Institute for Research on Poverty
Discussion Paper no. 1204-00

Metropolitan Labor Markets and Ethnic Niching: Introduction to a Research Project

Franklin D. Wilson
Center for Demography and Ecology
and
Institute for Research on Poverty
University of Wisconsin–Madison
E-mail: wilson@ssc.wisc.edu

January 2000

Analysis for this paper was supported by a Center Grant (5P30-HD05876) from the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development to the Center for Demography and Ecology, University of Wisconsin–Madison. Editorial assistance was provided by the staff of the Institute for Research on Poverty.

Abstract

This paper reports the findings of a study of labor market niching involving 102 ethnic groups living in 216 metropolitan areas in 1990. Approximately 12 percent of the labor force of the 216 metropolitan areas studied was employed in ethnic niches. The percentage in niches was substantially higher for indigenous minority groups (American Indians, African Americans, Hawaiians, and Puerto Ricans) and for non-European groups, including those from Latin American, the Caribbean, and Asia. Also, 59 percent of employment sectors, formed by cross-classifying 47 major industries and 19 major occupations, had at least 1 percent of their workforces employed in niches, with the percentage so concentrated being higher for construction, manufacturing, and selected consumer market and professional service sectors, and selected managerial/professional, service, and blue-collar occupations. The study found that ethnic groups differ considerably with respect to the types of sectors in which they have niches. Niches in service and blue-collar occupations associated with construction, manufacturing, and consumer market industries are primarily occupied by indigenous minority and non-European groups. Niches in professional/managerial and technical occupations are dominated by European, Middle Eastern, and selected Asian groups. Although niching appears to be pervasive among some ethnic groups, for individual groups there is considerable discontinuity in the sectors in which niching occurs across metropolitan areas; few groups have multiple occupational niches within a given industry in one or more metropolitan area. Finally, workers employed in workplace jobs in which the workforce is majority co-ethnic are also likely to work in ethnic niches. It is suggested that ethnic niching emerges from economic competition resulting from changes in the relative number and sizes of ethnic populations in conjunction with the expansion/contraction of employment opportunities in local labor markets.

Metropolitan Labor Markets and Ethnic Niching: Introduction to a Research Project

INTRODUCTION

A substantial body of work suggests that occupational attainment processes allocate individuals with similar productivity characteristics into similar labor market positions (see Featherman and Hauser, 1978; Grusky, 1994). But other research raises a related question of whether ethnicity, as a socially and politically constructed collectivity, also influences or affects this allocation process. Recent work on the assimilation of individuals of European ancestry indicates that ethnicity may only be symbolic of distant primordial affiliations, and thus may provide little or no insight on their current labor market status (see Lieberson and Waters, 1988; Waters, 1990; Farley, 1991; Alba and Nee, 1997). Although this claim may have some merit, sufficient evidence exists to indicate significant differences in employment status, occupational attainment, and earnings between a large number of ethnic groups, including those of European ancestry (see Neidert and Farley, 1985; Farley, 1993; Logan, 1999; Waldinger, 1996a and 1996b).

This paper presents results documenting the need for further analysis of the ethnic basis of employment in metropolitan labor markets. The primary question raised here is a variant of that asked by some economic sociologists; namely, how do social structures intervene in market transactions involving the allocation of labor and capital in the production of goods? (See Portes, 1995, 1998.) Specifically, I ask whether observed ethnic variation in employment with respect to labor market sectors reflects the organization of ethnically based employment activities into meaningful, though nonexclusive, social collectivities, such as ethnic niches.

The objectives of this paper are rather modest. First, it presents a comparative analysis of labor market niching, focusing on identifying and describing inter- and intraethnic group differences as they exist within and between metropolitan areas in 1990. Second, it explores the association of the ethnic composition of workplace affiliation of employed persons identified in the Multi-City Study of Urban

Inequality with being employed in an industry/occupation sector identified as a niche for one's ethnic group. Results reported below for 102 ethnic/ancestry groups living in 216 metropolitan areas in 1990 show that ethnic groups differ substantially in ethnic niching, including the employment sector in which niching occurs, and the extent of geographic continuity in niching. Approximately 12 percent of the labor force of major metropolitan areas in 1990 was employed in ethnic niches, and ethnically homogeneous workplaces were associated with ethnic niches defined by industry and occupation sector of employment. Later work will focus on explaining the patterns of ethnic niching that emerge from the analysis reported here. The focus on ethnic niching is motivated by questions of whether it plays an important role in structuring labor market opportunities available to individuals, and whether it is a major factor promoting inequality among workers of different ethnic backgrounds.

BACKGROUND

Sources of Ethnic Niching

The term ethnic niche is used here to designate employment sector categories (occupation- or industry-based) in which members of a specific ethnic group are concentrated above a level one would expect based on their share of the total labor force in a local labor market. Sociologically, an employment-based ethnic niche is a social collectivity in which a substantial fraction of its members may be known to each other, and are a part of a social network formed by common ties of culture, shared genealogy and history, religion, race, national origin, and/or co-residence. Although ethnic niches are often formed through self-selection, I use the term to refer to any collectivity in which members of an ethnic group are concentrated at a higher level than members of other groups (see the methodological discussion below).

The model of ethnic niching proposed here rests on three assumptions. First, human societies can be conceptualized as being structured on the basis of socially and politically constructed collectivities or

"group-based social hierarchies" (see van den Berghe, 1978; Sidanius and Pratto, 1999). Second, the location of an individual collectivity in a hierarchy is substantially determined by the extent of access to and control of scarce resources, such as authority and power, wealth, prestige, and material resources (Sidanius and Pratto, 1999). Ethnicity, in this sense, represents a form of social capital through which individuals gain access to resources by virtue of their identification and affiliation with the collectivity (Portes, 1998). Finally, ethnic collectivities, though often situationally determined, emerge, in part, through the competition for scarce resources and subsequently facilitate individual members' access to and control of these resources (see Olzak, 1992). Niching is an important aspect of the ethnic division of labor present in local labor markets, because it provides ethnic groups a means of securing for their members a share of the material resources available for distribution through employment, and, through network recruiting and the imposition of regulatory mechanisms and procedures, enables them to maintain their respective positions in the labor market (see Waldinger, 1996a).

The process underlying the formation, persistence, and changes in the extent of ethnic niching is driven by economic competition resulting from changes in the relative number and sizes of ethnic populations in conjunction with the expansion and contraction of employment opportunities in local labor markets. In addition, in multi-ethnic societies in which market exchange is the predominant mode of economic organization, ethnic groups not only may compete for existing labor market opportunities but, through marshaling their own resources, may exploit opportunities to produce and distribute goods and services for which no previous demand existed.

A key aspect of ethnicity, both as a form of collective identity and affiliation, is that group members share a common set of beliefs, behavioral expectations, norms, experiences, cultural practices, and/or resources. This has important implications for the social organization of labor market activities. As previously stated, group membership is in itself a resource, structuring the individual's location and activities in labor markets. In addition, many of these shared attributes are relevant to group members' participation in the labor force, as they may facilitate or enhance their ability to exploit available

opportunities through social capital formation centered on the family, voluntary associations, and residential concentrations. The intergenerational transfer of capital, business ownership, and knowledge about a labor market specialty is one example of how the specialization of groups in a given activity can persist and become spatially diffused; the formation of cooperative economic enterprises, as is characteristic of ethnic economies, where labor and capital are shared is another, and trust and mutual obligations are often essential (see Portes and Manning, 1986; Portes, 1995; Granovetter, 1995).

Generally, niches are associated with the concentration and specialization of members of an ethnic group in industrial/occupational activities based on members' ability to meet labor demand through social network connections, and, in some instances, based on their possessing special skills, experiences, or other attributes that employers consider relevant to productivity (see Lieberson, 1980, Morawska, 1990, Waldinger, 1996a, b; Scott, 1996; Model, 1997; Reitz, 1990). However, there are other social formations identified in the literature in which niches are essential components. For example, niches are intrinsically linked to (1) ethnic economies, the concentration of co-ethnic owners and workers in one or more related industries for the purpose of exporting goods or to meet market demand often arising internally within the ethnic group (Logan, Alba, and McNulty, 1994), and (2) middle-man minorities, businessmen of one ethnic group providing goods and services to members of another ethnic group (Bonacich, 1973). The first social formation may also include ethnic enclaves, if specialization and spatial concentration are involved. There are numerous examples of these formations in the literature (see Bailey and Waldinger, 1991; Aldrich and Waldinger, 1990; Logan, Alba, and McNulty, 1994; Model, 1993; Portes and Bach, 1985; Logan and Alba, forthcoming; Razin and Light, 1998; Light and Rosenstein, 1995; Waldinger, 1996a), even though, as suggested by Alba and Nee (1997), there is still considerable confusion regarding the distinction between ethnic economies and ethnic enclaves. In this case, as with middle-man minorities, entrepreneurs are the key actors responsible for promoting the development of ethnic niches, through the establishment of business enterprises which rely on co-ethnics as a labor supply. Residential concentration and the institutionalization of the provision of resources, goods, and

services through social networks facilitates the use of co-ethnics as a labor supply, particularly if English is not the standard means of discourse.

Furthermore, social interaction networks associated with enclaves are highly dense, which not only contributes to the saliency of ethnic boundaries but provides an avenue for the transfer of labor-market-relevant information and resources (see Portes and Manning 1986; Olzak, 1992).

Immigration, Discrimination, and Niching

Much research suggests that labor market niching is related to the flow of immigrants, usually from the same origin, to a particular destination (see Morawska, 1990; Model, 1993; Portes and Rumbaut, 1996; Waldinger, 1996a, b). Since migration is a network-driven process, immigrants do not select destinations at random, but rather move to places where there is an existing network of friends and relatives who can provide them with various forms of assistance, including jobs (see Massey, 1985; Massey et al, 1994; Sassen, 1995). Furthermore, immigration is a key process associated with the emergence of ethnic organizations and social networks and contributing to their persistence via population renewal and the reaffirmation of the cultural heritage and traditions of the group (see Olzak, 1992).

Several researchers have taken note of the fact that pioneer migrants may establish a presence in a given labor market activity—either because of prior experience, skills, propensity, or language—and others of similar backgrounds quickly follow suit (see Model, 1993; Morawska, 1990; Lieberson, 1980; Portes and Rumbaut, 1996; Waldinger, 1996a). Waldinger (1996a) suggests that through social networking, occupational closure quickly follows the establishment of occupational specialization. He further suggests that niches may provide a “protected environment” for members of a particular ethnic group, because members may be more favorably treated with respect to employment opportunities and may receive more equitable compensation than members who work in other industries (p. 95). For immigrants, employment in a niche may provide the opportunity to acquire the necessary skills,

experience, and capital to secure employment in the general local economy. Further, the presence of ethnic economies, whether or not they are enclaves, facilitates ready access to jobs through social networking (see Portes and Rumbaut, 1996; Waldinger, forthcoming).

