following previous studies on immigrants' success in the labour market, we expected socio-economic outcomes to increase with education, age, years since migration and hours of work. We also expected socio-economic outcomes to be higher among men, married immigrants, and immigrants from European republics (Haberfeld et al., 2000). Because past research had repeatedly demonstrated that attainment of labour market outcomes is differentially determined for men and women, the analysis is carried out separately for the two gender groups.

## ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Table 1 presents the mean characteristics of economically active immigrants from the former Soviet Union in metropolitan and peripheral labour markets. The majority of immigrants (two-thirds) had chosen residence in metropolitan centres. The data reveal some differences between immigrants in the two labour markets which hold for both men and women and are especially evident with regard to socio-economic characteristics and outcomes.

On average, immigrants in metropolitan labour markets are characterized by higher levels of formal education than immigrants in peripheral labour markets. They also hold occupations of higher socio-economic status and enjoy higher earnings. When considering the difference in working hours between workers in the periphery and workers in the metropolitan centres (the former work longer hours than the latter), the disparity in earnings is even more pronounced.

The first question examined by this research is whether recent immigrants were differentially sorted into the two labour markets. We estimated logit regression models in which the likelihood for residence in the metropolitan (versus peripheral) labour market is predicted by ethnicity, education, age, marital status, and years since migration. The general form of the estimation model is:

$$\ln\left(\frac{p}{1-p}\right) = a + \sum b_i x_i + \sum c_i d_i$$

where  $p$  is the probability of residence in the metropolitan labour market,  $x$  is a vector of covariates such as years since migration, education, and age,  $d$  represents dichotomous variables such as ethnic origin, marital status and gender,  $a$  is the intercept and  $b$  and  $c$  are the coefficient estimates representing the effects of the covariates and the dichotomous variables, respectively, on the dependant variable. Although we do not expect different sorting processes for men and women, analysis was undertaken for the total population and for the two gender groups separately in order to maintain consistency with the rest of the analyses. The parameter estimates of the models are presented in Table 2 (page 113).

The results of the logit analysis are similar for both men and women and patterns of residence are not random with respect to immigrants' characteristics. Rather, immigrants are sorted into local labour markets, at least partly, on the basis of their social and demographic characteristics. Ethnic origin, marital status, years since migration, and education, all exert significant effects on the odds for residence in metropolitan versus peripheral labour markets. Specifically, immigrants with higher education and those who have been in Israel for a longer period are more likely to establish residence in the metropolis, whereas, other things being equal, immigrants of European origin and married immigrants are more likely to establish residence in peripheral communities.<sup>8</sup>

At the outset of this article we suggested that occupational and economic outcomes of immigrants are enhanced by the metropolitan labour market compared with peripheral labour markets, for two reasons. First, the former markets are characterized by greater abundance of high-status and lucrative jobs. Hence, employment is likely to increase socio-economic outcomes. Second, the former markets are more likely to operate according to universal criteria, i.e., rewards are more likely to be determined by human capital resources than by ascriptive characteristics.

To test these hypotheses we estimated a series of regression models. In model 1 we test for the additive effect hypothesis of the local labour market on socio-economic outcomes. In this model we predict occupational status as a function of ethnicity, gender, education, age, marital status, years since migration *plus* the distinction between metropolitan (coded 1) and peripheral labour markets (controlling for industrial structure of the labour market).<sup>9</sup> In models 2 and 3 we predict occupational attainment of immigrants in each labour market separately. In model 4 immigrants in the two labour markets are pooled and interaction terms between the labour market and individual characteristics are added to provide a comprehensive statistical test for the interaction model against the additive model. The results are presented in Table 3 (pages 114-115).

The findings from model 1 provide firm support for the additive effect hypothesis. Coefficients reveal that employment in the metropolitan labour market is associated with net gain of occupational status. Even after controlling for social and demographic characteristics of immigrants as well as the industrial structure of the labour market, the occupational status of workers in metropolitan labour markets is higher than of workers in peripheral labour markets by 2.13 points for men and 1.93 points for women. A 2-point difference in status scores corresponds, for example, to the difference between food service employees (a score of 25) and salespersons (27), or between metal workers (29) and mechanics (31).

