DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES

I Z A

The Employment, Unemployment and Unemployment Compensation Benefits of Immigrants

Barry R. Chiswick
Michael E. Hurst

March 2000

The Employment, Unemployment and Unemployment Compensation Benefits of Immigrants

Barry R. Chiswick
University of Illinois at Chicago and IZA, Bonn

Michael E. Hurst
University of Illinois at Chicago

ABSTRACT

The Employment, Unemployment and Unemployment Compensation Benefits of Immigrants

This report analyzes the employment and unemployment experiences of adult foreign-born men, both among themselves and in comparison with the native born. The empirical analysis uses microdata from the 1990 Census of Population. Three dependent variables are analyzed, weeks worked (employment) in 1989, unemployment status in the reference week in 1990, and a proxy measure of unemployment compensation benefits received in 1989. The theoretical model focuses on the job search behavior of the foreign born within the context of an immigrant adjustment model based on the imperfect transferability of skills and labor market information acquired prior to immigration. In particular, the model focuses on the effects on employment and unemployment of schooling, labor market experience, marital status and the agricultural sector, in addition to English language fluency and country of origin. The hypotheses developed from the model are found to be consistent with the data. Employment is significantly lower, and unemployment is significantly higher, among the foreign born in the U.S. for three or fewer years, but then reaches a level after which there is little variation by duration of residence. Unemployment problems associated with immigrants appear to be short-term transitional adjustments.

Barry R. Chiswick
Department of Economics
University of Illinois at Chicago
601 South Morgan Street
Chicago, IL 60607-7121
USA
Tel.: +1-312 996-2684
Fax: +1-312 996-3344
Email: brchis@uic.edu

I. Introduction

In the past two decades there has been renewed interest in the economic adjustment of immigrants and the impact of immigrants on the labor market and economy of the United States. This has resulted from an increase in the scale of immigration, from 252,000 per year in the 1950's to over 734,000 per year in the 1980s, and to over 900,000 per year in the 1990's. The foreign born have increased to over 10 percent of the labor force.[1]

The analysis of immigrant economic adjustment has focused primarily on hourly or weekly earnings and to a lesser extent on occupational mobility. These are important issues for understanding the economic well-being of immigrants and for determining the progress of their economic assimilation. Another important dimension, however, of the economic adjustment of immigrants is the degree of their employment, unemployment and receipt of unemployment compensation benefits. The employment and unemployment experiences of immigrants, and their receipt of unemployment compensation benefits, are important for analyzing the annual income of immigrants, and their impact in the labor market, as well as for societal interests in unemployment per se.

During the Depression of the 1930s and in the early post-war years when there was a fear of the return of the Great Depression, there was interest in the unemployment of immigrants. Even then there were few studies, with Fields (1935) and Rubin (1947) being two notable exceptions. The more recent resurgence in immigration and the implications for unemployment have resulted in little additional research on the topic. There have, however, been two studies analyzing the unemployment of the foreign born, using micro-data from the 1970 Census of Population and the 1976 Survey of Income and Education (SIE) in Chiswick (1982) and the microdata from a pooling of several samples from the Current Population Survey in Chiswick, Cohen and Zach (1997).

As it is likely that immigration will continue at the current levels, the share of immigrants in the labor market, currently at over 10 percent, will continue to grow. Moreover, immigrants are not uniformly distributed across the population, but rather tend to be concentrated in a few states, most notably California, Texas, Florida, New York, New Jersey and Illinois. This can, in principle, place a disproportionate impact of immigrants on the unemployment compensation programs of selected states.

This paper analyzes the employment and unemployment experiences of adult male immigrants using micro-data from the 1990 Census of Population. It also develops an algorithm for analyzing the receipt of unemployment compensation benefits by the

foreign born. Section II develops the model or conceptual framework used for the analysis. The data to be analyzed are presented in section III. Section IV analyzes in turn the three dependent variables, weeks worked in 1989 (employment), unemployment in the reference week in 1990 (the last week in March 1990), and a proxy for "unemployment compensation" benefits received in 1989. The analysis will focus on immigrant related variables, such as nativity, duration in the United States, citizenship status, whether or not fluent in English, and specific country of birth.

II.   The Models: Theoretical and Empirical[2]

This section develops the theoretical framework for analyzing immigrant employment and unemployment. It examines the job search behavior of immigrants in comparison with the native born, and among the foreign born by duration in the U.S., country of origin and other characteristics. Because of the less than perfect transferability of skills and labor market information, immigrants are at a disadvantage when they enter the United States labor market. In time they adjust, in part through investments that modify skills, but often only after voluntary job changes and unemployment. Because they have fewer skills specific to their employer, immigrants are also more vulnerable to layoffs due to cyclical, seasonal,

and transitory changes in economic activity. They therefore also experience more involuntary job turnover and unemployment.

The specification of the variables in the estimating equation that are specific to immigrants is then developed. Employment is shown analytically to be related to the person's skill level (including schooling and labor market experience) and demographic characteristics. Among the foreign born, other potentially relevant variables are: the duration of residence in the United States, the country of origin, whether the immigrant is a naturalized citizen, and English language skills.

A.   Immigrants and Job Search

Immigrants entering a labor market have similarities to native-born persons who are new entrants or reentrants to the labor market. In general, immigrants do not have a specific job waiting for them. Engaging in job search when ones does not have a job constitutes unemployment. It has been shown that much of the excess unemployment of youths and adult women in the United States in comparison with adult men can be attributed to their being recent entrants or reentrants to the labor market. The same is likely to be true for new immigrants.

Because skills and knowledge do not transfer perfectly from country to country, immigrants at first are less productive than the native born in the U.S. labor market. This implies a lower distribution of wage offers. Because immigrants have less

information about the labor market, they have greater uncertainty about high-paying jobs that are available. This results in a greater incentive to invest resources in the job search process and in training to increase the transferability of their skills. If the wealth to finance investments in job search were the same for the native born and the foreign born, there would be a greater actual investment of resources by the foreign born. One such resource is "own-time," which is often more profitably employed when a person is not working. It is the use of own-time in the job search process that generates unemployment or less than full-year employment.

Immigrants initially have an incentive to make greater investments in skill and information relating to the U.S. labor market but not in training that is useful only for the current employer (firm-specific training). Part of the early investment is learning about the labor market, which is often done best by experiencing a variety of jobs. Investing in firm-specific training, however, raises the cost of an experimental job change. Yet the smaller the investment in firm-specific training, the lower the incentive for immigrants to remain in their present employment and hence the greater the likelihood of job quits for any reason, not solely to experience a different employer or workplace.

As their residence lengthens, immigrants acquire more skills and knowledge relevant to the U.S. labor market, in part through modification, adaptation, or

credentialing of preexisting skills. Some of this arises from conscious investment decisions and some from everyday experience. As skills relevant to the United States increase, upward occupational mobility becomes more feasible and job changes often result.

Not only do new immigrants have less information about the U.S. labor market, but also U.S. employers are less able to judge the skills of new immigrants in comparison with the native born. As a result, lower wage offers and more hiring errors (and hence more discharges) will be made, and employers will be more reluctant to finance investments in firm-specific training for new immigrants. In addition, the anticipation of upward occupational mobility by immigrants would further discourage the financing of firm-specific investments by employers, particularly by employers who cannot or do not expect to internalize this upward mobility. A lower investment made by a firm for a new immigrant's training diminishes the firm's commitment to the worker, and many more layoffs can be expected because of seasonal, cyclical, or transitory changes in business conditions.

Hence, both the new immigrants and their employers anticipate greater turnover during the period of investments by the immigrants in country-specific skills (including learning simply by living in the country) and smaller investments by both in firm-specific training. Indeed, the anticipation of greater turnover from quits,

layoffs, and discharges is in part a self-fulfilling prophecy, since greater job turnover discourages firm-specific training, thereby encouraging turnover.

Greater job turnover among recent immigrants would not result in greater unemployment if the immigrants immediately take other jobs or permanently drop out of the labor force. Although these outcomes do occur, there is often a period of job search without employment.

Recent immigrants may have greater difficulty financing their job search than native-born men, partly offsetting the factors considered above. Unemployment compensation is available for workers who lose a job in covered employment as a result of a layoff, but the benefits are less likely and the waiting period is longer if the separation is a discharge or if it is voluntary (a quit). All state programs have a work history requirement that typically links benefits to employment in a covered job in the first four of the five calendar quarters before the onset of unemployment. Since work credits are not earned for preimmigration employment, recent immigrants are generally not eligible for unemployment compensation benefits unless they have been employed in a job (or jobs) covered by the program for at least a year after entering the country.

This discussion implies that recent immigrants would tend to experience more spells of unemployment, both voluntary and involuntary, than would native-born

workers, other things being the same. It also implies that unemployment among immigrants, particularly recent immigrants, will be more sensitive to seasonal, cyclical, and random fluctuations in business conditions than unemployment among the native born. As their skills and labor market information relevant to the U.S. improve, they will learn more efficient job search methods, and can be expected to approximate the job search behavior and unemployment experience of native-born workers. The speed at which this occurs and the number of years until there is employment (weeks worked) and unemployment parity with the native born are, of course, empirical questions.

It is conceptually useful to distinguish economic migrants, persons who move primarily for narrowly defined labor market reasons, from refugees, persons whose decisions to migrate are influenced by non-labor market considerations such as political ideology or identity, social class, race, or ethnic origin. Economic migrants are more likely to have anticipated and prepared for their move. Economic migration streams will include a larger proportion of individuals who are adept at adjusting to new situations, that is, they are likely to be more highly "favorably selected" than refugees. Thus, economic migrants are expected to adjust more easily to the U.S. labor market. Moreover, in recent years refugees are eligible for transitional Federal income support assistance that is not available to other immigrants. Refugees are

8

therefore expected to have higher unemployment or lower employment during their first few years in the United States, and their employment during the early period is expected to be more cyclically sensitive.