Labor market discrimination faced by immigrants and members of established ethnic groups may lead to the formation of employment niches in sectors of the local labor market in which there are few if any discriminatory barriers and in which members of other ethnic groups are not present in appreciable numbers (Granovetter, 1995; Sassen, 1995). For example, among members of the least desired group in the labor queue, niches may emerge not just through self-selection but also because group members are more or less forced to accept whatever residual jobs are available once groups higher up in the queue have made their selection. Historically, the concentration of blacks in low-skill/low-wage occupations can in part be attributed to limited access to the broad array of occupations available in labor markets in which they are situated (see Lieberson, 1980; Model and Ladipo, 1996).

An employment niche established by one ethnic group, may, through succession, become associated with another ethnic group, as the former group shifts its employment to other industries and occupations that offer greater remuneration, as in occupational upgrading. The upgrading can occur through an upward shift in the educational distribution of a group and/or a lessening of labor market discrimination, providing ethnic group members access to a broader array of occupational opportunities. The new occupants of the employment niche often face limited mobility options either because of limited skills and experiences or because of the presence of barriers limiting their participation in the labor market and access to occupational opportunities.

Although niching by industry and occupation appears to be substantial for many of the ethnic groups that have experienced considerable population increases through immigration since 1965, except in the case of ethnic enclaves or co-ethnic owner-controlled ethnic economies, we do not have a clear picture of which ethnic groups are more likely to have members employed in niches, what role immigration plays in the niching process, and in what industrial sectors and occupations niching is likely

to occur. These are important questions that research should attempt to address. Niching is not simply an employment strategy pursued by recent migrants through social networking, but is also a strategy adopted by groups because of the long-term economic advantages associated with specializing and concentrating in an activity. For example, on the surface, it would appear that niching is more likely to be associated with low-skill occupations that pay minimum wages, and where informal channels of transmitting information about job opportunities seem more effective. However, Waldinger (1994, 1996a) clearly demonstrates that the concentration of Russian Jews in professional/managerial occupations and African-American and Asian immigrant concentrations in municipal government are examples of niches in which incumbents have college degrees. Waldinger (1996b) and Scott (1996) make similar cases for Israelis, Chinese, and Japanese in Los Angeles (see also Logan and Alba, forthcoming). Unfortunately, we do not know what share of a group's employment in a niche is associated with high- versus low-skill occupations, and whether the high-skill/low-skill mix changes with duration of residence and/or nativity. Moreover, based on findings reported by Waldinger (1996a) we do know that predominantly native-born groups also concentrate in niches and that the organization of labor market activities through ethnic niching can continue to provide economic value even to succeeding generations who are regarded as having been assimilated.

Intermetropolitan Variation

The literature on ethnic niching is weakest with respect to comparative studies of its association with characteristics of metropolitan areas. One could hypothesize, for example, that ethnic niching is a collective response to conditions prevailing in local labor markets. Niching emerges from the interaction of labor-force-relevant attributes and resources of ethnic groups with the opportunity structure and other conditions prevailing in local labor markets, including the presence of other ethnic groups, supply and demand conditions, and the industrial structure of the area.

Much of what is known about ethnic niching is based on case studies of selected ethnic groups in individual metropolitan areas, such as New York, Miami, Los Angeles, Chicago, Toronto, and San Francisco (see Waldinger, 1996a; Reitz, 1990; Model, 1997; Logan and Alba, forthcoming). Most of the groups studied have been those that have increased in size due to substantial immigration in the last quarter of a century, including Mexicans, Hondurans, Salvadorans, Chinese, Filipinos, Koreans, Vietnamese, Haitians, Cubans, West Indians, Dominicans, Guatemalans, Russians, and Colombians concentrated in major gateway cities (see Porter and Rumbaut, 1996, p. 36, Figure 1). Although this approach can be fully justified on the basis of the importance that immigration has played in the economy of these places, there is also a danger in misrepresenting the role that ethnic niching plays as a mechanism for organizing an ethnically diverse population, whether or not local areas have received significant flows of immigrants in the recent past.

Although there is considerable evidence pointing to the crucial role of immigration, little is known of the precise nature of the relationship of immigration with the organization of local labor markets into ethnic niches. Previous studies of labor conflict during the 1875–1930 period suggest that interurban variations in the volume of immigration, share of the local population foreign-born, the extent of ethnic diversity of the urban population, and the expansion and contraction of local economies each had important effects on the extent of competition between ethnic groups, which, in turn, affected the level of conflict present in local areas (see Lieberson, 1980; Olzak, 1992). In addition, it is not clear whether the associations of immigration and ethnic differentiation with ethnic niching are linear and positive. These associations are probably conditional on the economic structure of metropolises and related to the nativity and skill distributions of ethnic populations. For example, Eaton (1998) reports that in small and medium-size cities, immigrants fill occupational niches that would not exist in their absence. Moreover, since some ethnic groups contain substantial immigrant shares, it would be of some importance to determine what share of niche concentrations is driven by local circumstances.

I am aware of only three studies that analyze ethnically based employment concentration for more than three metropolitan areas. The first, by Logan, Alba, and McNulty (1994), reports the results of a study of ethnic economies in metropolitan areas in 1980. Their study focuses on the top five areas of concentration for each of the ethnic groups studied. Their results indicate a certain level of consistency in the type of industries in which individual groups concentrate across metropolitan areas. Non-Hispanic whites are disproportionately concentrated in professional and financial services, and in unionized and highly paid blue-collar occupations in most metropolitan areas. African Americans are concentrated in transportation and personal and social services; Puerto Ricans in food stores; Filipinos in health services; Asian Indians in eating places, health services (including hospitals), and transportation; and Japanese, Chinese, Koreans, Cubans, and Mexicans likely to be concentrated in a large number of industries, many situated in economic enclaves. In contrast to non-Hispanic whites, the other ethnic groups who had a disproportionate number of entrepreneurs were likely to be associated with business activities requiring little investment and which pay lower wages and provide goods to an ethnic market. Cubans in Miami were the only group that came close to exhibiting a pattern of dominance similar to that observed among non-Hispanic whites. The analysis by Logan and colleagues makes it clear that ethnic groups such as Japanese, Chinese, Koreans, and Cubans are very similar in the types of industries that are included in their respective ethnic economies, regardless of whether they are concentrated in the same city. Razin and Light (1998), in an analysis of intermetropolitan variation in self-employment among similar non-European groups, report similar findings. Specifically, their results indicate that nonmainstream groups, mainly non-Europeans, show a marked tendency to concentrate in a small number of entrepreneurial niches and exhibit high niche continuity across metropolitan areas.

The third study, reported by Wilson (forthcoming), focuses on the association of concentration of co-ethnics in niches with employment status, occupational attainment, and earnings for four pan-ethnic groups resident in 23 metropolitan areas. This study's findings suggest first that concentration in ethnic niches in 23 of the largest metropolitan areas varies significantly by ethnicity. In 1990, 9 percent of

whites, 27 percent of Asians, 36 percent of Hispanics, and 37 percent of African Americans were employed in co-ethnic niches. These levels represent increases from 1980, except for African Americans, who experienced a 3 percent decrease in niche employment. A substantially greater percentage of African Americans were concentrated in co-ethnic niches in industry/occupation sectors in which no other ethnic group had a niche, and few of these niches are associated with activities linked to enclave economies. These niches were most often the lower tier of the occupational distribution in health care, social services, and public administration industries. By way of contrast, Asian and Hispanic groups were concentrated in industry/occupation sectors where other ethnic groups also had established niches. A substantial number of these concentrations reflect employment in economies or enclave-based establishment providing goods and services in protected ethnic markets, as suggested by Logan, Alba and McNulty (1994).

CURRENT ANALYSIS

The current analysis is an extension of previous work (Wilson, forthcoming) in which the universe has been expanded to include 102 ethnic/ancestry groups resident in 216 metropolitan areas in 1990. The primary objective of the current analysis is more modest, as it seeks to provide a descriptive summary of the extent of concentration of individual populations in ethnic niches in 1990. This is a necessary precursor to a larger analysis of the determinants of intermetropolitan variation in ethnic niching and changes in niching between 1980 and 1990. I seek to determine which ethnic groups are more likely to be concentrated in labor market niches according to industry/occupation sectors, and whether the sectors that form the basis of niches for individual groups exhibit high continuity across metropolitan areas.

RESEARCH DESIGN

Data

The data for this analysis are derived from the Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) files for 1990, 1 and 5 percent samples. I have merged the 1 and 5 percent PUMS, since they are independent representative samples of the U.S. population. This has the advantage of increasing the sample counts for small ethnic populations in individual metropolitan areas. These files have sufficient subsamples for metropolitan areas to calculate measures and perform analysis on each as if they were independent samples. The actual number of metropolitan areas included in the sample is 216. The selection of individual metropolitan areas was based largely on whether the estimated population count for a metropolitan area derived from the 5 percent PUMS was within 95 percent of the estimated count derived from the 1 percent PUMS. Population counts based on the 1 percent PUMS for most metropolitan areas are more accurate because the geography corresponds to that given in the official definition of PMSAs and MSAs. Included in the 216 metropolitan areas are 21 consolidated metropolitan statistical areas (CMSA) composed of 68 PMSAs, with the remaining 195 units being metropolitan statistical areas (MSA).

The 5 percent PUMS file does not provide representative samples of the population of all metropolitan areas, including New York, Memphis, Houston, Cincinnati, Baltimore, Miami, and Philadelphia, among others. In the vast majority of affected metropolitan areas, the population in the omitted territory represents less than 5 percent of the total population. The underrepresentation occurs because identifying the population of an excluded area would have violated confidentiality rules. A number of metropolitan areas include counties with total populations too small to be identified on the 5 percent sample files, particularly if the missing county was located in another state. In these cases, small counties were combined with other counties that were a part of the same metropolitan area or with adjacent nonmetropolitan counties or counties that were a part of another metropolitan area. In other

instances, metropolitan counties located in a different state were merged with other counties of that state. I use the Public Use Microdata Areas (PUMA) codes available on the 5 percent PUMS to reassign areas that properly belong to a metropolitan unit, provided the additional geography does not increase the population of the metropolitan areas by more than 5 percent of its official size. In other instances, if parts of the territory of one metropolitan area are combined with the territory of other metropolitan areas, I combine the entire territory of both metropolitan areas and treat them as one unit.