In addition to the effect of the local labour market on occupational attainment, data in model 1 reveal significant effects of ethnicity, education, age and years since migration. Thus, European origin and education are likely to increase occupational status while age is likely to decrease occupational attainment. Net of social and demographic characteristics, and controlling for the type of local labour market, occupational status of immigrants tends to rise with the passage of time in the host country. Specifically, the occupational status of immigrant men increases by an average of 2.52 points for every year of residence, while the status of women increases by 4.00 points for every year.

Models 2 and 3 pertain to the attainment of occupational status in metropolitan and peripheral labour markets, respectively. The coefficients provide only partial support for the hypothesis that status returns on human capital attributes are higher in the metropolitan than in the local labour markets. The data show that immigrants' status returns on education are higher in the metropolitan labour market than in the periphery, although the differences are not significant at the conventional level of statistical tests. Specifically, status returns in the metropolitan market for every year of education are 3.16 points and 3.28 points for men and women, respectively, compared with 2.73 and 2.77 points in the periphery. European origin has a positive significant effect on occupational outcomes in the metropolitan labour market (for both men and women), but not in the periphery.

Findings regarding years since migration reveal a substantial rise in occupational status within a six-year period, both in the metropolitan area and in the periphery. Contrary to our expectations, however, the rate of increase per year is more pronounced in the periphery than in the metropolitan labour market in the case of women (3.83 vs. 4.39), although the difference is not statistically significant. In the case of men, occupational status returns on years since migration are exactly the same.

Model 4 in Table 3 provides a statistical test for the interaction effect. The results reaffirm the findings and conclusions derived from the coefficients of models 2 and 3. The positive and significant interaction between metropolitan



residence and education indicates that occupational status returns on education are higher in the metropolis than in the periphery (for women only). That is, while education tends to increase occupational status of all immigrants, the educational payoffs for women are higher in the urban markets than in the peripheral markets. Occupational advantages associated with European origin are similar in the metropolis and the periphery (the interaction term between labour market and ethnicity is not significant). The occupational status of immigrants is likely to rise with years of residence. The negative effect of the interaction term between metropolitan market and years since migration (in the case of women) indicates that, contrary to theoretical expectations, rise in status is more rapid in the periphery. It should be noted, however, that this effect is significant in the model for women but not in the model for men.

In Table 4 (pages 116-117) we test for the additive (model 1) and interactive effect (models 2, 3 and 4) of the local labour market on immigrants' earnings. In model 1, monthly earnings are predicted by ethnicity, education, age, marital status, years since migration, hours of work,<sup>10</sup> occupational status,<sup>11</sup> and the local labour market in which one is employed. Models 2 and 3 are estimated separately for the metropolitan and the peripheral labour markets (thus, type of local labour market is not included in the equations). In model 4, interaction terms between individual characteristics and the local labour market are added to the model to statistically test the interaction effects. All equations control for the industrial structure by adding a series of 9 dummy variables, each representing a major economic branch. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 4.

Findings with regard to the additive effect (model 1) are consistent for both men and women. Other things being equal, employment in the metropolitan centre provides workers with net gains in earnings which amount to 7 per cent for men and 5 per cent for women. This finding supports the "additive effect" hypothesis, i.e., metropolitan labour markets provide immigrants, both men and women, not only with a substantial increment in occupational status, but also with a substantial earnings increment.<sup>12</sup>

Earnings tend to rise with education, occupational status and hours of work, and to decrease with age. Earnings are likely to be higher among married immigrants and immigrants of European origin. Immigrants' monthly earnings are also likely to rise with length of residence in the new country.

Models 2 and 3 provide only partial support for the hypothesis that immigrants in the metropolitan centres receive higher returns on labour market relevant characteristics. Although the earnings returns for education, hours of work, and occupational status are higher in the metropolitan markets than in the peripheral markets, differences between the markets, for the most part, are rather small, if not negligible. The same is true for the rise in earnings with years of residency, which is only slightly higher in the metropolitan labour markets than in the

periphery. Finally, while ethnicity has a stronger effect on earnings in the periphery in the case of men, it has no significant impact on earnings in the case of women.