B.   Modeling the Immigrant Experience

The estimating equation is developed for a microeconomic model, that is, a model in which the unit of observation is an individual. This discussion shall be in terms of employment (weeks worked) because this is the dependent variable used in much of the empirical analysis. The same arguments generally apply, however, to unemployment, but with the opposite sign. The discussion of the basic variables relevant to the native born and the foreign born is presented first, and then the variables that are unique to the foreign born are developed. Figure 1 presents a listing of the dependent and explanatory variables used in the analysis, as well as their codes and the hypothesized partial effects of the explanatory variables on employment.

FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE

In the microeconomic model of employment the person's skills and demographic characteristics are key explanatory variables. The extent of employment tends to be greater among those who have a larger stock of skills relevant to the labor market. Not only do higher wages mean a higher cost of not working, but also there is an

apparent positive association between investments in formal training (schooling) and informal or postschool training, including firm-specific training. Greater investments in firm-specific training are associated with lower turnover because the training is not productive in alternative employments and the investment is shared by the worker and employer (Becker, 1964).

These effects imply a greater number of weeks worked in a year for those with more years of formal schooling. Years of labor market experience or on-the-job training are also associated with lower quit and layoff rates. Thus employment increases with labor market experience, although the initial sharp rise in employment with years of labor market experience tapers off. The maximum potential labor market experience is estimated as age minus schooling minus five years. This is a close approximation of actual labor market experience for adult men, and it is entered as a quadratic variable.

Since the extent of employment varies systematically by certain demographic characteristics, it is important to control statistically for these effects. Employment tends to be greater among married men, apparently because marriage is associated with increased specialization in labor market activities by men. Marital status is held constant by a dichotomous variable that takes the value of zero for men who are married (spouse present) and unity for men in other marital statuses.

Additional control variables include industry/occupation and place of residence. Because of its unique characteristics, including a high degree of seasonality, it is useful to enter a variable for the agricultural sector. This is done through a dichotomous variable that is unity for workers reporting their industry and occupation is in agriculture. Region of residence is taken into account through variables for size of place and for the southern states.

Is there an effect of nativity on the extent of employment after controlling for differences in skill (schooling and total labor market experience) and for demographic characteristics (marital status and place of residence)? Although this question could be answered by including a dichotomous variable for foreign birth, by itself that variable is inadequate and can be misleading. There are several dimensions of being foreign born that may be relevant for employment, including duration of residence in the United States, country of origin, English language skills and citizenship.

The effects of duration of residence (or year of immigration) on employment have been discussed. The variable is entered into the analysis as a set of dichotomous explanatory variables, one for each of the year-of-immigration intervals provided in the census data. The procedure permits a fuller examination of potential nonlinearities in the differential effect on weeks worked of labor market experience

in the United States compared with labor market experience in the country of origin. Controlling for duration of U.S. residence, the coefficient of the variable for total labor market experience measures the impact of pre-immigration labor market experience on employment. Controlling for total experience, the coefficient of the variable for duration of U.S. residence measures the differential impact on employment of experience in the United States.

Fluency in the destination language is a form of human capital that has been shown to be productive in the labor market through enhancing earnings (Chiswick and Miller, 1995). There has been less research on the effect of language skills on employment. The more fluent are likely to be more efficient in finding a better job match, thereby reducing the extent of job turnover (spells of unemployment) and shortening the duration of job search. Then English language fluency among the foreign born would be associated with a greater number of weeks worked in the year.

Labor market adjustments are likely to be easier for immigrants from countries that are similar to the United States in language, occupational requirements, and labor market structure. Since refugees are less likely to have planned for the move, their skills are not as transferable. They would be expected to have greater difficulty in finding a job and to be more likely to invest in training programs to increase the transferability of their skills. The effects will be greatest during the first few years

in the United States. Refugees may also be less favorably selected for adjusting to the destination labor market and may therefore have higher quit and layoff rates and fewer weeks worked. Dichotomous variables for country of origin are included in the analysis to test for these effects. With the British Isles as the benchmark, it is hypothesized that the partial effects on weeks worked of the variables for non-English-speaking countries are negative, and that the negative effects are most pronounced for the country category with the largest proportion of recent refugees, those born in the USSR.

There are various legal barriers to the employment of aliens--foreign-born persons who are not naturalized citizens. Owing to a Presidential Executive Order, the employment of aliens is severely limited in the Federal Civil Service. Some state occupational licensing laws require applicants to be citizens, or in the process of acquiring citizenship, to receive a license. The 1964 Civil Rights Act and subsequent amendments and administrative regulations bar discrimination in the private sector on the basis of national origin, race, and religion, but did not bar discrimination against aliens. In 1973 the Supreme Court confirmed this interpretation in the Farrah Manufacturing Co. case. The legal climate changed with the passage of the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act which made it illegal for private sector employers to discriminate in employment against lawful permanent resident aliens.

13

In spite of the change in the law, some employers may engage in discriminatory behavior. If so, these policies narrow the employment opportunities of aliens. However, the number of employers, including other aliens, who do not discriminate may be sufficiently large so that there is no adverse effect on employment.

The discrimination hypothesis suggests that naturalized citizens would work more weeks per year than otherwise similar aliens. To the extent that those with an easier adjustment in the U.S. labor market are also more likely to become citizens, there would also be a positive observed relationship between employment and citizenship, even if there were no discrimination against aliens. Both hypotheses predict a positive partial correlation between employment and citizenship, and their separate effects cannot be identified. A citizenship variable is included in the analysis, to test whether citizenship has a favorable effect on employment.

Three dependent variables from the 1990 Census of Population are analyzed in this study: weeks worked in the reference year (1989), unemployment status in the reference week at the end of March 1990 (i.e., the week prior to completing the census form) and "unemployment compensation" benefits in 1989. Although much of the public policy discussion and media attention centers on the unemployment of immigrants, the empirical analysis in this study also focuses on employment, as measured by the number of weeks worked in a year, rather than relying on

unemployment status in the reference week. Among adult noninstitutionalized men (ages twenty-five to sixty-four), labor force participation rates in any week are very high, about 95 percent. It is even higher among those who are labor force participants at any time during the year. For adult men, more than for any other group, employment and unemployment are virtual complements.

An important advantage of using the weeks worked data in addition to the unemployment data in the 1990 Census as the dependent variable is that weeks worked is based on 52 weekly experiences for each observation, whereas unemployment is based on a one-week experience. The difference in the dependent variable is not expected to result in substantive differences in findings, but because it is based on 52 one-week observations the power of the analysis is expected to be greater in the weeks-worked analysis. Moreover, the data on unemployment in the census reference week are subject to patterns of seasonality that may vary in a systematic manner across the groups or explanatory variables under study. A disadvantage of the weeks worked data, however, is that they are subject to greater recall error.

There are no direct data on unemployment compensation benefits in the 1990 Census of Population. The last question on the person's income asks the respondent "32. Income in 1989... h. Any other sources of income received regularly such as

Veterans (VA) payments, unemployment compensation, child support or alimony. Do Not include lump-sum payments, such as money from an inheritance or the sale of a home." It provides for the respondent to indicate the dollar amount (Census, 1993, p. E-15). The more detailed instructions indicate: "All other Income-- Includes unemployment compensation, Veterans Administration payments, alimony and child support, contributions received periodically from person not living in the household, military family allotments, net gambling winnings and other kinds of periodic (cash) income other than earnings." (Census, 1993, p. B-17). Previous questions had asked the respondent to report wage, salary, self-employment (farm and non-farm), interest, dividend, net rental, social security, public assistance and retirement and disability income. Under the assumptions that adult males are not likely to be recipients of alimony or child support payments, and that the reporting of net gambling winnings is random with respect to the variables of interest, this income category (INCOME8) is likely to reflect unemployment compensation benefits when the sample is limited to adult (age 25 to 64 years) men who are not veterans, are not disabled, are not currently in the military, and are not currently enrolled in school. See Appendix A, which is available upon request from the authors, for a fuller discussion of this procedure.

16

III.   The Statistical Analysis

This section presents the empirical analyses for adult foreign-born men, both among themselves and in comparison with the native born. It begins with the determinants of weeks worked in 1989 among those who worked at least one week and had non-zero earnings in 1989. This is followed by the analysis of unemployment among those in the labor force in the reference week. The final subsection analyzes the "unemployment compensation" income received in 1989.

Table 1 reports the means and standard deviations of the dependent and the explanatory variables, for the foreign born and the native born. The foreign born worked 1.6 fewer weeks than the native born (45.8 weeks compared to 47.4 weeks) or 3 percent fewer weeks and had a higher rate of unemployment (6.2 percent compared to 4.8 percent) (Table 1). The lower employment and higher unemployment rate of the foreign born may, in part, be due to their lower level of schooling, 12.0 years in contrast to 13.5 years. It may also be due to their recency of arrival, 40 percent have been in the U.S. for 10 or fewer years at the time of the Census. Among the foreign born, only 41 percent were naturalized citizens, while only 52 percent spoke only English at home or, if they spoke another language, spoke English very well. The largest single source country was Mexico (23 percent of the foreign born), with nearly another quarter of the immigrants coming from each

17

of the other three major regions, Europe/Canada, Asia, and other parts of Latin America.

TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

A)   Weeks Worked

Table 2 reports the OLS regression analysis for weeks worked in 1989 for the native born (column 1) and the pooled sample of the native and foreign born (columns 2 to 4). Regressions limited to the foreign born are reported in Table 3.

TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

Although the simple difference in employment was 1.6 fewer weeks worked by the foreign born, after controlling for schooling, experience, marital status, region of residence, and whether employed in agriculture, this declines by 60 percent to 1.0 fewer weeks worked in the non-farm sector and 2.3 fewer weeks among the foreign born in agriculture (Table 2, column 2). The pattern of fewer weeks worked among the foreign born is not invariant with duration in the United States. Other things the same, the foreign born in the United States for 3 or fewer years worked 5.9 fewer weeks, but this drops rapidly with duration to 1.3 fewer weeks for those in the U.S. 4 to 5 years, 1.2 fewer weeks for 6 to .8 years, 1.0 fewer weeks for 9 to 10 years, 0.6 fewer weeks for 11 to 15 years, and only 0.22 fewer weeks for the 16 to 20 year

18

group (Table 2, column 3). For longer durations there is no significant difference from the native born.

Could this steep increase in weeks worked with duration of residence be merely a cohort effect, with recent cohorts being less adept at finding and retaining employment? Analyses performed elsewhere suggest that there in no cohort effect. Data from the 1970 Census of Population, the 1976 Survey of Income and Education and pooled samples from the Current Population Survey (four samples from 1979 to 1988) also find relatively low employment in the first few years and a steep increase in weeks worked with duration of residence (Chiswick 1982, Chiswick, Cohen and Zach, 1997). In particular, among adult white men in the 1970 Census, the foreign born in the U.S. up to 5 years worked 2.9 fewer weeks than the native born, and those in the U.S. 6 to 10 years worked 1.1 fewer weeks, in contrast to the 4.1 weeks and 1.4 weeks, respectively, for white men in the 1990 Census. Yet the recent immigrant cohort that experienced low employment in the 1970 Census or the 1976 SIE did not differ in their weeks worked from the native born in the 1990 Census. Thus, the increase in weeks worked with duration observed in the 1990 Census appears to be a robust finding describing the immigrant adjustment process, that is, reflecting the acquisition of U.S.-specific skills and information (both formal and informal) with an increase in duration in the U.S.

This interpretation is strengthened when variables are added to the equation for naturalized citizens and fluency in English among the foreign born, as in Table 2, column 4. Immigrants who are naturalized citizens and who have fluency in English work more weeks in the year, 0.7 weeks and 0.5 weeks, respectively, and these differences are highly significant. Indeed, when these variables are held constant, the coefficients on the duration variables become more negative, reflecting fewer weeks of employment among aliens who are not fluent in English.

In Table 3 the analysis is limited to the foreign born. It is instructive that the signs of the human capital and demographic variables are the same and all are highly significant in the separate equations for the native born and foreign born (compare Table 2, column 1 and Table 3, column 2). Among the foreign born an extra year of schooling increases weeks worked by about 0.25 weeks per year, while an extra year of (pre-immigration) labor market experiences raises it by about 0.1 weeks per year when evaluated at 10 years. Marriage has a large effect; although the exact causal relationship may be ambiguous, married foreign-born men work 2.5 weeks more than otherwise similar men who are not married.

It should be noted that years of schooling and years of labor market experience (when duration in the U.S. is held constant) have smaller partial effects for the foreign born than the native born. Similar patterns were found in analyses of

20

immigrant earnings (Chiswick, 1978, 1979) and were attributable to the less-than-perfect transferability of the skills acquired in the origin rather than in the U.S. A similar interpretation could apply here as well.

There are sharp differences in the effects of place of residence and industry. Rural and southern residence and the agricultural sector have highly significant effects on immigrant employment (Table 3, column 2). Living in the South lowers weeks worked by 0.3 weeks, while working in a non-agricultural sector in a rural area raises employment by 0.3 weeks compared to an urban area. Employment in the agricultural sector (industry and occupation) lowers the number of weeks worked by 4.1. This is in contrast with the native born for whom there is no employment difference between the rural nonfarm sector and urban areas and a slightly smaller (although statistically significant) number of weeks worked in the South (Table 2, column 1, coefficient = -0.07, t = -2.3). And, among the native born the agricultural sector effect on employment is only 1.5 fewer weeks, much smaller than the 4.1 fewer weeks among the foreign born. Thus, agricultural employment is associated with many fewer weeks worked in the year among the foreign born, who are primarily hired farm laborers, in contrast to the native born in this sector among whom there is a high rate of self-employment or family-member employment.[3]

When the analysis among the foreign born considers the effects of immigrant-related variables robust patterns emerge. Using the 1975-1979 group (11 to 15 years) as the benchmark, weeks worked increases with duration in the United States. The most dramatic change occurs in the first decade when employment increases from 5.4 fewer weeks than the benchmark for the 1987-90 cohort to 1.5 fewer weeks for the 1985-86 cohort, to 0.8 fewer weeks for the 1982-84 cohort, and to 0.3 fewer weeks for the 1980-81 cohort, where all of these differences are statistically different from zero (Table 3, column 2). Immigrants in the U.S. longer than the benchmark generally work more weeks in the year.

When the data are limited to the foreign born, naturalized citizens work 0.9 weeks more than aliens, and those who speak only English or speak it very well work 0.9 more weeks (0.75 weeks when county of origin is held constant) than those who are not fluent.

Other variables the same, with the British Isles as the benchmark, immigrants from all countries of origin work fewer weeks. The differences are small for most European countries but exceed 2.0 weeks per year for three large groups, immigrants from the USSR (-2.8 weeks), Korea (-2.1 weeks), and Mexico (-2.1), as well as for two small heterogenous groups, Other Africa (-2.0 weeks), and Other Countries

(-2.3 weeks). The explanations for these patterns by country of origin may well differ, such as refugee effects for those from the USSR, and seasonal employment and sojourner job turnover among those from Mexico.[4]

B)   Unemployment

The statistical analysis of unemployment among those in the labor force in the reference week in March 1990 is reported in Table 4. Among both the foreign born and native born, those with more schooling and who are married have lower rates of unemployment. Among the native born more labor market experience is associated with lower unemployment, but more pre-immigration experience has no effect on unemployment among the foreign born. Those living in the South and those in rural areas who are not in the agricultural sector have lower rates of unemployment among both the native born and foreign born.

TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE

A divergence by nativity appears in the data for the effect on unemployment of being in an agricultural occupation and industry. The unemployment rate among the native born is lower in agriculture than in other industrial sectors by 0.7 percentage points (t = -3.65), while among the foreign born it is higher by 3.0 percentage points (t = 12.25). The nature of agricultural employment is very different among the native born, where self-employment and family employment dominate, than among the

predominantly hired farm labor among the foreign born, and this has its effects on the patterns of unemployment.

Other variables the same, the foreign born have a lower unemployment rate than the native born, by 0.3 percentage points (t = -3.42) in the non-agricultural sector but a higher unemployment rate (by 0.8 percentage points) in the agricultural sector (Table 4, column 2).

In the regression equations limited to the foreign born, compared with the benchmark, the 1975-79 cohort, the unemployment rate is higher among the most recent immigrants, the 1987-90 cohort (3.0 percentage points higher, t-ratio = 15.8), but the rate for the benchmark does not differ significantly from the rate for other immigrants who arrived in the 1980's (Table 4, column 5). Although earlier cohorts (1950's to 1974) have significantly higher unemployment rates, the differences are very small, less than 0.8 percentage point. Other variables being the same, within the first 3 years the unemployment rate reaches a plateau, and thereafter does not vary much with duration of residence.

Citizenship and English language skills are both associated with lower levels of unemployment, about one-percentage point each, and the effects are highly significant.

Country-of-origin differences in the unemployment rate can be substantial. Most notable are immigrants from the USSR with an unemployment rate 8.1 percentage points (t-ratio = 15.9) greater than the benchmark, the British Isles. Other very high unemployment rate groups include immigrants from the English-speaking West Indies (4.3 percentage points higher), Other Latin America, Africa, and Indochina (all over 2 percentage points higher), whereas the Japanese report 3.4 percentage points lower unemployment rates. The extraordinarily high unemployment rates among Soviet immigrants is a temporary phenomenon--the gap diminishes with duration of residence.[5]

The unemployment rate of immigrants from Mexico is only 1.7 percentage points higher than that of British Isles immigrants. Their disadvantage in terms of weeks worked is much greater than their disadvantage in terms of unemployment rates. This may arise from a greater propensity for seasonal employment and sojourner migration, that is, alternating periods of employment in the U.S. with spells in Mexico as a substitute for unemployment in the United States.

In Table 5 the unemployment regressions are recomputed using logistic regression analysis. The observed patterns are the same as in the OLS analysis. Unemployment rates decrease with education and are lower among those who are married and are

living in the south.   The agricultural sector is associated with lower unemployment among the native born, but higher unemployment among the foreign born.

TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE

In the non-agricultural sector the foreign born have a lower unemployment rate than the native born, although in the agricultural sector the foreign born have a higher unemployment rate in the OLS analysis but not in the Logit analysis. (Tables 4 or 5, column 2). Among the foreign born, unemployment rates are lower for naturalized citizens and those more fluent in English (Tables 4 or 5, columns 5). Unemployment rates are particularly high among immigrants in the U.S. for three or fewer years (Tables 4 or 5, column 5).   Immigrants from the USSR show particularly high unemployment rates, while those from Japan have the lowest rates.   Mexican immigrants also exhibit higher unemployment rates, other things being the same, than British immigrants.   This may be due to differences in seasonal patterns of employment and unemployment, and may be related to a higher propensity for returning to and from origin among Mexican.

C)   "Unemployment Compensation" Benefits

The analyses reported in Table 6 and Table 7, and in Appendix B which is available upon request from the authors, are concerned with the measure of unemployment compensation benefits. As indicated in Appendix A, the census

variable for "other income," INCOME8, can be used as a proxy measure of unemployment compensation benefits for groups that do not receive other income transfers on a recurring basis. That is, it is a proxy for unemployment compensation benefits under the assumption that few men receive Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) or alimony income, and by excluding from the sample those who are veterans, in the Armed Forces, disabled or enrolled in school as they may be receiving recurring income on this basis (See Appendix A).[6]

The Tobit regression analysis for the receipt of unemployment compensation benefits, as measured in this study, is reported in Table 6 for the native born and the pooled analysis. The dollar amount of this income can be decomposed into the probability of receiving any income from this source and the amount received by recipients, and among recipients the number of weeks benefits are received and the weekly benefit amount. This decomposition is reported schematically in Table 7, with the detailed regression analyses presented in Appendix B.