Measurement of Variables

In generating tabulations of ethnic populations in industry- and occupation-specific niches for individual metropolitan areas, I have attempted to preserve as much detail as possible in categorizing ethnicity, occupation, and industry. Ethnicity consists of 102 categories, using the information on *first* ancestry mentioned by respondents to identify 84 categories, and first and second ancestry to identify 18 additional categories. All but one of the categories contain at least 1,000 sample respondents on the 1990 PUMS. The use of first ancestry mentioned is not completely reliable as a measure of ethnicity, particularly for white European groups (see Farley, 1991). Nevertheless, the first ancestry categories capture a great deal of the diversity of countries of origin reflected in the U.S. population. The 18 combined categories were created in instances in which 1,000 or more respondents reported the same second ancestry for 1990. This occurred only for European ancestry groups. One thousand respondents per ancestry group is sufficient to delineate industry and occupational clusters of 20 sample respondents or more in individual metropolitan areas. Each of the ethnic (ancestry) groups identified has a substantial presence in at least one metropolitan area. Although I agree with claims of the problematic character of the ancestry data, there is no reason to expect that these data are of no use in identifying statistical regularities in the distribution of ethnic populations across employment sectors (see Neidert and Farley, 1985).

I use a 47-category breakdown of industry and a 19-category breakdown of occupations. An ethnic niche consists of an employment sector, defined by the i^{th} industry/occupation cell, with 333 or more workers (population, not sample counts), and in which members of a specific ethnic group are 1.5 times more likely to be concentrated than members of all other ethnic groups, as defined by the concentration index, i.e.,

$$CI_{ijk} = ((e_{ijk} / o_{ijk}) / (e_{jk} / o_{jk}))*100$$

where CI_{ijk} is the concentrated index for the i^{th} industry/occupation sector, the j^{th} ethnic group living in the k^{th} metropolitan area; e_{ijk} is the number of workers of ethnic group (j) who are associated with the i^{th} industry/occupation sector and living in the k^{th} metropolitan area; e_{jk} is all workers of ethnic group (j) in metropolitan area (k); and o_{ijk} and o_{jk} are similarly defined for the employment of all "other" groups in the i^{th} industry/occupation sector and living in the k^{th} metropolitan area. This measure is an odds ratio, and as such is independent of the proportion a group represents of the total population. The value 1.5, though arbitrary, attempts to set a lower limit to the extent to which an ethnic group is specialized in an activity. However, I should note here that in subsequent analysis I intend to focus on the full range of values individual groups may have for each activity in which there are 333 or more members.

An employment sector composed of 333 co-ethnic workers, based on an average of 20 sample respondents, is the minimum statistical aggregate needed to ensure reliable results. In addition to employment sectors identified as niches, there is a residual category consisting of sectors in which the concentration index is less than 150 and/or the number of workers per sector is less than 333. In subsequent analysis, this classification will make it possible to observe shifts in employment between nonniche and niche sectors for individual ethnic groups between 1980 and 1990.

Industry, rather than industry/occupation, is often used to delineate the sector boundaries of niches. I also use this approach, but only when industry is the most appropriate unit to define an attribute. (For example, industry rather than industry/occupation would be more appropriate for identifying owners and managers of an ethnic group.) The combination of industry and occupation provides a more refined

measure of the type of work activities in which individuals are engaged. Although ethnic niches have often been distinguished according to gender, immigration status, and public sector, these characteristics are treated as attributes of niches in this study. For each employment sector identified, whether or not a niche, selected information on the characteristics of workers is appended. This information includes percentage foreign-born, gender, self-employed, supervisor, mean number of years completed, and English fluency.

RESULTS

Industry/Occupation Sectors as Niches

Before results are summarized for individual ethnic groups, it would be useful to address a broader issue related to the extent of labor market niching across an array of industry and occupational sectors. Is niching limited to a few sectors, and how extensive is it in employment sectors in which it does occur? The results reported in Table 1, which indicate the share of the labor force in an industry/occupation sector that is employed in niches, provide answers to these questions. There are 893 cells in Table 1 formed by cross-classifying 47 industry with 19 major occupation categories. Thirteen of these cells contain structural zeros, because there are no workers present. Of the remaining 880 employment sectors identified in Table 1, 519 (59 percent) have 1 percent or more of workers employed in niches. Note, however, that there is considerable variation in the industry and occupational sectors in which niching is present. Reading across the rows, we see that a number of industry sectors have 15 or more occupations in which niching is present, including construction, wholesale, other retail, FIRE, business services, other personal services, entertainment and recreation, hospitals, and public administration. Reading down the columns, one can note that 10 of the occupational sectors have niche concentrations across industries, including professionals, managers and officials, management-related occupations, sales, administrative support, protective services, cleaning and building services, mechanics

TABLE 1
Share of Labor Force in an Industry/Occupational Sector Employed in Niches, 1990

	OCCUPATIONAL SECTOR																		
INDUSTRY	CCOUNT1	CCOUNT2	CCOUNT3	CCOUNT4	CCOUNT5	CCOUNT6	CCOUNT7	CCOUNT8	CCOUNT9	CCOUNT10	CCOUNT11	CCOUNT12	CCOUNT13	CCOUNT14	CCOUNT15	CCOUNT16	CCOUNT17	CCOUNT18	CCOUNT19
Agriculture	1	0	5	2	0	5	0	0	0	6	0	37	5	6	0	0	15	14	17
Forest, Fish, Hunt, Trap	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mining	10	7	16	4	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	9	0
Construction	16	5	8	3	3	6	0	0	0	9	0	5	12	13	0	3	13	17	27
Food & Kindred	6	1	0	0	2	3	0	7	0	10	0	0	5	0	0	19	30	14	27
Other Nondurable	3	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	14	26	8	13
Textile Mill Product	4	0	0	6	3	13	0	0	0	16	0	0	29	8	0	22	48	16	35
Apparel & Oth. Fin. Text.	11	0	0	0	6	17	0	0	0	8	0	0	5	0	0	27	51	9	22
Paper & Allied	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	21	3	7
Print, Publish & Allied	8	4	11	0	5	2	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	3	9
Chemical & Allied	11	8	10	2	1	4	0	0	0	3	0	0	7	6	0	6	22	6	17
Petro. & Coal	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0
Lumb, Wood & Furn.	2	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	5	0	11	7	12	0	16	30	11	18
Other Durables	11	2	5	3	2	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	4	0	8	18	7	8
Primary Metal	3	0	2	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	7	21	11	13
Fabricated Metals	10	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	4	0	0	4	4	0	11	20	5	8
Machinery, exc. Elect.	15	5	12	8	8	6	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	4	0	13	18	3	9
Electric Mach. & Equip.	16	5	12	7	6	5	0	0	0	3	0	0	3	1	0	20	22	4	9
Motor Veh. & Equip	5	5	3	5	0	5	7	0	0	9	0	0	5	0	0	5	25	7	10
Other Trans. Equip.	26	12	23	4	3	12	3	0	0	4	0	0	7	8	0	8	19	0	10
Misc. Manufact.	4	0	2	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	12	20	0	10

table continues

TABLE 1, continued

INDUSTRY	OCCUPATIONAL SECTOR																		
	CCOUNT1	CCOUNT2	CCOUNT3	CCOUNT4	CCOUNT5	CCOUNT6	CCOUNT7	CCOUNT8	CCOUNT9	CCOUNT10	CCOUNT11	CCOUNT12	CCOUNT13	CCOUNT14	CCOUNT15	CCOUNT16	CCOUNT17	CCOUNT18	CCOUNT19
Not Spec. Manufact.	5	0	0	0	4	11	0	0	0	7	0	0	8	8	0	9	39	16	28
Truck., Ware. Storage	2	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	23	17
Other Transportation	6	6	2	10	3	15	11	4	0	15	8	0	5	5	0	1	8	16	22
Communications	6	2	5	3	8	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0
Utilities, Sanitary Service	7	3	4	2	0	6	0	0	0	3	0	0	6	11	0	10	4	19	21
Wholesale	13	7	6	2	10	3	0	8	0	11	0	22	9	9	0	13	25	15	24
General Merchandise	1	1	0	0	3	9	2	4	0	9	0	0	2	0	0	2	7	4	13
Groc, Dair, Ret. Bakeries	0	1	0	0	6	6	0	4	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	17	5	2	6
Motor Veh. Deal. & Gas Sta.	6	2	0	0	3	6	0	0	0	3	0	0	13	0	0	7	5	3	14
Eating and Drinking	9	2	0	0	28	3	0	16	0	19	4	0	0	0	0	3	4	2	7
Other Retail	6	2	7	1	3	2	7	4	0	6	0	2	5	11	0	3	9	10	10
Fin, Ins, Real Est.	13	6	5	3	13	3	13	0	0	23	13	4	2	4	0	3	2	3	8
Bank. & Credit	8	7	6	3	2	7	7	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Business Services	14	5	12	6	7	5	23	0	11	34	8	0	3	3	0	2	15	10	25
Repair Services	6	0	0	0	1	6	0	0	0	5	0	0	16	4	0	6	14	11	17
Private Household	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Other Personal Services	3	1	7	0	4	2	5	21	0	41	10	5	0	3	0	7	33	2	4
Entertain. & Recreat.	6	3	14	3	2	4	5	4	0	14	4	9	2	7	0	0	3	0	4
Hospitals	3	5	9	16	0	17	14	29	31	39	6	0	2	5	0	2	11	7	0
Health Service, exc. Hos.	6	0	12	3	3	3	0	11	24	19	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0
Element. & Second. Schs.	10	3	14	0	3	6	14	23	9	24	16	4	2	3	0	0	0	11	0

table continues

TABLE 1, continued

	OCCUPATIONAL SECTOR																		
INDUSTRY	CCOUNT1	CCOUNT2	CCOUNT3	CCOUNT4	CCOUNT5	CCOUNT6	CCOUNT7	CCOUNT8	CCOUNT9	CCOUNT10	CCOUNT11	CCOUNT12	CCOUNT13	CCOUNT14	CCOUNT15	CCOUNT16	CCOUNT17	CCOUNT18	CCOUNT19
College & Univ.	5	3	15	4	0	5	7	4	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Educat. Service	0	0	9	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Soc. Serv., Relig. & Memb.	7	4	9	0	2	8	3	11	16	12	7	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	5
Leg, Eng. & Oth. Prof. Serv.	15	13	25	5	4	4	11	0	0	9	4	0	0	3	0	0	4	3	3
Public Admin.	7	7	10	4	5	19	16	11	9	23	7	5	6	6	0	6	12	16	16

Occupation categories: CCOUNT(i)

1. Executive, Administrator, Manager
2. Management-related
3. Professional
4. Technical
5. Sales
6. Administrative Support
7. Protective Services
8. Food Services
9. Health Services
10. Cleaning and Building
11. Personal Services
12. Farming, Forestry, Fishery
13. Mechanics and Repairers
14. Construction Trade
15. Extractive
16. Precision Production
17. Machine Operators, Assemblers
18. Transportation and Material Moving
19. Laborers and Private Household

and repairers, precision production, machine operators and assemblers, transportation and material moving, and laborers.