The findings revealed by model 4 indicate that the differences in earnings returns between metropolitan and peripheral labour markets are statistically insignificant for all variables except two – occupational status (for men) and hours of work (for women). Specifically, earnings returns on occupational status are significantly higher in the metropolis than in the periphery. Similarly, earnings returns on hours of work are significantly higher in the metropolis than in the periphery (the increment in earnings is higher by 2 per cent in the metropolis than in the periphery for each hour of work for women).

## CONCLUSIONS

The goal of the present study was to compare immigrants in two types of local labour markets: metropolitan and peripheral. The analysis focused on economically active immigrants who arrived in Israel from the former Soviet Union after 1989. The analysis revealed that immigrants are not randomly distributed across local labour markets, but their settlement patterns are associated with their social and demographic attributes. Unlike previous immigration patterns, immigrants of European origin are more likely to settle in the periphery than are immigrants from Asian republics. However, similar to the previous immigration pattern, lower education and recency of arrival are also associated with greater probability of residence in the periphery.

The data do not, however, provide consistent support for the thesis that the local labour market exerts an interactive effect on socio-economic attainment of immigrants. The rules according to which immigrants are rewarded are, for the most part, quite similar across the two labour markets. That is, regardless of the labour market, immigrants' occupational status and earnings are likely to rise with education and European origin, and to decline with age. Occupational status and earnings are likely to rise with the passage of time in the host society. As immigrants become more knowledgeable of the new society, they steadily and monotonously improve their relative position in the labour market. This pattern is evident both in the periphery and in the metropolis.

The data show that in comparison with metropolitan labour markets, peripheral labour markets have detrimental consequences for the socio-economic outcomes of immigrants. In other words, net of social and demographic characteristics, the socio-economic outcomes of immigrants in the metropolitan markets are considerably higher than the outcomes of immigrants in the periphery. Apparently the advantageous opportunity structure of the metropolis rewards immigrants in the metropolis with occupational and earnings "bonus" or "premium".

## NOTES

1. An earlier version of this article was presented at the Taiwan-Israel Workshop, Taipei, January 2000, and at the IZA Workshop on Migration and Labour Markets, January 2000. The authors wish to thank Aziza Khazzoom for helpful comments and suggestions and Yasmin Alkalay for organization of the data set.
2. In general, Arab migration is not permitted under Israel's migration policy, so the present analysis does not pertain to this population.
3. During this period, Israel absorbed over 10,000 immigrants from Ethiopia. This group is strikingly different from other recent groups. Most arrived with very little formal education and experience with market economy. As a result, most were settled by the state in absorption centres in the periphery. It is therefore not possible to contrast the experience of these immigrants in peripheral and metropolitan labour markets.
4. Immigrants who had been in Israel less than one year were excluded from the analysis.
5. It would have been useful to have information on internal migration in Israel. However, the Israeli census does not provide such information. Using data from the survey on immigrants, we find that only 8 per cent of the immigrants changed residence between 1992 and 1994 (i.e., in both directions). It should also be emphasized that very little commuting exists between the two types of local labour markets. Using data from a survey on immigrants, we found that only 6.7 per cent of the labour force in peripheral communities commute daily to metropolitan centres and only 2.8 per cent of immigrants residing in metropolitan areas are employed outside the metropolitan labour market.
6. The 100-point socio-economic scale for occupations in Israel for 2-digit occupations was computed by Semyonov et al. (2001) using the 1995 census of population. The index was computed as the linear combination of the mean education and mean earnings of occupations.
7. In Israel, Jews from European republics are ranked above immigrants from the Asian republics in most aspects of social stratification (see Habersfeld et al., 2000).
8. This is contrary to our expectations and we do not have any definite explanation for this finding. It may be related to a higher tendency among immigrants of European origin to purchase their own housing. This would lead them to peripheral communities where housing is less expensive.
9. A set of 9 dummy variables was added to all equations as controls for the industrial structure of the labour market. Each dummy variable pertains to a major economic branch (or industrial sector) defined at the 1-digit classification level.
10. Since hours of work are reported only per week and earnings are reported only per month, we use the usual weekly hours as a predictor of monthly earnings.
11. Occupational status is included in the set of predictors in order to examine the effect of human capital resources on earnings net of occupational attainment.
12. It is possible that the earnings gap between peripheral and metropolitan labour markets is due also to difference in cost of living. In light of the consistent occupational advantages associated with metropolitan residence, and the fact that Israel is a small country, we are inclined to believe that the earnings disparities due to labour markets are "real".