TABLE 6 ABOUT HERE

TABLE 7 ABOUT HERE

Among both the foreign born and the native born, the measure of unemployment compensation benefits and the probability of receiving a benefit decreases with higher levels of schooling, although the amount of the benefit for recipients rises

27

with the level of schooling, reflecting higher wage rates. Total benefits are not related to labor market experience among the foreign born once duration of residence in the U.S. is taken into account, although it has a positive effect among the native born. Among recipients, however, benefits increase with experience again reflecting their higher wage rate. Whereas those who are in agriculture receive higher total benefits and have a higher probability of receiving a benefit among the foreign born, the opposite is found among the native born, again reflecting the lower rate of eligibility due to a higher rate of self-employment.

Other things the same, the foreign born received significantly lower unemployment compensation benefits than the native born. The most recent cohort, 1987-90, received particularly low benefits and the difference is highly statistically significant. The low benefits in spite of the lower level of weeks worked and higher unemployment rate may well be due, in part, to the prior work requirements to qualify for benefits, and the ineligibility for benefits or fear of applying among illegal aliens. There is a tendency for the benefit gap between the foreign born and the native born to diminish with duration of residence, that is, benefits increase with duration of residence.

The analyses in Table 7 and Appendix B indicate that although the foreign born receive significantly less in the measure of unemployment benefits analyzed here,

this is due to a lower probability of receiving any benefits. Among recipients, the foreign born receive either the same or larger total benefits and a higher weekly benefit.

The analysis of the effects of duration of residence on unemployment compensation benefits indicates that the foreign born receive lower total benefits because of a lower probability of receiving any benefits. This period of significantly lower total benefits than the native born extends for about 20 years, although the magnitude of the effect diminishes with duration. Indeed, there is little difference between the foreign born and the native born, other variables the same, for the total benefits received by recipients or for the weekly benefits received by recipients.

The lower probability of receiving benefits among the foreign born in the first few years in the United States in spite of their higher unemployment rate may be related to the requirement of work in covered employment. That is, the most recent of immigrants may have been working in the U.S. too short a period of time to satisfy program eligibility requirements. The persistence of the lower probability of receiving benefits for up to 20 years requires other explanations. Other variables the same, citizenship and English language skills have a negative effect on benefits received and the probability of receiving benefits, but not on the magnitude of benefits among recipients.

IV.   Summary and Conclusion

   This report has analyzed the employment and unemployment experiences of adult

foreign-born men, both among themselves and in comparison with the native born.

It was based on an econometric analysis of data from the 1990 Census of Population,

Public Use Microdata Sample, 1 percent and 5 percent samples. Three dependent

variables are analyzed: the number of weeks worked in 1989, unemployment status

in the reference week in 1990, and a proxy measure of unemployment compensation

benefits received in 1989.

   The theoretical model focuses on the job search behavior of the foreign born in

comparison with the native born, and among the foreign born by duration in the U.S.,

country of origin, naturalization, English language fluency, and other characteristics.

The job search model applied to immigrants emphasizes the less than perfect

transferability from their origin to the destination labor market of their pre-

immigration skills and labor market information, as well as the more limited

information employers have regarding their skills. Investment in skills and labor

market information specific to the destination often entails job turnover and periods

of job search. These activities are most intense during the initial period in the

destination, and diminish with a longer duration of residence. As a result, the

employment and unemployment experience of immigrants would be expected to approach that of the native born, other variables being the same.

Among the foreign born, weeks worked are greater and unemployment rates are lower for those with more schooling, and weeks worked increase but unemployment rates are invariant with total labor market experience. The effects of schooling and total experience are weaker among the foreign born than among the native born. Those who are married have greater employment and lower unemployment. Employment in the agricultural sector has a different effect on the foreign born and native born, largely due to differences by nativity in the extent of self-employment (and family employment) versus hired farm labor. Agricultural employment is associated with lower employment and greater unemployment among the foreign born than among the foreign born in other sectors. The foreign born have significantly lower rates of employment (weeks worked) and higher unemployment rates during their first few years in the United States.

Overall, the foreign born worked 1.6 fewer weeks than the native born, but other variables the same they worked only 1.0 fewer weeks. The pattern of fewer weeks of employment varies by duration of residence--5.9 fewer weeks for those in the U.S. 3 or fewer years, with the difference diminishing with duration of residence. Among

31

the foreign born, those who are naturalized citizens and those who are fluent in English work more weeks, with each effect approximately 1 week.

Employment also varies by country of origin. Although the differences are small for most countries of origin (generally less than two fewer weeks than the benchmark, the British Isles), the differences are large for immigrants from the USSR (2.8 fewer weeks), Korea (2.1 fewer weeks) and Mexico (2.1 fewer weeks). Among immigrants from the USSR the weeks worked differential is a temporary phenomenon--it is very large for the most recent cohort (1987-90) and diminishes sharply with duration of residence. Comparisons with data from earlier periods indicates that the effects of duration of residence do not reflect changes in cohort quality, but rather a longitudinal effect. That is, it is a consequence of the process of adjustment with duration of residence.

Overall, the foreign born have an unemployment rate about 1.4 percentage points higher than the native born, but other variables the same, they have an unemployment rate that is slightly lower than the native born. The unemployment rate is much higher for the recent foreign born, (1987-90 cohort), but declines sharply to a level that does not vary with duration of residence. Naturalized citizens and those fluent in English have lower unemployment rates. The very high unemployment rates of

immigrants from the USSR is a short-term refugee effect, and does not differ by duration among other cohorts.

The analysis of unemployment compensation benefits is based on an algorithm developed for this project. The foreign born reported receiving fewer benefits in 1989, due to a significantly lower probability of receiving any benefits. Among those who received unemployment compensation benefits the foreign born received a larger total benefit and a larger weekly benefit.

In conclusion, the analysis finds that immigrants experience fewer weeks worked and higher unemployment rates during the first few years in the U.S., but after that their employment and unemployment experiences are very similar to those of the native born. Among the foreign born those who are citizens and fluent in English work more weeks and have lower unemployment rates. The foreign born in the agricultural sector work fewer weeks and have higher unemployment rates than the foreign born in the rest of the economy and the native born in agriculture. Refugees from the USSR experience very low employment and very high unemployment rates during their first three years, but there are no significant differences thereafter. The foreign born have a lower probability of receiving unemployment compensation benefits and receive less income from this source, other variables the same, although

33

foreign-born benefit recipients do receive more in a year than their native-born counterparts.

The unemployment problems associated with immigrants appear therefore to be largely short-term, transitional adjustments not unlike those experienced by native-born new entrants and re-entrants to the labor market.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

NOTES

[1]   For an analysis of the socioeconomic and demographic characteristics of the foreign-born population, based on the 1990 Census of Population, see Chiswick and Sullivan (1995).

[2]   The discussion in this section draws on Chiswick (1982) and Chiswick, Cohen and Zach (1997).

[3]   The frequency distribtion (percent) of foreign-born and native-born agricultural workers (industry and occupation) by class of worker (1990) is:

Class of Worker	Native Born	Foreign Born
Private sector	37.1	83.7
Government sector	1.4	0.8
Self-employment (including unpaid family wokers)	61.6	15.5
	_____	_____
Total	100.0	100.0

Source: 1990 Census of Population, Public Use Microdata Sample, 1 percent sample.

4   Soviet immigrants have a much steeper slope of employment with respect to duration of residence. Those who arrived between 1987 and 1990 worked 13.5 fewer weeks (t = -15.5) than the benchmark, Soviet immigrants who arrived between 1975 and 1979; those who arrived in 1985-86 worked a marginally significant (t = 1.5) 2.4 more weeks than the benchmark cohort, with no significant differences from the benchmark for any earlier cohort.

5   Soviet immigrants who immigrated in the most recent three-year period, 1987-90, had an unemployment rate 15.9 percentage points (t = 9.1) higher than Soviet immigrants who arrived in the benchmark (1975-79) period. The unemployment rates for earlier cohorts were not significantly different from the benchmark, except for a 6.7 point (t = 2.5) higher rate for the 1982-84 cohort.

6   An alternative procedure would be to include these groups in the sample, but add dichotomous variables for these characteristics to the estimating equation. Tests with this procedure indicate that there are no substantive differences in the findings for the human capital, demographic and immigrant variables.

References

Becker, Gary S., (1964), Human Capital, New York: NBER.

Chiswick, Barry R. (1978), "The Effect of Americanization on the Earnings of Foreign-Born Men," Journal of Political Economy, October, pp 897-922.

Chiswick, Barry R., (1979), "The Economic Progress of Immigrants: Some Apparently Universal Patterns" in William Fellner, ed. Contemporary Economic Problems, 1979, Washington: American Enterprise Institute, 1979, pp 357-399.

Chiswick, Barry R., Yinon Cohen and Tzippi Zach (1997), "The Labor Market Status of Immigrants: Effects of Duration of Residence and the Unemployment at Arrival","" Industrial and Labor Relations Review.

Chiswick, Barry R. and Paul W. Miller (1995), "The Endogeneity Between Language and Earnings: International Analyses," Journal of Labor Economics, April, pp. 245-287.

Chiswick, Barry R. and Paul W. Miller (1994), "Language and Labor Supply: The Role of Gender Among Immigrants in Australia," <u>Research on Income Inequality</u>, Vol 5, pp 153-189.

Fields, Harold (1935), "The Unemployed Foreign-Born," <u>Quarterly Journal of Economics</u>, 49, May, pp 433-41.