While niching may be extensive, the percentage of workers employed in niches in individual employment sectors varies substantially from 1 to 51 percent, with most sectors having less then 10 percent of their workforce employed in niches. The percentages are higher for blue-collar workers in manufacturing, followed by service workers in tertiary sectors, administrators and managers, and professionals in both the manufacturing and tertiary sectors.

Further analysis will be required to identify factors associated with these patterns. Moreover, several possibilities come to mind. First, some employment sectors may have characteristics that facilitate the formation and persistence of niches—for example, sectors in which bureaucratic procedures in personnel actions may provide fewer opportunities for niche formation. On the other hand, sectors in which small business development is frequent, or in which collective bargaining is present, or in which worker productivity relies less on skills than on the regularity and persistence with which workers approach their tasks, may provide greater opportunities for niche formation.

Second, since employment sectors, as defined here, capture interindustry variations, it may well be that industry, not sector, is the most important structure, at least as it relates to employment outcomes. Recent work indicates considerable interindustry variation in product life cycle and market share, application of technology, rate of returns to capital, and extent of unionization of the workforce (see Tilly and Tilly, 1994; Dickens and Katz, 1986). These differences can result in differential outcomes to workers with regard to wages and working conditions. Model (1997) demonstrated this point in a recent study. Her analysis of the benefits to ethnic group members employed in ethnic economies in New York indicates that such benefits are not unique, as they were derived from the particular industry in which the workers were employed.

Table 2 provide summary statistics on the ethnic groups included in the analysis, including the number of metropolitan areas in which each group resides (columns 2 and 3); the percentage of the total

TABLE 2
Summary Labor Force Statistics for Ethnic Groups, 1990

	Metropolitan Areas				Concentration Index							
ETHNICITY	Labor Force Total (1)	No. MSAs (2)	No. MSAs 500+ Wrkrs (3)	% Lab. Force in MSAs (4)	Min. (5)	Mean (6)	Max. (7)	No. Niches (8)	% Lab. Force in Niches (9)	Single GP Niche (10)	Percent Immigrant (11)	Percent Women (12)
Mexico	5586528	214	131	89.317	150.51	381.47	6972.27	950	41.3090	13	0.48978	0.41207
Puerto Rico	830873	191	67	80.793	150.87	244.09	652.69	117	16.3037	1	0.00391	0.47318
Cuba	467214	167	28	97.021	150.14	241.71	1041.56	57	14.3152	2	0.80274	0.45591
San Salvador	270732	107	20	97.666	151.88	553.16	1847.33	90	45.0360	0	0.96641	0.43683
Guatemala	136295	107	13	90.945	151.04	572.79	2256.60	42	33.8265	0	0.94343	0.43487
Honduras	59511	92	10	88.705	175.49	559.81	1156.10	13	14.8842	0	0.91247	0.51499
Nicaragua	91119	87	11	103.181	173.85	385.52	1497.83	21	17.2500	2	0.91910	0.48843
Costa Rica	27842	79	5	78.205	.	.	.	0	0.0000	0	0.81007	0.50041
Dominican Republic	233097	116	13	75.839	151.25	429.17	1450.41	55	38.7917	0	0.86351	0.48932
Colombia	198207	136	17	85.552	150.10	411.85	1567.17	33	17.7394	0	0.88538	0.48786
Ecuador	122586	94	10	78.176	155.97	467.03	1063.20	22	20.0000	0	0.86417	0.46135
Peru	93781	106	10	83.227	150.76	451.46	1077.38	15	10.4354	0	0.88874	0.47017
Argentina	30314	87	9	95.671	156.52	184.00	212.79	3	4.2777	0	0.78363	0.44637
Chile	35486	79	6	83.095	184.84	570.38	990.98	2	2.8049	0	0.85488	0.44695
Panama	83132	139	16	83.788	154.69	456.25	1265.69	9	7.4084	0	0.74703	0.45431
Other Cen./So. America	1565956	214	131	81.124	150.41	200.44	611.96	154	9.9202	1	0.30539	0.48239
Other Hispanic	43377	131	9	79.626	194.88	292.59	417.89	4	5.4138	0	0.73712	0.57887
Haiti	166711	81	12	75.701	150.76	582.93	2367.39	37	31.2865	1	0.90711	0.47614
Jamaica	270668	137	23	73.011	153.16	414.65	922.60	35	22.1181	.	0.84879	0.55591
Trinidad/Tobago	49982	69	6	69.140	153.75	330.04	801.82	10	18.6785	0	0.92456	0.55203
Brazil	35790	88	8	71.287	234.41	676.29	1468.14	4	10.0775	0	0.83862	0.50388
Guyana	56123	59	5	68.687	153.24	291.67	581.65	8	16.1847	0	0.95756	0.52006

table continues

TABLE 2, continued

	Metropolitan Areas				Concentration Index							
ETHNICITY	Labor Force Total (1)	No. MSAs (2)	No. MSAs 500+ Wrkrs (3)	% Lab. Force in MSAs (4)	Min. (5)	Mean (6)	Max. (7)	No. Niches (8)	% Lab. Force in Niches (9)	Single GP Niche (10)	Percent Immigrant (11)	Percent Women (12)
Other Caribbean	181338	156	19	74.384	151.18	314.50	908.88	21	16.7555	0	0.68009	0.53586
Nigeria	45925	124	11	76.461	3951.32	3951.32	3951.32	1	1.0753	0	0.79416	0.32104
Other Sub-Sah. Africa	215570	174	41	73.898	153.14	628.54	2660.18	15	5.5530	0	0.54108	0.42957
Israel	38094	86	7	84.156	164.63	215.64	263.17	7	10.2075	0	0.69770	0.38587
Lebanon	181959	196	49	77.262	153.92	207.34	330.87	12	4.4379	0	0.29902	0.42742
Iran	117882	145	24	97.082	154.81	296.11	671.23	34	20.9898	0	0.93087	0.33213
Egypt	43571	100	11	86.700	154.46	267.13	426.75	6	6.9967	0	0.88672	0.30604
Syria	55336	148	15	78.632	226.89	296.46	355.53	3	3.6364	0	0.26116	0.42190
Turkey	37226	118	11	84.186	235.30	235.30	235.30	1	1.9507	0	0.59208	0.37177
Palestinian	25105	84	8	77.850	1630.10	1630.10	1630.10	1	2.5759	0	0.72861	0.28703
Assyrian	17727	52	7	116.743	662.46	1209.74	1757.02	2	7.9930	0	0.71416	0.41616
N. Africa/Mid. East	95451	153	23	80.415	161.44	457.11	1011.14	13	9.8852	0	0.76271	0.29047
Japan	524741	196	60	90.876	150.28	207.92	547.84	93	17.3629	.	0.26619	0.49992
China	959779	199	71	90.353	150.45	450.13	3409.69	204	31.6705	3	0.78721	0.47181
Philippines	768636	203	61	95.568	151.33	389.42	1660.75	155	29.1005	2	0.77731	0.55154
Korea	413683	201	55	87.074	150.30	480.13	2823.13	89	28.4566	3	0.89613	0.51682
Vietnam	265416	178	50	89.034	151.10	679.06	4900.90	57	19.1509	1	0.97078	0.42509
India/Pakistan	383652	191	60	83.547	151.94	332.64	1475.21	91	21.0972	0	0.93156	0.37359
Cambodia	37710	90	16	86.586	665.11	665.11	665.11	1	1.5419	0	0.98844	0.45264
Laos	49191	109	24	86.554	3819.77	4471.91	5092.99	2	1.7314	0	0.98902	0.42103
Thailand	63818	152	17	78.549	173.06	510.63	1482.66	9	11.0115	0	0.89634	0.59075
Pacific Islands	92858	160	21	84.325	194.66	213.24	261.59	4	2.1125	0	0.41699	0.49621
Other S.E. Asia	11792	45	2	86.607	.	.	.	0	0.0000	0	0.98768	0.33979

table continues

TABLE 2, continued

	Metropolitan Areas				Concentration Index							
ETHNICITY	Labor Force Total (1)	No. MSAs (2)	No. MSAs 500+ Wrkrs (3)	% Lab. Force in MSAs (4)	Min. (5)	Mean (6)	Max. (7)	No. Niches (8)	% Lab. Force in Niches (9)	Single GP Niche (10)	Percent Immigrant (11)	Percent Women (12)
Other Asia	120945	181	26	88.558	162.01	246.62	351.53	13	6.8827	0	0.77908	0.45644
American Indian	2707451	216	200	60.388	150.67	192.40	1911.81	160	6.6994	1	0.05699	0.49340
Hawaii	108726	146	12	78.931	153.53	258.31	573.70	13	13.2831	8	0.00398	0.48502
African American	13493776	216	192	68.188	150.28	301.11	6234.66	2010	33.4033	19	0.01646	0.53534
Canada	1252906	216	136	62.088	150.19	170.50	256.83	39	3.0163	0	0.12747	0.46439
Other N. America	19339389	216	216	61.554	150.09	185.01	662.60	1121	8.4883	5	0.05327	0.46215
Austria	308543	202	53	84.089	152.21	233.53	456.77	46	16.2370	0	0.09252	0.44962
Belgium	147030	187	40	73.336	199.68	199.68	199.68	1	0.3835	0	0.10589	0.44606
England	8393326	216	216	68.011	150.05	177.50	412.82	666	11.4494	2	0.04896	0.45483
Denmark	577084	210	101	66.538	150.16	180.02	286.99	24	3.6055	0	0.04603	0.47326
Netherlands	1362581	216	184	68.816	150.04	193.22	443.52	56	3.9309	1	0.06911	0.45633
France	2170363	216	201	62.851	150.03	177.69	301.07	80	3.4705	1	0.05688	0.49510
Germany	16004918	216	215	68.444	150.01	180.44	463.01	791	6.0618	3	0.03250	0.44979
Ireland	9056496	216	216	68.386	150.03	181.62	367.29	295	3.8240	1	0.01809	0.48043
Norway	1278243	216	123	60.673	150.29	175.85	291.38	56	4.8825	1	0.02216	0.48097
Scandinavia	271363	204	62	70.644	155.02	171.73	202.27	8	2.0915	0	0.01538	0.49353
Portugal	510002	184	50	75.6744	151.688	327.350	898.32	63	13.9623	2	0.28884	0.46490
Scotland	3339163	216	209	69.9280	150.022	182.143	361.54	314	9.8770	1	0.03155	0.44619
Switzerland	348355	207	99	72.5848	150.589	211.727	424.80	20	3.5625	0	0.07431	0.44912
Welsh	631120	216	132	76.6896	150.679	185.071	336.43	44	4.3352	0	0.01813	0.40336
Armenia	142255	135	20	86.3642	154.107	307.362	1551.32	17	9.9371	0	0.43729	0.43685
Czechoslovakia	596052	209	95	68.0797	151.165	194.077	295.46	26	3.0218	0	0.05224	0.46697
Romania	202594	188	38	81.6046	152.711	256.711	344.14	20	7.8086	0	0.31528	0.44448