## REFERENCES

- Bailey, T.  
1987 *Immigrants and Native Workers: Contrasts and Competition*, Westview, Boulder, Colorado.
- Blau, P.M., and O.D. Duncan  
1967 *The American Occupational Structure*, Free Press, Wiley, New York.
- Bloom, D.E., and M. Gunderson  
1990 "An analysis of the earnings of Canadian immigrants", in R. Freeman, and J.M. Abowd (Eds), *Immigration, Trade and Labour Market*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Borjas, G.  
1982 "The earnings of male Hispanic immigrants in the United States", *Industrial and Labour Relation Review*, 35: 343-353.
- Borjas, G., and M. Tienda  
1993 "The employment and wages of legalized immigrants", *International Migration Review*, 27: 712-748.
- Boyd, M., D.L. Featherman, and J. Matras  
1980 "Status attainment of immigrant-origin categories in the United States, Canada and Israel", *Comparative Social Research*, 3: 199-228.
- Chiswick, B.  
1982 *The Employment of Immigrants in the United States*, American Enterprise Institute, Washington, DC.
- Chiswick, B., and P. Miller  
1988 "Earning in Canada: The roles of immigrant generation, French ethnicity and language", *Research in Population Economics*, 6: 183-224.
- Doron, A., and H. Kargar  
1993 "The politics of immigration policy in Israel", *International Migration*, 31: 497-512.
- Duncan, O.D., and A.J. Reiss  
1956 *Social Characteristics of Urban and Rural Communities, 1950*, John Wiley and Sons, New York.
- Evans, M.D., and J. Kelly  
1991 "Prejudice, discrimination, and the labour market: attainment of immigrants in Australia", *American Journal of Sociology*, 97: 721-759.
- Haberfeld, Y.  
1993 "Immigration and ethnic origin: the effect of demographic attributes on earnings of Israeli men and women", *International Migration Review*, 29: 286-305.
- Haberfeld, Y., M. Semyonov, and Y. Cohen  
2000 "Ethnicity and labour market performance among recent immigrants from the former Soviet Union to Israel", *European Sociological Review*, 16(3).
- Jasso, G., and M.R. Rosenzweig  
1990 *The New Chosen People*, Russell Sage Foundation, New York.
- Jones, F.L.  
1992 *Sex and Ethnicity in the Australian Labour Market: The Immigrant Experience*, Australian Government Printer (for the Australian Bureau of Statistics), Canberra.