Leighton, Linda and Jacob Mincer (1982), "Labor Turnover and Youth Unemployment," In Richard B. Freeman and David A. Wise, eds., <u>The Youth Unemployment Problem: Its Nature, Causes and Consequences</u>, Chicago, pp 235-67.

Rubin, Ernest (1947), <u>Unemployment of Aliens in the United States</u>, 1940. Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University.

U.S. Bureau of the Census (1992), <u>1990 Census of Population and Housing</u>, <u>Public Use Microdata Sample</u>, <u>United States</u>, <u>Technical Documentation</u>, U.S. Government Printing Office, October.

Figure 1
List of Dependent and Explanatory Variables

Variable	Definition	Hypothesized Partial Effect on Employment [a]
Dependent Variables		
Employment	Weeks worked in 1989 among those who worked and had non-zero earnings in 1989	
Unemployed	Unemployed among those in the labor force in the reference week in March 1990	
Unemployment Compensation	Unemployment compensation benefits, proxy measure[b]	
Explanatory Variables		
Education	Years of Schooling	+
Experience	Years of labor market experience (Age-Education-5), and its square	+
Not married	Not "married, spouse present" = 1	-
Rural	Rural area = 1	?
South	Southern state and DC = 1	?
Foreign Born	Foreign born = 1	-
Naturalized Citizen	Naturalized citizen =1, Alien and US born = 0	+
Speaks English	Foreign Born and Speaks only English or Speaks English Very Well = 1	+
Agriculture	Industry and Occupation is in agriculture = 1	[c]
Foreign* Agriculture	Foreign born and in Agriculture = 1	-

Figure 1 Continued

Years Since Migration	1990 minus year of immigration	+

Year of Immigration	Period of immigration dichotomous variables:
	    Immigrated before 1950 (PRE-50)
	    or between 19XX and 19YY.
		(d)

Country of Birth	Dichotomous country of birth variables, British Isles as the benchmark, see Table 1 for details	(e)

[a]Hypothesized partial effect of the explanatory variable on weeks worked (employment) is positive (+), negative (-), or ambiguous (?).   Hypothesized signs are reversed for unemployment status. Analysis limited to males age 25 to 64.

[b]"All other income" (INCOME 8), with the population limited to adult males who were not veterans, are not disabled, and are not currently in the military or enrolled in school. See Appendix A.

[c]Hypothesis is a positive sign for the native born and a negative sign for the foreign born.

[d]Hypothesis is that employment increases with duration of residence.

[e]Hypothesis is that employment is lower for immigrants from non-English speaking countries, and lower for recent refugees than for economic migrants.

Note: The sample is limited to native-born and foreign-born males age 25 to 64 years in 1990, who worked in at least one week and had non-zero earnings (wage, salary and self-employment income) in 1989. Persons born abroad of American parents and persons born in a territory of the United States are excluded from the analysis.

TABLE 1
Means and Standard Deviations, Native-Born and Foreign-Born Men
Aged 25-64, 1990

Variable	Native Born		Foreign Born		Total	
	Mean	**Standard Deviation**	**Mean**	**Standard Deviation**	**Mean**	**Standard Deviation**
Weeks Worked	47.36	10.50	45.76	11.59	47.19	10.64
Unemployment Rate	4.82	2.14	6.18	1.12	4.94	2.18
UI Benefits Received	78.59	7430.96	61.75	3347.86	76.64	7503.93
UI Benefits, with UI	2692.39	33479.34	2894.67	18360.16	2708.86	34658.85
Education	13.47	2.66	11.95	4.78	13.32	2.98
Experience	22.04	11.13	22.73	11.45	22.10	11.16
Experience Squared	609.38	572.94	647.70	612.94	613.07	577.30
Not Married	0.31	0.46	0.34	0.47	0.31	0.46
Rural	0.27	0.45	0.06	0.24	0.25	0.43
South	0.34	0.47	0.24	0.43	0.33	0.47
Agriculture	0.03	0.16	0.05	0.21	0.03	0.16
Foreign born	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.10	0.30
Year of Immigration						
Pre - 1950			0.024	0.154	0.003	0.050
1950-1959			0.086	0.281	0.009	0.093
1960-1964			0.078	0.268	0.008	0.087
1965-1969			0.104	0.306	0.010	0.101
1970-1974			0.137	0.344	0.013	0.115
1975-1979			0.174	0.379	0.017	0.130
1980-1981			0.117	0.321	0.012	0.107
1982-1984			0.098	0.297	0.009	0.097
1985-1986			0.081	0.273	0.008	0.089
1987-1990			0.101	0.301	0.010	0.102
Naturalized Citizen			0.411	0.492	0.041	0.197
Speaks English			0.520	0.500	0.052	0.222
Countries of Birth						
British Isles			0.036	0.185	0.004	0.060

TABLE 1 Continued

Variable	Native Born		Foreign Born		Total	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Western Europe			0.050	0.217	0.005	0.070
Eastern Europe			0.025	0.157	0.003	0.051
Southern Europe			0.056	0.231	0.006	0.076
Balkans			0.013	0.114	0.001	0.037
USSR			0.011	0.105	0.001	0.034
Canada/Aust/NZ			0.035	0.183	0.003	0.057
Mexico			0.232	0.422	0.023	0.150
Cuba			0.042	0.200	0.004	0.064
Brit. W. Indies			0.029	0.169	0.003	0.055
Other Lat. America			0.143	0.350	0.015	0.120
North Africa			0.046	0.210	0.004	0.066
Other Africa			0.018	0.134	0.002	0.045
Southwest Asia			0.043	0.202	0.004	0.064
Indochina			0.034	0.182	0.003	0.059
China			0.050	0.219	0.005	0.070
Japan			0.012	0.111	0.001	0.035
Philippines			0.044	0.205	0.004	0.065
Korea			0.026	0.159	0.003	0.051
Other Asia			0.013	0.115	0.001	0.037
Other Countries			0.039	0.195	0.004	0.061
Observations	496,382		251,739		546,545	

[a] Other countries includes other countries not listed, at sea and, the largest category, country of birth not reported.

Source: 1990 Census of Population, Public Use Microdata Sample, 1 percent sample of the native born and total, 5 percent sample of the foreign born.

TABLE 2

Regression Analysis of Weeks Worked, for Pooled Native and Foreign-Born Adult Men, 1990

Variable	Native Born (1)	---------- Pooled Native and Foreign Born --------		
		(2)	(3)	(4)
Education	0.36879	0.33714	0.33713	0.32903
	(61.90)	(64.51)	(64.56)	(61.73)
Experience	0.21119	0.21085	0.20441	0.20505
	(36.29)	(38.01)	(36.87)	(36.98)
Experience Squared	-0.00504	-0.00488	-0.00482	-0.00484
	(-44.54)	(-45.49)	(-44.98)	(-45.08)
Not Married	-3.49135	-3.44305	-3.40119	-3.40078
	(-105.77)	(-108.35)	(-107.09)	(-107.08)
Rural	-0.01379	-0.03218	-0.02358	-0.03359
	(-0.40)	(-0.95)	(-0.70)	(-0.99)
South	-0.07010	-0.09330	-0.09215	-0.09550
	(-2.26)	(-3.09)	(-3.05)	(-3.17)
Agriculture	-1.49781	-1.57257	-1.76666	-1.74288
	(-15.87)	(-16.39)	(-20.06)	(-19.78)
Foreign born	(a)	-0.97702	(a)	(a)
		(-19.84)		
Foreign* Agriculture	(a)	-1.36589	(a)	(a)
		(-5.78)		
Years of Migration				
Pre-1950	(a)	(a)	0.40412	-0.62988
			(1.44)	(-2.07)
1950-1959	(a)	(a)	0.22523	-0.73001
			(1.48)	(-3.90)
1960-1964	(a)	(a)	0.07724	-0.75439
			(0.48)	(-4.02)
1965-1969	(a)	(a)	0.23033	-0.51029
			(1.65)	(-3.13)
1970-1974	(a)	(a)	-0.22213	-0.84389
			(-1.81)	(-5.95)
1975-1979	(a)	(a)	-0.57178	-1.09778
			(-5.24)	(-8.79)
1980-1981	(a)	(a)	-1.02229	-1.43232
			(-7.75)	(-10.20)
1982-1984	(a)	(a)	-1.18945	-1.55043
			(-8.14)	(-10.11)
1985-1986	(a)	(a)	-1.30615	-1.56678
			(-8.27)	(-9.63)

TABLE 2 continued

Variable	Native Born	----------	Pooled Native and Foreign Born	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1987-1990	(a)	(a)	-5.92740	-6.16612
			(-42.71)	(-42.80)
Naturalized Citizen	(a)	(a)	(a)	0.70984
				(6.78)
Speaks English	(a)	(a)	(a)	0.47447
				(4.95)
Constant	41.95137	42.28619	42.38369	42.48890
	(380.96)	(415.87)	(416.51)	(413.94)
Adjusted R2	0.0436	0.0447	0.0473	0.0479
Standard Error	10.27686	10.45284	10.43843	10.4377
Observations	496,351	546,513	546,513	546,513