table continues

TABLE 2, continued

	Metropolitan Areas				Concentration Index							
ETHNICITY	Labor Force Total (1)	No. MSAs (2)	No. MSAs 500+ Wrkrs (3)	% Lab. Force in MSAs (4)	Min. (5)	Mean (6)	Max. (7)	No. Niches (8)	% Lab. Force in Niches (9)	Single GP Niche (10)	Percent Immigrant (11)	Percent Women (12)
Russia	1145466	211	94	86.5483	150.366	254.191	603.88	237	33.4724	1	0.07505	0.46532
Slovak	724439	213	96	83.5166	151.112	179.987	239.02	37	3.0877	0	0.02814	0.46666
Lithuania	302373	195	53	82.5227	157.405	201.153	345.73	23	5.1088	0	0.05570	0.44754
Ukraine	283225	189	50	83.3089	153.287	201.732	291.77	11	2.2251	0	0.16315	0.44677
Hungary	578223	212	84	84.8123	150.116	187.688	343.64	42	5.6205	0	0.12403	0.46940
Greece	553645	210	84	79.5297	151.405	316.651	974.97	44	9.7962	0	0.24199	0.43726
Italy	5441543	215	195	82.1331	150.045	184.408	348.82	268	6.3805	2	0.06085	0.45702
Poland	3043278	215	165	80.5233	150.140	185.662	480.04	158	5.1874	1	0.07796	0.47248
Yugoslavia	108199	175	30	81.9078	164.291	381.910	1348.61	6	3.8344	0	0.28302	0.46034
Other S.E./Cen. Europe	158231	173	34	80.2237	158.198	288.990	535.60	34	18.4278	0	0.13116	0.45198
Other N.W. Europe	395214	212	93	76.4214	150.218	199.094	290.33	29	5.8876	0	0.06013	0.44964
Sweden	1497189	214	162	70.4266	152.833	179.897	337.13	82	5.1463	1	0.02212	0.48926
Finland	266928	195	49	62.1185	158.145	166.225	184.19	6	1.9302	1	0.05617	0.49067
Croatia	231646	201	50	76.9432	183.304	202.292	229.56	5	1.3316	0	0.09795	0.45244
Serbia	52261	148	15	80.4715	165.107	165.107	165.11	1	0.9833	0	0.25566	0.43352
England/France	849986	216	152	69.3003	152.216	184.131	443.37	41	3.9376	0	0.00830	0.51711
England/Germany	3963741	216	206	74.0031	150.280	179.516	464.50	326	8.7347	1	0.00329	0.48367
England/Ireland	2994823	216	203	72.9905	150.258	170.990	273.18	152	4.6202	0	0.00915	0.52520
England/Scotland	1371407	216	176	73.5165	151.064	193.277	391.76	169	12.1036	1	0.01785	0.50763
Netherlands/Germany	899404	215	165	69.5807	150.416	195.847	320.40	18	1.3561	0	0.00411	0.48980
Netherlands/Ireland	600639	214	158	67.1048	160.028	164.487	166.70	3	0.5130	0	0.00201	0.52906
France/Germany	1312540	216	174	70.9397	151.015	175.256	228.09	38	1.9812	0	0.00506	0.53039
France/Ireland	897458	216	146	67.7402	151.234	172.301	224.42	26	2.5109	0	0.00444	0.54921

table continues

TABLE 2, continued

	Metropolitan Areas				Concentration Index							
ETHNICITY	Labor Force Total (1)	No. MSAs (2)	No. MSAs 500+ Wrkrs (3)	% Lab. Force in MSAs (4)	Min. (5)	Mean (6)	Max. (7)	No. Niches (8)	% Lab. Force in Niches (9)	Single GP Niche (10)	Percent Immigrant (11)	Percent Women (12)
Germany/Ireland	5909180	216	210	72.4281	150.062	168.019	390.10	182	2.7302	1	0.00135	0.50766
Germany/Norway	538570	202	77	57.6854	150.263	176.220	263.30	17	2.7201	0	0.00208	0.51172
Germany/Scotland	1071569	215	174	73.5882	150.081	181.434	265.94	66	5.4655	0	0.00356	0.48590
Germany/Italy	973054	214	125	81.6834	150.987	175.802	276.97	55	4.2958	1	0.00534	0.48957
Germany/Poland	923993	211	121	76.3066	150.049	172.063	248.86	38	2.8944	1	0.00893	0.49368
Germany/Sweden	614107	212	118	69.5184	151.483	180.111	245.17	18	1.7773	0	0.00190	0.49869
Ireland/Italy	1023290	213	109	79.4726	152.265	181.951	291.02	50	4.5545	0	0.00157	0.51123
Ireland/Poland	465760	211	75	78.5197	158.503	182.268	255.90	13	1.9469	0	0.00202	0.50959
Russia/Poland	322269	174	42	87.1916	159.206	274.449	592.91	67	25.7870	0	0.01804	0.48362
Italy/England	319915	207	68	80.1053	151.461	172.581	212.53	8	1.3190	0	0.00947	0.49547

labor force 16 years and older residing in these metropolitan areas; the mean, minimum, and maximum values of the concentration index; the number of employment niches associated with each group; the percentage of the labor force employed in niches; and the shares of the labor force foreign-born and women. There is considerable variation among ethnic groups with respect to the summary indicators.

The vast majority of ethnic groups have members residing in 100 or more metropolitan areas (column 2). The exceptions are mostly groups with estimated populations of less then 50,000. Moreover, labor force size is positively related to the number of metropolitan areas in which groups are present. The number of metropolitan areas of residence is reduced substantially if the sample is restricted to those with 500 or more workers for each ethnic group (column 3). The metropolitan areas listed in this column represent the universe of places which will be the focus of a comparative multivariate analysis.

Column 4 indicates the percentage of each group's total labor force 16 years old and over present in the metropolitan areas listed in column 3. These percentages are somewhat inflated because of the sampling fraction used to estimate the labor force of individual metropolitan areas. The total counts (column 2) were estimated from the 1990 1 percent PUMS, while the counts for metropolitan areas were estimated from both the 1 and 5 percent PUMS. As discussed in the methods section, the counts for some of the groups are inflated because they include counts from portions of PUMA not officially a part of the territory of individual metropolitan areas.

In columns 8 and 9, one can observe considerable ethnic group variation in the number and share of the labor force concentrated in niches. African Americans have the largest number of niches, followed by Other North Americans, Mexicans, Germans, English, German/English, Scots, Irish, Italians, Russians, and Chinese. The number of niches associated with each group can be partly explained by group size and the number of metropolitan areas in which they are concentrated. Groups with the largest labor force resident in more metropolitan areas have more niches. On the other hand, size of group and geographic dispersion are not good predictors of the share of a group's labor force concentrated in niches, with the exception of African Americans and Mexicans. Niche concentrations are high for most of the Hispanic,

Caribbean, and Asian groups, and low for African, Middle Eastern, and European groups. Within the European category, Russian and Russian/Polish have above average niche concentrations at 33 and 26 percent, respectively.

Column 10 of Table 2 reports the percentage of an ethnic group's labor force concentrated in niches in employment sectors in which members of other groups do not have niches. The percentages in this column are much lower than those reported in column 8, indicating that the vast majority of ethnic groups have niches in labor market sectors in which other groups also have niches. It is possible for more than one ethnic group to specialize in a given sector. For example, niche concentration involving two or more groups in the same sector may be due to market demand for goods and services arising within individual ethnic groups. Only Mexicans, Hawaiians, and African Americans have substantial niche concentrations in sectors in which no other group has a niche. Approximately one-third of Mexicans, 62 percent of Hawaiians, and 57 percent of African Americans are concentrated in sectors dominated by single-group niches. In most instances, these niches are associated with low-skill service and blue-collar occupations.

Also included in Table 2 are estimates of the share of a group's labor force that is foreign-born and female. Foreign-born share is well above 50 percent for most of the non-European groups, and below 10 percent for most of the European groups. These differences reflect regional variation in the origin of immigrants in the United States since 1965. Contrary to what is commonly assumed, niche concentration is only moderately correlated with nativity ($r = .34$). If we exclude the native-born North American groups except Mexicans (Puerto Ricans, Canadians, Other North Americans, Hawaiians, and African Americans) and divide the remainder into European (n=50) and non-European (n=47) groups, the correlations between percentage employed in niches and nativity are statistically zero at .18 and .17, respectively. Finally, men make up a higher percentage of workers in the sample for most groups.

The results reported in Table 1 indicate that niches were not just present in manufacturing and consumer service industries, or in low-level service or blue-collar occupations, but also in tertiary

industries and high-skill white-collar occupations. The data reported in Table 3 are presented to determine whether niching in particular occupational sectors is associated with particular ethnic groups. Table 3 reports the distribution of the labor force of individual ethnic groups across occupational sectors. These distributions were derived by summing counts across industry and metropolitan areas of residence categories.

One can observe clear patterns of concentrations of ethnic groups in specific occupational sectors. Most of the Hispanic groups are concentrated in service (food, health, and cleaning and building) and blue-collar (machine operators and assemblers, and laborers) occupations. In addition, ethnics of Guatemalan, Honduran, Argentinean, Chilean, and Panamanian ancestry are also concentrated in construction trades, while Puerto Ricans, Cubans, and other Hispanics are concentrated in administrative support.