- Kraus, V., and D. Weintraub  
 1981 "Community structure and the status attainment process of the Jewish population in Israel", *Zeitschrift-fur-Soziologie*, 10(4): 364-378.
- Lee, S.  
 1996 "Issues in research on women: international migration and labour", *Asian and Pacific Journal*, 5(1): 5-26.
- Lewin-Epstein, N., and M. Semyonov  
 1992 "Local labour markets, ethnic segregation, and income inequality", *Social Forces*, 71(4): 1101-1119.
- Light, I., P. Bhachu, and S. Karageorgis  
 1993 "Migration network and immigrant entrepreneurship", in I. Light, and P. Bhachu (Eds), *Immigration and Entrepreneurship: Culture, Capital and Social Networks*, Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick: 25-49.
- Long, J.E.  
 1980 "The effect of Americanization on earnings: some evidence for women", *Journal of Political Economy*, 88: 620-629.
- Portes, A., and R. Bach  
 1985 *Latin Journey: Cuban and Mexican Immigration to the United States*, University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Portes, A., and R. Rumbaut  
 1990 *Immigrant America: A Portrait*, University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Raijman, R., and M. Semyonov  
 1998 "Best of times, worst of times, and occupational mobility: the case of Soviet immigrants in Israel", *International Migration*, 36(3): 291-310.
- Semyonov, M.  
 1981 "Effects of community on status attainment", *Sociological Quarterly*, 22: 359-372.  
 1996 "On the cost of being an immigrant in Israel: the effect of tenure, ethnicity and gender", *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, 15: 115-131.
- Semyonov, M., and T. Lerenthal  
 1991 "Country of origin, gender and the attainment of socio-economic status: a study of stratification in the Jewish population of Israel", *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, 10: 327-345.
- Semyonov, M., N. Lewin-Epstein, and H. Mandel  
 2001 "Updated socio-economic scale for occupations in Israel", *Megamot*, 40: 706-729 (Hebrew).
- Spilerman, S., and J. Habib  
 1976 "Development towns in Israel: the role of community in creating ethnic disparities in labour force characteristics", *American Journal of Sociology*, 81: 781-812.

TABLE 1  
 MEANS, DEFINITIONS AND STANDARD DEVIATION OF ATTRIBUTES OF IMMIGRANTS (AGE 25-65)  
 WHO ARRIVED IN ISRAEL BETWEEN 1985 TO 1995, CLASSIFIED BY LABOUR MARKETS

	Definition	Metropolitan labour market (MT)			Peripheral labour market (PR)		
		Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women
Education	Years of formal schooling	14.00 (2.92)	13.88 (3.11)	14.12 (2.71)	13.63 (3.04)	13.48 (3.18)	13.80 (2.86)
Earning	Natural Logarithms of monthly earnings	3,085.95 (2,106.44)	3,740.08 (2,186.00)	2,402.57 (1,779.57)	2,811.33 (1,912.56)	3,354.61 (1,926.21)	2,203.24 (1,702.88)
Hours of work	Usual hours per week	43.32 (14.00)	48.57 (12.34)	37.91 (13.54)	44.12 (13.83)	48.88 (12.34)	38.93 (13.50)
Occupational status	100 point scale (see note 5)	37.22 (29.34)	39.54 (30.25)	34.83 (28.17)	32.35 (27.53)	34.56 (27.60)	29.94 (27.25)
Year since migration	In years	3.98 (1.42)	3.92 (1.45)	4.05 (1.38)	3.81 (1.40)	3.74 (1.43)	3.88 (1.37)
Age	In years	41.39 (9.48)	42.08 (9.88)	40.67 (8.98)	41.15 (9.34)	41.83 (9.83)	40.39 (8.7)
Ethnicity	Per cent European republics (versus Asian republics)	86.29	85.80	86.80	88.17	87.78	88.59
Married	Per cent married	80.94	86.19	75.51	83.60	88.97	77.68
Gender	Per cent men	50.84	-	-	52.38	-	-
Number of cases		20,463	10,404	10,059	9,608	5,033	4,576

Source: 1995, Israel Census of Population.

TABLE 2  
 LOGISTIC REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS PREDICTING ODDS  
 FOR RESIDENCE IN METROPOLITAN AREAS FOR RECENT IMMIGRANTS  
 (AGE 25-65)<sup>a</sup>

	Total	Men	Women
Ethnicity (European)	-0.24* (0.04)	-0.25* (0.05)	-0.23* (0.05)
Education	0.04* (0.004)	0.04* (0.005)	0.04* (0.05)
Age	0.002 (0.001)	0.002 (0.002)	0.002 (0.002)
Marital status (married=1)	-0.21* (0.03)	-0.32* (0.05)	-0.14* (0.04)
Years since migration	0.08* (0.008)	0.08* (0.01)	0.08* (0.01)
Gender (men=1)	-0.02 (0.02)	-	-
Constant	0.24* (0.08)	0.29* (0.11)	0.18 (0.13)
-2 Likelihood	37,420.407	19,344.462	18,078.315
X <sup>2</sup>	249.55	147.37	102.597
N	30,071	15,437	14,634
R <sup>2</sup>	0.012	0.013	0.010

Notes: a. standard errors in parentheses.