Notes: (a) Variable not entered
           t-ratios in parentheses

Source: 1990 Census of Population, Public Use Microdata Sample, 1 percent sample

TABLE   3
Regression Analysis of Weeks Worked, for Foreign-Born Adult Men, 1990

Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Education	0.27578	0.24964	0.20315	0.16729
	(50.63)	(44.34)	(34.11)	(24.67)
Experience	0.22701	0.15156	0.15792	0.15662
	(27.39)	(18.21)	(18.96)	(18.75)
Experience Squared	-0.00371	-0.00291	-0.00296	-0.00309
	(-24.30)	(-19.12)	(-19.42)	(-20.22)
Not Married	-2.84253	-2.48372	-2.46224	-2.40809
	(-56.96)	(-49.95)	(-49.53)	(-48.01)
Rural	0.56311	0.28051	0.18160	0.08031
	(5.78)	(2.89)	(1.87)	(0.82)
South	-0.29749	-0.30289	-0.32177	-0.30102
	(-5.59)	(-5.74)	(-6.10)	(-5.50)
Agriculture	-4.24603	-4.08308	-3.96360	-3.66187
	(-37.01)	(-35.93)	(-34.89)	(-31.82)
Year of Immigration				
Pre-1950	(a)	-0.13306	-0.86041	-1.21443
		(-0.84)	(-5.32)	(-7.32)
1950-1959	(a)	0.51351	-0.06881	-0.49781
		(5.24)	(-0.68)	(-4.70)
1960-1964	(a)	0.53186	0.12371	-0.19653
		(5.41)	(1.24)	(-1.91)
1965-1969	(a)	0.39561	0.10726	-0.11872
		(4.46)	(1.20)	(-1.30)
1970-1974	(a)	0.03375	-0.10922	-0.15897
		(0.42)	(-1.34)	(-1.94)
1980-1981	(a)	-0.27534	-0.10199	-0.21626
		(-3.25)	(-1.20)	(-2.53)
1982-1984	(a)	-0.78247	-0.53766	-0.65133
		(-8.71)	(-5.94)	(-7.16)
1985-1986	(a)	-1.47232	-1.09868	-1.23371
		(-15.37)	(-11.29)	(-12.61)
1987-1990	(a)	-5.44074	-5.00649	-5.24298
		(-60.71)	(-54.60)	(-56.54)
Naturalized Citizen	(a)	(a)	0.85707	0.82704
			(16.24)	(15.25)
Speaks English	(a)	(a)	0.91098	0.74868
			(17.67)	(13.49)
Countries of Birth				
Western Europe	(a)	(a)	(a)	-0.45000
				(-2.88)

TABLE 3 Continued

Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Eastern Europe	(a)	(a)	(a)	-0.33285
				(-1.80)
Southern Europe	(a)	(a)	(a)	-0.46766
				(-3.02)
Balkans	(a)	(a)	(a)	-0.87699
				(-3.83)
USSR	(a)	(a)	(a)	-2.78040
				(-11.38)
Canada/Aust/NZ	(a)	(a)	(a)	-0.49322
				(-2.88)
Mexico	(a)	(a)	(a)	-2.07228
				(-15.07)
Cuba	(a)	(a)	(a)	-0.72390
				(-4.31)
Brit. W. Indies	(a)	(a)	(a)	-1.85110
				(-10.41)
Other Lat. America	(a)	(a)	(a)	-1.43230
				(-10.46)
North Africa	(a)	(a)	(a)	-1.62805
				(-10.19)
Other Africa	(a)	(a)	(a)	-2.03329
				(-10.26)
Southwest Asia	(a)	(a)	(a)	-1.30062
				(-8.01)
Indochina	(a)	(a)	(a)	-1.08968
				(-6.19)
China	(a)	(a)	(a)	-1.49728
				(-9.42)
Japan	(a)	(a)	(a)	0.90066
				(3.82)
Philippines	(a)	(a)	(a)	-1.06157
				(-6.57)
Korea	(a)	(a)	(a)	-2.11499
				(-11.30)
Other Asia	(a)	(a)	(a)	-1.01892
				(-4.47)
Other Countries	(a)	(a)	(a)	-2.31583
				(-13.91)
Constant	40.91252	42.95727	42.59159	44.73148
	(299.14)	(291.72)	(288.11)	(215.06)

TABLE 3 Continued

Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Adjusted R^2	0.0420	0.0617	0.0640	0.0670
Standard Error	11.84162	11.71920	11.70515	11.68611
Observations	251,720	251,720	251,720	251,720

Notes: (a) Variable not entered
t-ratios in parentheses

Source: 1990 Census of Population, Public Use Microdata Sample, 1 percent sample.

TABLE 4
Regression Analysis of Unemployment, for Native-Born and Foreign-Born Adult Men, 1990

Variable	Native Born	Pooled Native and Foreign Born		Foreign Born	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Education	-0.00908	-0.00780	-0.00784	-0.00422	-0.00308
	(-72.98)	(-71.86)	(-70.68)	(-37.05)	(-21.51)
Experience	0.00190	0.00152	0.00155	-0.00008	0.00019
	(15.45)	(12.98)	(13.20)	(-0.48)	(1.07)
Experience Squared	-0.00004	-0.00003	-0.00004	0.00000	0.00000
	(-17.97)	(-15.19)	(-15.39)	(1.24)	(0.90)
Not Married	0.05440	0.05175	0.05160	0.03257	0.02805
	(79.18)	(78.33)	(78.02)	(31.12)	(26.34)
Rural	-0.00318	-0.00240	-0.00253	-0.00887	-0.00333
	(-4.49)	(-3.40)	(-3.58)	(-4.30)	(-1.59)
South	-0.00749	-0.00695	-0.00692	-0.00690	-0.00854
	(-11.61)	(-11.06)	(-11.01)	(-6.16)	(-7.34)
Agriculture	-0.00722	-0.00607	-0.00425	0.03217	0.02989
	(-3.65)	(-3.02)	(-2.31)	(13.37)	(12.25)
Foreign born	(a)	-0.00346	(a)	(a)	(a)
		(-3.42)			
Foreign* Agriculture		0.01140	(a)	(a)	(a)
		(2.33)			
Year of Immigration					
Pre-1950	(a)	(a)	0.00196	(a)	0.00210
			(0.31)		(0.58)
1950-1959	(a)	(a)	0.00328	(a)	0.00491
			(0.84)		(2.17)
1960-1964	(a)	(a)	-0.00679	(a)	0.00654
			(-1.75)		(2.98)
1965-1969	(a)	(a)	0.00167	(a)	0.00780
			(0.50)		(4.01)
1970-1974	(a)	(a)	-0.00440	(a)	0.00617
			(-1.51)		(3.53)
1975-1979	(a)	(a)	-0.00153	(a)	(a)
			(-0.60)		
1980-1981	(a)	(a)	-0.01033	(a)	0.00278
			(-3.58)		(1.54)
1982-1984	(a)	(a)	-0.00591	(a)	-0.00343
			(-1.87)		(-1.77)
1985-1986	(a)	(a)	-0.00418	(a)	0.00088
			(-1.25)		(0.42)

TABLE 4   Continued

Variable	Native Born (1)	Pooled Native and Foreign Born (2)	Pooled Native and Foreign Born (3)	Foreign Born (4)	Foreign Born (5)
1987-1990	(a)	(a)	0.01264 (4.40)	(a)	0.03046 (15.78)
Naturalized Citizen	(a)	(a)	-0.00806 (-3.74)	(a)	-0.01188 (-10.30)
Speaks English	(a)	(a)	0.00336 (1.70)	(a)	-0.00919 (-7.80)
Countries of Birth					
Western Europe	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	0.00203 (0.60)
Eastern Europe	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	0.00908 (2.30)
Southern Europe	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	0.00689 (2.08)
Balkans	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	0.01196 (2.45)
USSR	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	0.08109 (15.85)
Canada/Aust/NZ	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	0.00628 (1.71)
Mexico	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	0.01675 (5.70)
Cuba	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	0.01450 (4.04)
Brit. W. Indies	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	0.04246 (11.21)
Other Lat. America	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	0.02245 (7.67)
North Africa	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	0.02302 (6.75)
Other Africa	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	0.02303 (5.45)
Southwest Asia	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	0.01170 (3.37)
Indochina	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	0.02453 (6.56)
China	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	0.00129 (0.38)
Japan	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	-0.03391 (-6.68)
Philippines	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	0.00338 (0.98)

TABLE 4   Continued

Variable	Native Born	Pooled Native and Foreign Born		Foreign Born	
	(1)	**(2)**	**(3)**	**(4)**	**(5)**
Korea	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	-0.00601
					(-1.50)
Other Asia	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	0.00757
					(1.55)
Other Countries	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	0.03021
					(8.53)
Constant	0.14206	0.12829	0.12858	0.10080	0.07215
	(61.67)	(60.53)	(59.98)	(35.01)	(16.27)
Adjusted R^2	0.0264	0.0240	0.0241	0.0145	0.0198
Standard Error	0.21132	0.21511	0.21510	0.24938	0.24870
Observations	485,338	535,823	535,823	253,377	253,377

Notes: (a)   Variable not entered
t-ratios in parentheses

Source: 1990 Census of Population, Public Use Microdata Sample, 1 percent sample for the native born and pooled analysis, and 5 percent sample for the foreign born analysis.