Groups of Caribbean ancestry are concentrated in administrative support, health services, and laborer occupational sectors. Groups of Middle Eastern and Asian ancestry are concentrated in professional and sales occupations. However, some of the individual groups are concentrated in managerial (Korean and Thai), food services (Chinese, Thai, and Other Asian), and semiskilled blue-collar occupations (Vietnamese). North American ethnic groups (excluding Mexicans) are concentrated in construction trades (American Indians, Hawaiians, Canadians), transportation and material moving (American Indians and Hawaiians), administrative support (Hawaiians and African Americans), protective services (American Indians), health and cleaning and building services (African Americans), laborers (Hawaiians and African Americans), and managers, officials, and professional occupations (Canadians).

The European ethnic groups are heavily concentrated in white-collar occupations, including managers and officials, professionals, sales, and administrative support occupations. Selected groups are concentrated in several other occupational sectors, including farming, forestry, and fishery (Netherlands

TABLE 3
Percentage Distribution of Labor Force in Niches by Occupational Sector, 1990

		OCCUPATIONAL SECTOR																		
ETHNICITY	TOTAL	PCOUNT1	PCOUNT2	PCOUNT3	PCOUNT4	PCOUNT5	PCOUNT6	PCOUNT7	PCOUNT8	PCOUNT9	PCOUNT10	PCOUNT11	PCOUNT12	PCOUNT13	PCOUNT14	PCOUNT15	PCOUNT16	PCOUNT17	PCOUNT18	PCOUNT19
Mexico	2061207	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	13	0	8	1	17	2	6	0	5	26	3	15
Puerto Rico	109444	0	0	0	0	3	18	4	2	2	15	2	1	1	0	0	6	33	5	7
Cuba	64890	1	0	0	0	0	28	0	1	0	4	0	0	5	2	0	8	39	12	1
San Salvador	119080	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	20	2	15	2	3	2	5	0	2	24	1	22
Guatemala	41929	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	5	2	14	3	1	3	12	0	1	26	2	29
Honduras	7857	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	6	11	0	0	0	19	0	0	16	0	38
Nicaragua	16218	0	0	0	0	11	6	3	18	2	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	0	21
Costa Rica	0	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Dominican Republic	68576	0	0	0	0	10	3	0	9	7	10	0	0	2	0	0	5	37	6	9
Columbia	30082	1	0	0	0	0	6	0	13	0	19	2	0	3	0	0	1	33	4	17
Ecuador	19167	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	22	0	9	2	0	4	0	0	5	43	5	7
Peru	8146	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	24	0	27	0	0	0	5	0	0	14	4	19
Argentina	1241	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	0	0	0	0	0	72	0	0	0	0	0
Chile	828	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	0	0	0	0	48
Panama	5162	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	0	8	0	0	0	26	0	0	0	7	34
Other Cen./So. America	126022	1	0	0	0	7	8	1	7	1	10	4	8	1	7	0	3	25	2	14
Other Hispanic	1870	0	0	0	0	0	81	0	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Haiti	39486	0	0	5	2	2	1	1	16	25	17	0	8	0	0	0	0	10	8	5
Trinidad/Tobago	6454	0	0	12	0	0	49	0	0	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Brazil	2571	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	0	16	0	0	0	32	0	0	0	0	27
Guyana	6239	0	0	0	0	0	61	9	0	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

table continues

TABLE 3, continued

	OCCUPATIONAL SECTOR																			
ETHNICITY	TOTAL	PCOUNT1	PCOUNT2	PCOUNT3	PCOUNT4	PCOUNT5	PCOUNT6	PCOUNT7	PCOUNT8	PCOUNT9	PCOUNT10	PCOUNT11	PCOUNT12	PCOUNT13	PCOUNT14	PCOUNT15	PCOUNT16	PCOUNT17	PCOUNT18	PCOUNT19
Other Caribbean	22599	0	0	14	4	4	28	3	0	26	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Nigeria	378	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	0
Other Sub-Sah. Africa	8847	0	0	15	0	0	13	5	4	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	9
Israel	3272	0	0	22	0	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	0	0	0	0	0
Lebanon	6240	0	0	7	0	82	6	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Iran	24022	8	1	28	2	52	3	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Egypt	2643	0	0	40	0	29	0	0	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Syria	1582	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Turkey	611	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Palestinian	503	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Assyrian	1654	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
N. Africa/Mid. East	7587	0	0	0	0	90	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
China	274645	8	5	21	7	6	8	0	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	0	0
Philippines	213764	0	4	22	10	3	30	0	2	8	4	0	2	0	0	0	4	7	0	2
Korea	102505	10	1	8	0	54	0	0	8	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	1	0
Vietnam	45257	0	0	10	14	7	5	0	8	0	0	12	0	3	0	0	19	23	1	0
India/Pakistan	67623	2	1	54	8	15	8	1	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	2	3	3	1
Cambodia	503	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Laos	737	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0
Thailand	5520	10	0	33	0	8	7	0	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pacific Islands	1654	0	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

table continues

TABLE 3, continued

		OCCUPATIONAL SECTOR																		
ETHNICITY	TOTAL	PCOUNT1	PCOUNT2	PCOUNT3	PCOUNT4	PCOUNT5	PCOUNT6	PCOUNT7	PCOUNT8	PCOUNT9	PCOUNT10	PCOUNT11	PCOUNT12	PCOUNT13	PCOUNT14	PCOUNT15	PCOUNT16	PCOUNT17	PCOUNT18	PCOUNT19
Other S.E. Asia	0	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Other Asia	7372	0	0	38	0	12	26	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0
American Indian	109533	1	0	3	1	6	6	4	7	7	1	1	1	4	31	0	3	8	12	5
Hawaii	11400	0	0	3	0	0	25	14	0	0	4	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	24	10
African American	3073464	1	1	3	2	4	22	4	7	11	12	2	1	0	0	0	1	11	7	11
Canada	23464	20	1	16	0	6	7	0	2	0	0	0	0	6	26	0	12	3	1	0
Other N. America	1010456	1	0	1	0	4	5	0	2	1	1	1	6	11	16	1	4	26	10	10
Austria	42127	12	8	62	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Belgium	414	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	0	0
England	653573	25	7	48	3	13	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Denmark	13845	14	3	67	0	12	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Netherlands	36860	15	3	20	3	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	21	0	16	0	0	4	8	1
France	47340	10	3	7	0	9	20	2	2	2	1	2	3	5	9	0	3	16	6	2
Germany	664035	19	4	11	3	6	8	2	1	0	0	1	18	9	3	0	8	4	3	1
Ireland	236834	19	3	8	2	19	10	22	0	0	1	1	0	4	4	0	3	1	1	1
Norway	37867	19	4	39	2	8	10	2	0	2	0	0	6	0	7	0	1	0	0	1
Scandinavia	4010	0	0	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Portugal	53888	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	1	0	6	0	8	4	17	0	5	33	5	16
Scotland	230629	20	5	53	1	15	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Switzerland	9009	4	0	54	0	21	4	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Welsh	20985	8	4	53	2	23	2	2	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	0	0	2	0	0

table continues

TABLE 3, continued

		OCCUPATIONAL SECTOR																		
ETHNICITY	TOTAL	PCOUNT1	PCOUNT2	PCOUNT3	PCOUNT4	PCOUNT5	PCOUNT6	PCOUNT7	PCOUNT8	PCOUNT9	PCOUNT10	PCOUNT11	PCOUNT12	PCOUNT13	PCOUNT14	PCOUNT15	PCOUNT16	PCOUNT17	PCOUNT18	PCOUNT19
Armenia	12209	10	5	25	0	15	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	11	0	0	0
Czechoslovakia	12263	7	0	53	0	4	17	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	3	4	0	0
Romania	12909	4	5	75	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Russia	331839	16	7	54	1	21	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Slovak	18681	10	4	38	0	6	15	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	18	0	0
Lithuania	12749	3	0	85	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0
Ukraine	5249	10	0	65	0	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hungary	27562	15	5	57	0	12	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	2	0	0	0
Greece	43136	22	1	9	0	12	2	0	48	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1
Italy	285163	22	2	6	0	14	15	2	3	0	0	18	0	2	4	0	7	1	1	2
Poland	127118	9	8	28	3	8	13	0	0	0	5	0	0	3	1	0	11	9	1	2
Yugoslavia	3398	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	0	0	0	59	0	0	0	0	0
Other S.E./Cen. Europe	23392	7	5	75	0	8	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Other N.W. Europe	17783	5	7	85	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sweden	54264	25	2	41	1	12	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	2	0	0	0	1	0
Finland	3200	0	0	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	0	0	0	0	0
Croatia	2373	0	0	17	0	0	31	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	30	0	0	0	0	0
Serbia	414	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	0
England/France	23194	11	0	40	0	27	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
England/Germany	256215	19	3	59	4	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
England/Ireland	100994	22	2	42	1	10	17	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0

table continues

TABLE 3, continued

		OCCUPATIONAL SECTOR																		
ETHNICITY	TOTAL	PCOUNT1	PCOUNT2	PCOUNT3	PCOUNT4	PCOUNT5	PCOUNT6	PCOUNT7	PCOUNT8	PCOUNT9	PCOUNT10	PCOUNT11	PCOUNT12	PCOUNT13	PCOUNT14	PCOUNT15	PCOUNT16	PCOUNT17	PCOUNT18	PCOUNT19
England/Scotland	122031	13	1	67	3	12	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Netherlands/Germany	8486	5	0	6	0	19	10	5	0	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	21	10	8
Netherlands/Ireland	2068	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	0	0	17	0	0
France/Germany	18448	22	3	12	0	8	34	0	8	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	2	2	0	4
France/Ireland	15265	0	0	7	3	29	39	0	10	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0
Germany/Ireland	116851	9	6	9	3	7	27	14	4	1	0	3	0	5	1	0	1	2	1	7
Germany/Norway	8452	0	0	47	4	5	9	0	7	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	9	0	4
Germany/Scotland	43097	5	0	80	1	7	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Germany/Italy	34144	1	0	4	0	15	22	2	29	0	0	3	0	6	0	0	0	0	5	12
Germany/Poland	20406	5	3	14	0	2	20	0	15	0	0	0	0	4	8	0	7	12	0	10
Germany/Sweden	7590	17	5	42	5	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	5
Ireland/Italy	37038	4	1	4	0	12	17	20	24	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	11
Ireland/Poland	7122	5	0	10	6	15	5	20	6	0	0	0	0	6	5	0	0	0	0	22
Russia/Poland	72460	11	6	64	0	17	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Italy/England	3382	0	0	10	0	10	35	0	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

Occupation categories: PCOUNT(i)

1. Executive, Administrator, Manager
2. Management-related
3. Professional
4. Technical
5. Sales
6. Administrative Support
7. Protective Services
8. Food Services
9. Health Services
10. Cleaning and Building
11. Personal Services
12. Farming, Forestry, Fishery
13. Mechanics and Repairers
14. Construction Trade
15. Extractive
16. Precision Production
17. Machine Operators, Assemblers
18. Transportation and Material Moving
19. Laborers and Private Household

and Germany), protective services (Ireland), and several skilled and semiskilled blue-collar occupations (Portugal, Slovakia, Yugoslavia, Finland, Croatia, and Serbia).