\* p<.05.

Source: 1995, Israel Census of Population.

TABLE 3a  
 REGRESSION EQUATIONS COEFFICIENTS PREDICTING OCCUPATIONAL  
 STATUS OF RECENT IMMIGRANTS (AGE 25-65) IN METROPOLITAN (MT)  
 AND PERIPHERAL (PR) LABOUR MARKETS<sup>a</sup>

	Men			
	All (1)	MT (2)	PR (3)	All (4)
Ethnicity (European)	3.64* (0.63)	4.33* (0.77)	1.65 (1.07)	1.80 (1.16)
Education	3.05* (0.07)	3.16* (0.09)	2.73* (0.11)	2.87* (0.12)
Age	*-0.34 (0.02)	-0.38* (0.02)	-0.24* (0.04)	-0.24* (0.04)
Marital status (married=1)	0.45 (0.65)	0.33 (0.79)	1.18 (1.13)	1.03 (1.22)
Years since migration	2.52* (0.15)	2.49* (0.19)	2.45* (0.25)	2.59* (0.27)
Metropolitan	2.13* (0.46)	-	-	3.24 (3.09)
Ethnicity x MT	-	-	-	2.59 (1.38)
Education x MT	-	-	-	0.27 (0.15)
Age x MT	-	-	-	-0.14* (0.05)
Marital x MT	-	-	-	-0.73 (1.44)
Years since migration x MT	-	-	-	-0.12 (0.33)
Constant	-10.4* (1.84)	-7.95* (2.25)	-10.26* (3.05)	-11.18* (2.81)
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	0.317	0.310	0.338	0.317
N	13,233	9,030	4,202	13,233

Notes: a. standard errors in parentheses.

\* p<.05.

Source: 1995, Israel Census of Population.



TABLE 3b  
REGRESSION EQUATIONS COEFFICIENTS PREDICTING OCCUPATIONAL  
STATUS OF RECENT IMMIGRANTS (AGE 25-65) IN METROPOLITAN (MT)  
AND PERIPHERAL (PR) LABOUR MARKETS<sup>a</sup>

	Women			
	All (1)	MT (2)	PR (3)	All (4)
Ethnicity (European)	2.89* (0.62)	3.25* (0.75)	1.76 (1.14)	1.79 (1.18)
Education	3.13* (0.07)	3.28* (0.09)	2.77* (0.13)	2.81* (0.13)
Age	-0.59* (0.02)	-0.61* (0.03)	-0.56* (0.04)	-0.56* (0.04)
Marital status (married=1)	0.42 (0.49)	-0.16 (0.58)	1.82 (0.86)	1.81* (0.89)
Years since migration	4.00* (0.15)	3.83* (0.19)	4.39* (0.27)	4.46* (0.27)
Metropolitan	1.93* (0.45)	-	-	0.85 (3.27)
Ethnicity x MT	-	-	-	1.52 (1.39)
Education x MT	-	-	-	0.45* (0.16)
Age x MT	-	-	-	-0.06 (0.05)
Marital x MT	-	-	-	-1.95 (1.07)
Years since migration x MT	-	-	-	-0.67* (0.33)
Constant	-15.22* (1.80)	-14.30* (1.65)	-12.51* (3.16)	-14.46* (2.87)
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	0.309	0.296	0.332	0.310
N	13,124	9,100	4,023	13,124

Notes: a. standard errors in parentheses.

\* p<.05.

Source: 1995, Israel Census of Population.