TABLE 5
Logistic Regression Analysis of Unemployment, for Native and Foreign-Born Adult Men, 1990

Variable	Native Born (1)	Pooled Native and Foreign Born (2)	Pooled Native and Foreign Born (3)	Foreign Born (4)	Foreign Born (5)
Education	-0.18100	-0.14490	-0.14630	-0.06730	-0.04560
	(-70.16)	(-67.71)	(-66.50)	(-16.74)	(-20.18)
Experience	0.03450	0.02340	0.02380	-0.00310	0.00073
	(12.73)	(9.44)	(9.60)	(-0.48)	(0.25)
Experience Squared	-0.00084	-0.00058	-0.00059	0.00008	0.00008
	(-15.85)	(-12.34)	(-12.55)	(0.71)	(1.57)
Not Married	1.05290	0.98770	0.98630	0.53310	0.45520
	(73.63)	(74.26)	(73.60)	(14.25)	(26.47)
Rural	-0.02590	-0.01210	-0.01410	-0.15480	-0.05770
	(-1.62)	(-0.78)	(-0.90)	(-1.94)	(-1.58)
South	-0.18300	-0.15930	-0.15870	-0.12930	-0.15400
	(-12.36)	(-11.38)	(-11.34)	(-2.98)	(-7.62)
Agriculture	-0.16680	-0.12640	-0.12060	0.35090	0.31250
	(-3.83)	(-2.93)	(-3.26)	(5.01)	(9.70)
Foreign born	(a)	-0.19980	(a)	(a)	(a)
		(-9.08)			
Foreign* Agriculture	(a)	0.01350	(a)	(a)	(a)
		(0.17)			
Year of Immigration					
Pre-1950	(a)	(a)	-0.06590	(a)	0.01600
			(-0.44)		(0.23)
1950-1959	(a)	(a)	0.01760	(a)	0.07400
			(0.21)		(1.77)
1960-1964	(a)	(a)	-0.25860	(a)	0.11110
			(-2.97)		(2.83)
1965-1969	(a)	(a)	-0.05470	(a)	0.13960
			(-0.81)		(4.13)
1970-1974	(a)	(a)	-0.20170	(a)	0.10700
			(-3.48)		(3.59)
1975-1979	(a)	(a)	-0.18860	(a)	(a)
			(-3.79)		
1980-1981	(a)	(a)	-0.35890	(a)	0.05030
			(-6.25)		(1.67)
1982-1984	(a)	(a)	-0.31450	(a)	-0.06910
			(-4.97)		(-2.04)
1985-1986	(a)	(a)	-0.30510	(a)	0.00882
			(-4.79)		(0.26)

TABLE 5   Continued

	Native Born	Pooled Native and Foreign Born		Foreign Born	
Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1987-1990	(a)	(a)	-0.06980 (-1.36)	(a)	0.40840 (13.89)
Naturalized Citizen	(a)	(a)	-0.16720 (-3.70)	(a)	-0.23780 (-11.77)
Speaks English	(a)	(a)	0.10650 (2.63)	(a)	-0.18610 (-9.31)
Countries of Birth					
Western Europe	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	0.03410 (0.45)
Eastern Europe	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	0.26640 (3.31)
Southern Europe	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	0.26380 (3.81)
Balkans	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	0.34320 (3.60)
USSR	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	1.28200 (15.93)
Canada/Aust/NZ	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	0.18820 (2.38)
Mexico	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	0.41260 (6.63)
Cuba	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	0.38100 (5.24)
Brit. W. Indies	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	0.84520 (11.97)
Other Lat. America	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	0.49820 (8.02)
North Africa	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	0.51690 (7.36)
Other Africa	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	0.51630 (6.27)
Southwest Asia	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	0.22400 (2.98)
Indochina	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	0.54250 (7.47)
China	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	0.03760 (0.51)
Japan	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	-1.41060 (-7.70)
Philippines	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	0.08330 (1.10)

TABLE 5 Continued

Variable	Native Born (1)	Pooled Native and Foreign Born (2)	(3)	Foreign Born (4)	(5)
Korea	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	-0.19510
					(-2.13)
Other Asia	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	0.19440
					(1.93)
Other Countries	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	0.60300
					(8.89)
Constant	-1.26420	-1.60940	-1.59200	-2.15650	-2.75170
	(-25.64)	(-36.33)	(-35.54)	(-19.82)	(-32.68)
AIC	131,005	187,513	142,437	25,583	127,907
Observations	485,339	535,824	535,824	253,378	253,378

Notes: (a)   Variable not entered
        Asymptotic t-ratios in parentheses

Source: 1990 Census of Population, Public Use Microdata Sample, 1 percent sample for the native born and pooled analysis, and 5 percent sample for the foreign born analysis.

TABLE 6
Tobit Regression Analysis of Unemployment Insurance Benefit Payments
Pooled Native and Foreign-Born Adult Men, 1990

	Native Born	---------- Pooled Native and Foreign Born ----------		
Variable	**(1)**	**(2)**	**(3)**	**(4)**
Education	-301.87	-248.52	-273.33	-269.28
	(-19.60)	(-19.29)	(-21.09)	(-20.29)
Experience	114.93	83.21	89.79	90.12
	(7.24)	(5.75)	(6.18)	(6.21)
Experience Squared	-2.77	-1.89	-2.17	-2.18
	(-8.46)	(-6.55)	(-7.44)	(-7.46)
Not Married	521.78	388.02	411.41	411.35
	(6.49)	(5.03)	(5.33)	(5.33)
Rural	1021.15	1048.58	1002.41	1007.29
	(12.33)	(12.79)	(12.22)	(12.27)
South	-1828.27	-1775.68	-1777.84	-1774.84
	(-21.20)	(-21.36)	(-21.39)	(-21.35)
Agriculture	-1895.32	-1903.41	-637.08	-654.37
	(-7.55)	(-7.47)	(-3.18)	(-3.26)
Foreign born	(a)	-1512.11	(a)	(a)
		(-12.28)		
Foreign* Agriculture	(a)	4165.47	(a)	(a)
		(9.78)		
Years of Migration				
Pre-1950	(a)	(a)	170.54	571.27
			(0.21)	(0.68)
1950-1959	(a)	(a)	63.65	447.47
			(0.17)	(1.03)
1960-1964	(a)	(a)	99.87	420.44
			(0.28)	(1.05)
1965-1969	(a)	(a)	-699.15	-413.26
			(-2.28)	(-1.17)
1970-1974	(a)	(a)	-807.87	-567.76
			(-3.08)	(-1.89)
1975-1979	(a)	(a)	-1210.80	-1012.40
			(-5.01)	(-3.74)
1980-1981	(a)	(a)	-2871.55	-2709.61
			(-8.23)	(-7.47)
1982-1984	(a)	(a)	-1702.12	-1565.68
			(-4.83)	(-4.29)
1985-1986	(a)	(a)	-1703.30	-1605.11
			(-4.61)	(-4.25)

TABLE 6 continued

Variable	Native Born (1)	Pooled Native and Foreign Born		
		(2)	(3)	(4)
1987-1990	(a)	(a)	-2731.47	-2638.20
			(-7.19)	(-6.78)
Naturalized Citizen	(a)	(a)	(a)	-328.24
				(-1.38)
Speaks English	(a)	(a)	(a)	-181.21
				(-0.81)
Constant	-11244.06	-11961.47	-11659.23	-11717.19
	(-37.14)	(-43.48)	(-42.59)	(-42.29)
SCALE	7578.92	7708.30	7706.80	7706.67
Log Likelihood	-105,745	-119,251	-119,258	-119,257
Noncensored Values	8,321	9,224	9,224	9,224
Left Censored Values	261,119	299,936	299,936	299,936

Notes: (a) Variable not entered
t-ratios in parentheses

Source: 1990 Census of Population, Public Use Microdata Sample, 1 percent sample

TABLE 7
Signs of Partial Effects of Variables on Four Measures of Unemployment Insurance Benefits
For Adult Men , Pooled Native and Foreign Born, and Foreign Born Only, 1990

Variables	Total Benefits All		Claim Probability All		Total Benefits Recipients		Weekly Benefits Recipients	
	Pooled	Foreign Born	Pooled	Foreign Born	Pooled	Foreign Born	Pooled	Foreign Born
Education	--	--	--	--	+	+	+	+
Experience	+	0	+	0	+	+	0	+
Not Married	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0
Rural	+	+	+	+	--	0	0	0
South	--	--	--	--	0	0	0	0
Agriculture	--	+	--	+	0	--	0	0
Foreign born	--	(a)	--	(a)	+	(a)	+	(a)
Foreign/Agriculture	+	(a)	+	(a)	--	(a)	0	(a)
Year of Immigration								
Pre-1950	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1950-1959	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	0
1960-1964	0	+	0	+	+	0	+	+
1965-1969	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	0
1970-1974	0	+	--	+	0	0	0	0
1975-1979	--	(a)	--	(a)	0	(a)	0	(a)
1980-1981	--	--	--	--	0	0	0	0
1982-1984	--	--	--	--	+	0	0	0
1985-1986	--	--	--	--	0	0	0	+
1987-1990	--	--	--	--	+	0	0	0
Naturalized Citizen	0	--	0	--	0	0	0	0
Speaks English	0	--	0	--	0	+	0	0
Constant	--	--	--	--	--	0	--	0

TABLE 7 continued

Notes:　Only variables significant at the 5 percent level are signed; + means positive effect, -- means negative effect; non-significant variables are marked with a "0".

Signs in the "Pooled" columns are derived from Tables 6, B-3, B-2, and B-4 respectively.

The "Foreign Born" variable is from column 2 in each table.　All other variables are from column 4.

The signs in the "Foreign Born" columns are derived from Table B-5.

(a)　Variable not entered.

IZA Discussion Papers

No.	Author(s)	Title	Area	Date
31	C. M. Schmidt	Persistence and the German Unemployment Problem: Empirical Evidence on German Labor Market Flows	1/7	2/99
32	S.- Å. Dahl Ø. A. Nilsen K. Vaage	Work or Retirement? Exit Routes for Norwegian Elderly	3/7	2/99
33	A. Lindbeck D. J. Snower	Price Dynamics and Production Lags	1/7	2/99
34	P. A. Puhani	Labour Mobility – An Adjustment Mechanism in Euroland?	1/2	3/99
35	D. A. Jaeger A. Huff Stevens	Is Job Stability in the United States Falling? Reconciling Trends in the Current Population Survey and Panel Study of Income Dynamics	1	3/99
36	C. Lauer	The Effects of European Economic and Monetary Union on Wage Behaviour	1/2	3/99
37	H. S. Buscher C. Müller	Exchange Rate Volatility Effects on the German Labour Market: A Survey of Recent Results and Extensions	1/2	3/99
38	M. E. Ward P. J. Sloane	Job Satisfaction within the Scottish Academic Profession	7	4/99
39	A. Lindbeck D. J. Snower	Multi-Task Learning and the Reorganization of Work	1/5	4/99
40	S. M. Golder T. Straubhaar	Empirical Findings on the Swiss Migration Experience	1	4/99
41	J. M. Orszag D. J. Snower	Anatomy of Policy Complementarities	3/7	5/99
42	D. S. Hamermesh	The Changing Distribution of Job Satisfaction	7	5/99
43	C. Belzil J. Hansen	Household Characteristics, Ability and Education: Evidence from a Dynamic Expected Utility Model	7	5/99
44	D. N. F. Bell R. A. Hart	Overtime Working in an Unregulated Labour Market	1	6/99
45	R. A. Hart J. R. Malley	On the Cyclicality and Stability of Real Earnings	1	6/99
46	R. Rotte M. Vogler	The Effects of Development on Migration: Theoretical Issues and New Empirical Evidence	2	6/99