Although large numbers of ethnic groups have workers in different occupational sectors from white-collar, service, and blue-collar, the number of groups with greater than 20 percent of their employment in a given sector concentrated in niches varies substantially by region of origin (see Table 4). Hispanics have the largest such clusters, particularly Mexicans, Salvadorans, Guatemalans, and Dominicans. Haitians, Filipinos, Koreans, and African Americans also have nine or more employment sectors with 20 percent or more of a given sector's employment concentrated in niches. Although Guyanese and Russians are noticeably concentrated in fewer than six sectors, niche employment in most of these sectors is 40 percent or more. For these groups, it appears that whatever the type of occupation, employment in niches is a significant aspect of the labor market experience of group members.

Geographic Variation in Ethnic Niching

The results reported in Tables 2 through 4 indicate that niching is more extensive for some groups than others, and that individual groups may be concentrated in niches in more than one employment sector, from professional/managerial, to service, to unskilled blue-collar occupations. The next logical question is whether the concentration of individual groups in specific niches exhibits intermetropolitan continuity. That is, if the labor force of a group is substantially concentrated in specific industry/occupation niches, how likely is it that this concentration occurs in every metropolitan area in which a group has a sizable presence? This question raises an important issue; namely, whether members of individual ethnic groups possess a unique combination of skills and experiences that promote sectorial specialization, as in the case of Jews in garment manufacturing and retailing at the beginning of this century (Waldinger, 1996a); and/or whether there are society-wide institutional barriers in operation designed to channel the labor force participation of members of an individual ethnic group into specific employment sectors, as in systems in which labor market position is based on ascribed characteristics.

TABLE 4
Share of Labor Force in an Occupational Sector Employed in Niches, 1990

	OCCUPATIONAL SECTOR																		
ETHNICITY	CCOUNT1	CCOUNT2	CCOUNT3	CCOUNT4	CCOUNT5	CCOUNT6	CCOUNT7	CCOUNT8	CCOUNT9	CCOUNT10	CCOUNT11	CCOUNT12	CCOUNT13	CCOUNT14	CCOUNT15	CCOUNT16	CCOUNT17	CCOUNT18	CCOUNT19
Mexico	0	0	0	1	9	6	0	68	7	64	11	89	24	44	12	48	80	31	68
Puerto Rico	0	2	1	0	5	14	21	8	12	48	10	18	4	0	0	26	51	18	19
Cuba	1	0	0	0	0	21	0	3	0	14	0	0	20	6	0	31	61	38	2
San Salvador	0	0	0	0	10	7	0	80	60	60	35	40	32	34	0	17	69	11	67
Guatemala	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	23	29	49	32	13	31	62	0	9	55	15	62
Honduras	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	36	19	0	0	0	41	0	0	18	0	40
Nicaragua	0	0	0	0	16	8	40	46	17	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	0	37
Costa Rica	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dominican Republic	5	0	0	0	33	8	0	66	67	59	0	0	30	0	0	49	81	46	45
Columbia	4	0	0	0	0	7	0	38	0	50	11	0	13	0	0	5	48	18	40
Ecuador	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	63	0	33	18	0	22	0	0	17	54	25	22
Peru	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	35	0	37	0	0	0	14	0	0	15	15	25
Argentina	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	62	0	0	0	0	0
Chile	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	0	0	0	0	20
Panama	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	0	11	0	0	0	39	0	0	0	14	30
Other Cen./So. America	2	1	0	0	6	5	3	12	5	24	13	29	2	15	0	9	31	5	22
Other Hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	0	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Haiti	0	0	19	24	11	2	19	55	82	54	0	67	0	0	0	0	35	42	22
Trinidad/Tobago	0	0	19	0	0	38	0	0	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Brazil	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	0	26	0	0	0	49	0	0	0	0	28
Guyana	0	0	0	0	0	40	53	0	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

table continues

TABLE 4, continued

ETHNICITY	OCCUPATIONAL SECTOR																		
	CCOUNT1	CCOUNT2	CCOUNT3	CCOUNT4	CCOUNT5	CCOUNT6	CCOUNT7	CCOUNT8	CCOUNT9	CCOUNT10	CCOUNT11	CCOUNT12	CCOUNT13	CCOUNT14	CCOUNT15	CCOUNT16	CCOUNT17	CCOUNT18	CCOUNT19
Other Caribbean	0	0	19	18	8	23	21	0	63	28	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Nigeria	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	0
Other Sub-Sah. Africa	0	0	5	0	0	5	11	4	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	9
Israel	0	0	9	0	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	0	0	0	0	0
Lebanon	0	0	2	0	19	2	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Iran	12	7	25	7	51	8	0	0	0	0	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Egypt	0	0	11	0	14	0	0	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Syria	0	0	0	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Turkey	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Palestinian	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Assyrian	0	0	0	0	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
N. Africa/Mid. East	0	0	0	0	38	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
China	26	30	34	35	15	17	0	76	0	9	8	0	0	0	0	36	55	0	2
Philippines	1	23	43	44	10	40	9	11	70	33	0	39	3	0	0	32	30	3	15
Korea	33	8	19	3	63	1	0	29	0	25	22	0	5	0	0	20	27	20	4
Vietnam	0	0	17	32	12	8	0	21	0	0	54	0	14	0	0	38	28	10	0
India/Pakistan	5	5	41	22	22	12	20	0	14	0	10	41	0	0	0	16	10	29	8
Cambodia	0	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Laos	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0
Thailand	15	0	27	0	6	6	0	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pacific Islands	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

table continues

TABLE 4, continued

ETHNICITY	OCCUPATIONAL SECTOR																		
	CCOUNT1	CCOUNT2	CCOUNT3	CCOUNT4	CCOUNT5	CCOUNT6	CCOUNT7	CCOUNT8	CCOUNT9	CCOUNT10	CCOUNT11	CCOUNT12	CCOUNT13	CCOUNT14	CCOUNT15	CCOUNT16	CCOUNT17	CCOUNT18	CCOUNT19
Other S.E. Asia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Asia	0	0	15	0	6	10	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0
American Indian	1	0	3	3	3	2	13	8	19	2	3	3	6	34	0	5	7	15	5
Hawaii	0	0	4	0	0	17	53	0	0	15	0	0	0	49	0	0	0	51	23
African American	8	12	10	26	15	38	46	38	86	65	23	23	5	2	0	10	44	44	48
Canada	6	1	4	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	4	15	0	9	2	1	0
Other N. America	1	1	0	1	3	3	1	3	3	3	5	20	22	26	32	9	27	17	15
Austria	15	21	39	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Belgium	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0
England	25	17	30	8	11	2	3	1	0	0	2	9	1	0	0	1	0	2	0
Denmark	5	2	13	0	3	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Netherlands	6	3	5	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	30	0	13	0	0	3	7	1
France	4	2	2	0	2	4	3	1	4	2	3	6	5	6	0	3	10	5	1
Germany	12	6	5	5	3	3	6	1	1	0	2	46	13	4	12	13	4	5	2
Ireland	7	2	2	2	5	2	37	0	0	1	2	1	5	3	6	4	1	1	1
Norway	9	4	11	3	3	3	7	0	7	0	0	15	0	8	0	2	0	0	1
Scandinavia	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Portugal	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	2	0	27	0	30	16	43	0	14	51	16	33
Scotland	17	11	28	3	11	2	13	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Switzerland	1	0	9	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Welsh	3	3	12	2	8	1	4	0	0	0	0	8	0	2	0	0	2	0	0

table continues

TABLE 4, continued

ETHNICITY	OCCUPATIONAL SECTOR																		
	CCOUNT1	CCOUNT2	CCOUNT3	CCOUNT4	CCOUNT5	CCOUNT6	CCOUNT7	CCOUNT8	CCOUNT9	CCOUNT10	CCOUNT11	CCOUNT12	CCOUNT13	CCOUNT14	CCOUNT15	CCOUNT16	CCOUNT17	CCOUNT18	CCOUNT19
Armenia	9	10	14	0	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	0	0	22	0	0	0
Czechoslovakia	2	0	9	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	3	3	0	0
Romania	3	8	23	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Russia	40	38	62	7	40	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Slovak	3	3	7	0	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	4	10	0	0
Lithuania	2	0	20	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0
Ukraine	2	0	7	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hungary	8	6	17	0	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	3	0	0	0
Greece	17	2	6	0	8	1	0	57	0	0	5	0	3	0	0	4	0	4	3
Italy	14	4	3	0	6	5	7	4	0	0	44	0	3	6	0	13	1	3	4
Poland	5	10	9	3	3	4	1	1	0	11	0	0	4	1	23	15	8	1	3
Yugoslavia	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	0	0	0	40	0	0	0	0	0
Other S.E./Cen. Europe	11	15	43	0	11	0	0	9	0	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0
Other N.W. Europe	3	9	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sweden	12	3	12	2	5	4	0	0	0	0	3	7	0	2	0	0	0	2	0
Finland	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	0	0	0	0	0
Croatia	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0
Serbia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	0	0	0	0	0
England/France	4	0	9	0	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	4	0	0	0
England/Germany	16	6	27	8	4	2	1	0	0	0	2	7	1	0	0	1	0	1	2
England/Ireland	10	2	12	1	3	4	1	1	0	0	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0

table continues

TABLE 4, continued

ETHNICITY	OCCUPATIONAL SECTOR																		
	CCOUNT1	CCOUNT2	CCOUNT3	CCOUNT4	CCOUNT5	CCOUNT6	CCOUNT7	CCOUNT8	CCOUNT9	CCOUNT10	CCOUNT11	CCOUNT12	CCOUNT13	CCOUNT14	CCOUNT15	CCOUNT16	CCOUNT17	CCOUNT18	CCOUNT19
England/Scotland	13	3	36	7	11	3	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Netherlands/Germany	1	0	1	0	2	1	4	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	4	3	2
Netherlands/Ireland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	1	0	0
France/Germany	5	1	2	0	1	4	0	3	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
France/Ireland	0	0	1	2	5	5	0	5	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0
Germany/Ireland	3	4	2	2	1	4	20	2	1	0	4	1	4	1	0	1	1	1	4
Germany/Norway	0	0	8	3	1	1	0	4	0	0	0	19	0	0	0	0	5	0	3
Germany/Scotland	3	0	22	1	3	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
Germany/Italy	1	0	1	0	5	5	5	20	0	0	6	0	8	0	0	0	0	6	11
Germany/Poland	2	2	3	0	1	3	0	8	0	0	0	0	3	6	0	6	6	0	7
Germany/Sweden	3	2	4	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Ireland/Italy	2	1	1	0	4	4	39	18	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	11
Ireland/Poland	1	0	1	3	2	0	18	2	0	0	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	9
Russia/Poland	20	27	52	0	28	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Italy/England	0	0	1	0	1	3	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