TABLE 4a  
 REGRESSION EQUATIONS COEFFICIENTS PREDICTING RECENT  
 IMMIGRANTS (AGE 25-65) (LN) EARNINGS IN METROPOLITAN (MT)  
 AND PERIPHERAL (PR) LABOUR MARKETS<sup>a</sup>

	Men			
	All (1)	MT (2)	PR (3)	All (4)
Ethnicity (European)	0.03* (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)	0.06* (0.02)	0.06* (0.02)
Education	0.01* (0.002)	0.01* (0.02)	0.01* (0.003)	0.01* (0.003)
Age	-0.007 (0.00)	-0.007* (0.001)	-0.006* (0.001)	-0.006* (0.001)
Marital status	0.15* (0.01)	0.14* (0.01)	0.17* (0.02)	0.17* (0.02)
Years since migration	0.07* (0.003)	0.07* (0.004)	0.07* (0.005)	0.07* (0.005)
Occupational status	0.006* (0.00)	0.006* (0.00)	0.006* (0.00)	0.006* (0.00)
Hours of work	0.01* (0.00)	0.01* (0.00)	0.009* (0.001)	0.009* (0.001)
Metropolitan	0.07* (0.009)	-	-	0.04 (0.07)
Ethnicity x MT	-	-	-	-0.04 (0.03)
Education x MT	-	-	-	0.0001 (0.003)
Age x MT	-	-	-	0.0004 (0.001)
Marital x MT	-	-	-	-0.03 (0.03)
Years since migration x MT	-	-	-	0.03 (0.007)
Occupational status x MT	-	-	-	0.0009* (0.00)
Hours of work x MT	-	-	-	0.001 (0.001)
Constant	6.81* (0.04)	6.87* (0.05)	6.82* (0.07)	6.83* (0.06)
R <sup>2</sup>	0.312	0.321	0.279	0.312
N	11,941	8,149	3,791	11,941

Notes: a. standard errors in parentheses.

\* p<.05.

Source: 1995, Israel Census of Population.

TABLE 4b  
REGRESSION EQUATIONS COEFFICIENTS PREDICTING RECENT  
IMMIGRANTS (AGE 25-65) (LN) EARNINGS IN METROPOLITAN (MT)  
AND PERIPHERAL (PR) LABOUR MARKETS<sup>a</sup>

	Women			
	All (1)	MT (2)	PR (3)	All (4)
Ethnicity (European)	0.05* (0.01)	0.04* (0.01)	0.07 (0.03)	0.07* (0.03)
Education	0.007* (0.002)	0.008* (0.002)	0.005 (0.003)	0.005 (0.003)
Age	-0.007* (0.001)	-0.007* (0.001)	-0.005* (0.001)	-0.005* (0.001)
Marital status	0.08* (0.01)	0.09* (0.01)	0.07* (0.02)	0.08* (0.02)
Years since migration	0.06* (0.004)	0.06* (0.004)	0.05* (0.006)	0.05* (0.007)
Occupational status	0.009* (0.00)	0.009* (0.00)	0.009* (0.00)	0.009* (0.00)
Hours of work	0.02* (0.00)	0.02* (0.00)	0.02* (0.001)	0.02* (0.001)
Metropolitan	0.05* (0.01)	-	-	-0.03 (0.08)
Ethnicity x MT	-	-	-	-0.02 (0.03)
Education x MT	-	-	-	0.002 (0.004)
Age x MT	-	-	-	-0.002 (0.001)
Marital x MT	-	-	-	0.01 (0.02)
Years since migration x MT	-	-	-	0.01 (0.008)
Occupational status x MT				0.0006 (0.00)
Hours of work x MT				0.02* (0.001)
Constant	5.95* (0.04)	5.95* (0.05)	6.09* (0.08)	6.01* (0.07)
R <sup>2</sup>	0.463	0.478	0.425	0.464
N	11,737	8,155	3,581	11,737

Notes: a. standard errors in parentheses.

\* p<.05.

Source: 1995, Israel Census of Population.

## MARCHES METROPOLITAINS ET PERIPHERIQUES DU TRAVAIL ET REUSSITE SOCIO-ECONOMIQUE DES IMMIGRES EN ISRAEL

Cet article s'intéresse essentiellement aux effets de l'éventail d'opportunités locales sur la réussite socio-économique des immigrés récemment arrivés en Israël. Plus précisément, il examine les influences respectives du marché métropolitain du travail par rapport au marché périphérique sur l'intégration socio-économique des immigrés russes "récents" arrivés en Israël après l'effondrement de l'ex-Union Soviétique en 1989.