47	R. A. Hart F. Ritchie	Tenure-based Wage Setting	1/7	7/99
48	T. Bauer K. F. Zimmermann	Overtime Work and Overtime Compensation in Germany	1	7/99
49	H. P. Grüner	Unemployment and Labor-Market Reform: A Contract Theoretic Approach	1/3	7/99
50	K. F. Zimmermann	Ethnic German Migration After 1989 – Balance and Perspectives	1	8/99
51	A. Barrett P. J. O'Connell	Does Training Generally Work? The Returns to In-Company Training	7	8/99
52	J. Mayer R. T. Riphahn	Fertility Assimilation of Immigrants: Evidence from Count Data Models	3	8/99
53	J. Hartog P. T. Pereira J. A. C. Vieira	Inter-industry Wage Dispersion in Portugal: high but falling	7	8/99
54	M. Lofstrom	Labor Market Assimilation and the Self-Employment Decision of Immigrant Entrepreneurs	1	8/99
55	L. Goerke	Value-added Tax versus Social Security Contributions	3	8/99
56	A. Lindbeck D. J. Snower	Centralized Bargaining and Reorganized Work: Are they compatible?	1/5	9/99
57	I. N. Gang K. F. Zimmermann	Is Child like Parent? Educational Attainment and Ethnic Origin	1	9/99
58	T. Bauer K. F. Zimmermann	Occupational Mobility of Ethnic Migrants	1	9/99
59	D. J. DeVoretz S. A. Laryea	Canadian Immigration Experience: Any Lessons for Europe?	1/2/3	9/99
60	C. Belzil J. Hansen	Subjective Discount Rates, Intergenerational Transfers and the Return to Schooling	7	10/99
61	R. Winkelmann	Immigration: The New Zealand Experience	7	10/99
62	A. Thalmaier	Bestimmungsgründe von Fehlzeiten: Welche Rolle spielt die Arbeitslosigkeit?	3	10/99
63	M. Ward	Your Everyday, Average Academic	5	10/99
64	M. Ward	Salary and the Gender Salary Gap in the Academic Profession	5	10/99
65	H. Lehmann J. Wadsworth A. Acquisti	Grime and Punishment: Job Insecurity and Wage Arrears in the Russian Federation	4	10/99

66	E. J. Bird H. Kayser J. R. Frick G. G. Wagner	The Immigrant Welfare Effect: Take-Up or Eligibility?	3	10/99
67	R. T. Riphahn A. Thalmaier	Behavioral Effects of Probation Periods: An Analysis of Worker Absenteeism	1/3	10/99
68	B. Dietz	Ethnic German Immigration from Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union to Germany: the Effects of Migrant Networks	1	11/99
69	M.-S. Yun	Generalized Selection Bias and the Decomposition of Wage Differentials	7	11/99
70	I. N. Gang F.L. Rivera-Batiz	Immigrants and Unemployment in the European Community	1	11/99
71	L. Goerke	The Wedge	3	11/99
72	J. Fersterer R. Winter-Ebmer	Are Austrian Returns to Education Falling Over Time?	7	11/99
73	G. S. Epstein S. Nitzan	The Endogenous Determination of Minimum Wage	3	11/99
74	M. Kräkel	Strategic Mismatches in Competing Teams	7	12/99
75	B. Henry M. Karanassou D. J. Snower	Adjustment Dynamics and the Natural Rate: An Account of UK Unemployment	1	12/99
76	G. Brunello M. Giannini	Selective Schools	7	12/99
77	C. M. Schmidt	Knowing What Works: The Case for Rigorous Program Evaluation	6	12/99
78	J. Hansen R. Wahlberg	Endogenous Schooling and the Distribution of the Gender Wage Gap	7	12/99
79	J. S. Earle Z. Sakova	Entrepreneurship from Scratch: Lessons on the Entry Decision into Self-Employment from Transition Economies	4	12/99
80	J. C. van Ours J. Veenman	The Netherlands: Old Emigrants – Young Immigrant Country	1	12/99
81	T. J. Hatton S. Wheatley Price	Migration, Migrants and Policy in the United Kingdom	1	12/99
82	K. A. Konrad	Privacy, time consistent optimal labor income taxation and education policy	3	12/99
83	R. Euwals	Female Labour Supply, Flexibility of Working Hours, and Job Mobility in the Netherlands	1	12/99
84	C. M. Schmidt	The Heterogeneity and Cyclical Sensitivity of Unemployment: An Exploration of German Labor Market Flows	1	12/99

85	S. Pudney M. A. Shields	Gender and Racial Discrimination in Pay and Promotion for NHS Nurses	5/6	12/99
86	J.P. Haisken-DeNew C. M. Schmidt	Money for Nothing and Your Chips for Free? The Anatomy of the PC Wage Differential	5/7	12/99
87	T. K. Bauer	Educational Mismatch and Wages in Germany	7	12/99
88	O. Bover P. Velilla	Migration in Spain: Historical Background and Current Trends	1	12/99
89	S. Neuman	Aliyah to Israel: Immigration under Conditions of Adversity	1	12/99
90	H. Lehmann J. Wadsworth	Tenures that Shook the World: Worker Turnover in Russia, Poland and Britain	4	12/99
91	M. Lechner	Identification and Estimation of Causal Effects of Multiple Treatments Under the Conditional Independence Assumption	6	12/99
92	R. E. Wright	The Rate of Return to Private Schooling	7	12/99
93	M. Lechner	An Evaluation of Public-Sector-Sponsored Continuous Vocational Training Programs in East Germany	6	12/99
94	M. Eichler M. Lechner	An Evaluation of Public Employment Programmes in the East German State of Sachsen-Anhalt	6	12/99
95	P. Cahuc A. Zylberberg	Job Protection, Minimum Wage and Unemployment	3	12/99
96	P. Cahuc A. Zylberberg	Redundancy Payments, Incomplete Labor Contracts, Unemployment and Welfare	3	12/99
97	A. Barrett	Irish Migration: Characteristics, Causes and Consequences	1	12/99
98	J.P. Haisken-DeNew C. M. Schmidt	Industry Wage Differentials Revisited: A Longitudinal Comparison of Germany and USA	5/7	12/99
99	R. T. Riphahn	Residential Location and Youth Unemployment: The Economic Geography of School-to-Work-Transitions	1	12/99
100	J. Hansen M. Lofstrom	Immigrant Assimilation and Welfare Participation: Do Immigrants Assimilate Into or Out-of Welfare?	1/3/7	12/99
101	L. Husted H. S. Nielsen M. Rosholm N. Smith	Employment and Wage Assimilation of Male First Generation Immigrants in Denmark	3	1/00
102	B. van der Klaauw J. C. van Ours	Labor Supply and Matching Rates for Welfare Recipients: An Analysis Using Neighborhood Characteristics	2/3	1/00
103	K. Brännäs	Estimation in a Duration Model for Evaluating Educational Programs	6	1/00

104	S. Kohns	Different Skill Levels and Firing Costs in a Matching Model with Uncertainty – An Extension of Mortensen and Pissarides (1994)	1	1/00
105	G. Brunello C. Graziano B. Parigi	Ownership or Performance: What Determines Board of Directors' Turnover in Italy?	7	1/00
106	L. Bellmann S. Bender U. Hornsteiner	Job Tenure of Two Cohorts of Young German Men 1979 - 1990: An analysis of the (West-)German Employment Statistic Register Sample concerning multivariate failure times and unobserved heterogeneity	1	1/00
107	J. C. van Ours G. Ridder	Fast Track or Failure: A Study of the Completion Rates of Graduate Students in Economics	7	1/00
108	J. Boone J. C. van Ours	Modeling Financial Incentives to Get Unemployed Back to Work	3/6	1/00
109	G. J. van den Berg B. van der Klaauw	Combining Micro and Macro Unemployment Duration Data	7	1/00
110	D. DeVoretz C. Werner	A Theory of Social Forces and Immigrant Second Language Acquisition	1	2/00
111	V. Sorm K. Terrell	Sectoral Restructuring and Labor Mobility: A Comparative Look at the Czech Republic	1/4	2/00
112	L. Bellmann T. Schank	Innovations, Wages and Demand for Heterogeneous Labour: New Evidence from a Matched Employer-Employee Data-Set	5	2/00
113	R. Euwals	Do Mandatory Pensions Decrease Household Savings? Evidence for the Netherlands	7	2/00
114	G. Brunello A. Medio	An Explanation of International Differences in Education and Workplace Training	7	2/00
115	A. Cigno F. C. Rosati	Why do Indian Children Work, and is it Bad for Them?	7	2/00
116	C. Belzil	Unemployment Insurance and Subsequent Job Duration: Job Matching vs. Unobserved Heterogeneity	7	2/00
117	S. Bender A. Haas C. Klose	IAB Employment Subsample 1975-1995. Opportunities for Analysis Provided by the Anonymised Subsample	7	2/00
118	M. A. Shields M. E. Ward	Improving Nurse Retention in the British National Health Service: The Impact of Job Satisfaction on Intentions to Quit	5	2/00
119	A. Lindbeck D. J. Snower	The Division of Labor and the Market for Organizations	5	2/00
120	P. T. Pereira P. S. Martins	Does Education Reduce Wage Inequality? Quantile Regressions Evidence from Fifteen European Countries	5/7	2/00

An updated list of IZA Discussion Papers is available on the center's homepage *www.iza.org*.