Sur la base du recensement israélien de la population de 1995, les analyses effectuées dans ce cadre portent sur les questions suivantes: (1) les immigrés arrivés récemment ont-ils été sciemment dirigés vers les différents marchés locaux du travail; (2) les marchés locaux du travail exercent-ils une influence différente sur la réussite socio-économique; (3) existe-t-il des types de réussite socio-économique différents et des inégalités à caractère ethnique entre les marchés du travail métropolitains et périphériques?

Ces analyses révèlent que les immigrés des républiques européennes et ceux qui ont un niveau d'éducation plus faible ont davantage de chances de se faire une place sur les marchés périphériques du travail que sur les marchés métropolitains. Les premiers, par comparaison avec les seconds, ont des conséquences néfastes sur la réussite socio-économique des immigrés.

Les données recueillies ne plaident pas de façon claire en faveur de la thèse selon laquelle il y aurait de nettes différences entre les différents types de marchés du travail en termes de réussite socio-économique et d'inégalité. Les règles qui dictent le niveau de réussite des immigrés sont en majeure partie similaires d'un type de marché à l'autre. Le temps qui passe, l'éducation et l'origine européenne sont des facteurs qui favorisent de manière générale la progression du statut professionnel et des revenus des immigrés. Ce statut et ces revenus sont plutôt susceptibles de décliner avec l'âge, quel que soit le type de marché du travail. Néanmoins, la réussite socio-économique des immigrés est considérablement plus élevée en zone métropolitaine que dans la périphérie. Les conclusions de l'étude montrent que le marché local du travail joue un rôle majeur dans la détermination de la réussite socio-économique des immigrés.

## MERCADOS LABORALES METROPOLITANOS, MERCADOS LABORALES PERIFÉRICOS Y RESULTADOS SOCIOECONÓMICOS ENTRE LOS INMIGRANTES A ISRAEL

Este artículo se concentra en el impacto de la estructura de oportunidades locales en los resultados socioeconómicos de los recientes inmigrantes a Israel.

Concretamente, examina la medida en que los mercados laborales metropolitanos en comparación a los mercados laborales periféricos afectan diferencialmente la incorporación socioeconómica de los recientes inmigrantes “rusos”, que llegaron a Israel tras el desmembramiento de la ex Unión Soviética en 1989.

Utilizando el Censo de Población Israelí de 1995, el análisis encara las siguientes cuestiones: (1) los recientes inmigrantes fueron distribuidos diferencialmente en los mercados laborales locales; (2) los mercados laborales locales afectan diferencialmente los logros socioeconómicos; y (3) las modalidades de logros socioeconómicos y los patrones de desigualdad étnica difieren entre los mercados laborales metropolitanos y periféricos?

Los análisis revelan que los inmigrantes de las repúblicas europeas y de menor instrucción tienen mayor tendencia a asentarse en mercados laborales periféricos. Los mercados laborales periféricos, en comparación con los mercados laborales metropolitanos, tienen consecuencias negativas para los resultados socioeconómicos de los inmigrantes.

Los datos no apoyan verdaderamente la hipótesis de que los patrones de logros socioeconómicos y de desigualdad difieran mucho entre ambos mercados laborales. Las reglas a las que se atienen los logros socioeconómicos de los inmigrantes son, en su mayoría, similares en ambos mercados laborales. Por lo general, la situación profesional y los ingresos de los inmigrantes habrán de incrementarse con el paso del tiempo, a través de la educación y para quienes tienen origen europeo, y habrán de disminuir con la edad, sea cual sea el tipo de mercado laboral local. Ello no obstante, los resultados socioeconómicos de los inmigrantes son considerablemente superiores en la zona metropolitana que en la periferia. Los resultados sugieren que el mercado laboral local desempeña una función esencial en la determinación de las recompensas y resultados socioeconómicos de los inmigrantes.