Occupation categories: CCOUNT(i)

1. Executive, Administrator, Manager
2. Management-related
3. Professional
4. Technical
5. Sales
6. Administrative Support
7. Protective Services
8. Food Services
9. Health Services
10. Cleaning and Building
11. Personal Services
12. Farming, Forestry, Fishery
13. Mechanics and Repairers
14. Construction Trade
15. Extractive
16. Precision Production
17. Machine Operators, Assemblers
18. Transportation and Material Moving
19. Laborers and Private Household

Tables 5 and 6 focus on different aspects of this issue. Table 5 reports the number of metropolitan areas in which a specific industry/occupation niche is present for individual ethnic groups. Reported in this table are industry/occupation sectors with 5,000 or more workers and in which employment in the sector represents at least 1 percent of the reference group's labor force. Only 40 of the 102 ethnic groups are present, and, for most of the groups, more than one entry is reported.

Column 2 of Table 5 lists the number of metropolitan areas in which members of a given ethnic group have workers present in an employment sector, column 3 reports the number of metropolitan areas in which there are 333 or more workers of a given ethnic group in a sector, and column 4 lists the number of metropolitan areas in which a sector is designated as a niche. Although substantial variation exists across groups with respect to the number of metropolitan areas associated with each employment sector identified, a comparison of columns 2 and 3 with column 4 makes clear that in the majority of cases the number of metropolitan areas in which sector-specific niches are present represent fewer than 20 percent of the metropolitan areas in which there are workers present. Nevertheless, the number of areas in which sector-specific niches are present is impressive for some groups, including Mexicans, Chinese, American Indians, African Americans, Other North Americans, English, Germans, Scots, Russians, and the double ethnic categories with English as one of the groups.

Table 6 (following page 47) reports the number of occupations associated with individual industry sectors for ethnic groups by metropolitan area of residence. Reported in this table are industry sectors in which an ethnic group has niches in four or more occupations. The results reported in this table provide insights into a group's strategic importance to an industry in a metropolitan area with respect to the concentration of its labor force in multiple occupational sectors. A group whose employment is pervasive throughout the occupational hierarchy of an industry is in a position to substantially control or influence employment relations, including hiring and retention policies, work conditions, and compensation levels. Such pervasiveness would almost certainly have consequences for the ethnic composition of the entire industry or major sectors within it.

TABLE 5
Characteristics of Industry/Occupational Sectors by Ethnicity

ETHNICITY	INDUSTRY	OCCUPATION	Labor Force in Niches (1)	No. MSAs (2)	No. MSAs w/333+ Wkrs. per Sector (3)	No. MSAs w/ Niches in Sector (4)	% Sector Labor Force in Niches (5)	% Total Labor Force in Sector (6)
Mexico	Agriculture	Farm., For., Fishery	323550.10	152	142	51	95.8711	6.7636
Mexico	Construction	Construction Trade	109282.44	143	142	22	48.2841	4.5360
Mexico	Construction	Laborers, Pvt. HH.	112051.36	123	103	27	88.7117	2.5314
Mexico	Apparel & Oth. Fin. Text.	Machine. Opt., Assembler	80802.12	79	36	14	94.7302	1.7095
Mexico	Eating and Drinking	Food Services	217378.20	166	164	28	75.4493	5.7741
Mexico	Business Services	Cleaning & Building	62282.72	100	67	19	87.1885	1.4316
Mexico	Private Household	Laborers, Pvt. HH.	49624.80	87	57	17	85.4225	1.1643
Puerto Rico	Apparel & Oth. Fin. Text.	Machine. Opt., Assembler	5537.84	32	26	2	71.7949	1.1491
Puerto Rico	Hospitals	Admin. Support	6167.14	46	39	3	73.6052	1.2482
Puerto Rico	Public Admin.	Admin. Support	5429.96	70	63	1	53.8324	1.5026
Cuba	Apparel & Oth. Fin. Text.	Machine. Opt., Assembler	9529.40	19	15	3	92.0139	2.2847
Cuba	Other Transportation	Trans. & Material Move	5286.12	24	23	2	73.6842	1.5826
Cuba	Wholesale	Admin. Support	5519.86	25	19	2	82.7493	1.4716
Cuba	Bank. & Credit	Admin. Support	8558.48	34	32	3	76.8982	2.4553
San Salvador	Construction	Construction Trade	5196.22	28	28	3	36.5823	5.3720
San Salvador	Construction	Laborers, Pvt. HH.	5825.52	18	17	3	83.2905	2.6452
San Salvador	Apparel & Oth. Fin. Text.	Machine. Opt., Assembler	9241.72	19	15	2	93.6248	3.7332
San Salvador	Eating and Drinking	Food Services	21198.42	46	46	7	91.0425	8.8059
San Salvador	Business Services	Cleaning & Building	11057.70	27	26	5	92.9003	4.5016
San Salvador	Private Household	Laborers, Pvt. HH.	16721.40	27	24	5	94.2249	6.7115
Guatemala	Private Household	Laborers, Pvt. HH.	9079.90	25	23	5	89.6980	8.1665
Dominican Republic	Apparel & Oth. Fin. Text.	Machine. Opt., Assembler	7533.62	9	9	2	96.5438	4.4142
Dominican Republic	Groc, Dair, Ret. Bakeries	Sales	5555.82	21	21	1	88.7931	3.5395

table continues

TABLE 5, continued

ETHNICITY	INDUSTRY	OCCUPATION	Labor Force in Niches (1)	No. MSAs (2)	No. MSAs w/333+ Wkrs. per Sector (3)	No. MSAs w/ Niches in Sector (4)	% Sector Labor Force in Niches (5)	% Total Labor Force in Sector (6)
Dominican Republic	Eating and Drinking	Food Services	5969.36	29	29	1	79.0476	4.2718
Other Cen./So. America	Agriculture	Farm., For., Fishery	9853.04	116	111	7	35.4463	2.1881
Other Cen./So. America	Construction	Construction Trade	8882.12	134	132	6	20.0976	3.4789
Other Cen./So. America	Apparel & Oth. Fin. Text.	Machine. Opt., Assembler	9421.52	60	37	4	69.8667	1.0615
Other Cen./So. America	Eating and Drinking	Food Services	7821.30	157	156	9	14.1971	4.3366
Other Cen./So. America	Business Services	Cleaning & Building	8540.50	85	59	9	57.6456	1.1662
Other Cen./So. America	Private Household	Laborers, Pvt. HH.	8108.98	72	55	6	61.6963	1.0346
Haiti	Eating and Drinking	Food Services	5519.86	28	27	2	69.6145	6.2829
Haiti	Health Service, exc. Hos.	Health Services	6023.30	15	14	3	89.0957	5.3569
China	Apparel & Oth. Fin. Text.	Machine. Opt., Assembler	31285.20	38	30	6	94.5652	3.8150
China	Wholesale	Sales	5268.14	47	44	2	40.8647	1.4866
China	Eating and Drinking	Exec., Admin., Man.	11363.36	107	79	10	62.1436	2.1086
China	Eating and Drinking	Food Services	74652.96	148	145	31	84.7693	10.1553
China	Bank. & Credit	Admin. Support	9619.30	62	58	2	55.2116	2.0091
China	College & Univ.	Professional	13287.22	109	93	17	54.3782	2.8177
Philippines	Electric Mach. & Equip.	Precision Production	7551.60	38	23	3	80.7692	1.2728
Philippines	Other Transportation	Admin. Support	12891.66	43	41	4	70.0195	2.5064
Philippines	Fin, Ins, Real Est.	Admin. Support	9493.44	53	51	4	64.4689	2.0047
Philippines	Bank. & Credit	Admin. Support	17188.88	60	54	7	82.3428	2.8418
Philippines	Oth. Personal Services	Cleaning & Building	6472.80	40	33	4	70.4501	1.2508
Philippines	Hospitals	Professional	42720.48	105	91	15	85.8692	6.7727
Philippines	Hospitals	Technical	12693.88	74	53	7	80.2273	2.1540
Philippines	Hospitals	Admin. Support	6418.86	57	45	5	69.5906	1.2557

table continues

TABLE 5, continued

ETHNICITY	INDUSTRY	OCCUPATION	Labor Force in Niches (1)	No. MSAs (2)	No. MSAs w/333+ Wkrs. per Sector (3)	No. MSAs w/ Niches in Sector (4)	% Sector Labor Force in Niches (5)	% Total Labor Force in Sector (6)
Philippines	Hospitals	Health Services	8414.64	60	46	6	74.6411	1.5347
Philippines	Health Service, exc. Hos.	Health Services	8810.20	66	61	7	76.9231	1.5592
Philippines	Public Admin.	Admin. Support	7156.04	59	54	3	57.1839	1.7036
Korea	Groc,Dair, Ret. Bakeries	Sales	16343.82	73	71	8	80.1587	5.6604
Korea	Motor Veh. Deal.& Gas Sta.	Sales	8091.00	59	57	6	74.0132	3.0348
Korea	Eating and Drinking	Food Services	7623.52	121	117	5	34.4996	6.1346
Korea	Other Retail	Sales	20479.22	81	80	9	80.3811	7.0730
Vietnam	Electric Mach. & Equip.	Precision Production	5699.66	38	28	5	73.0415	3.3021
Vietnam	Oth. Personal Services	Personal Services	5429.96	40	38	4	75.5000	3.0434
India/Pakistan	Groc, Dair, Ret. Bakeries	Sales	5897.44	59	57	5	61.8868	2.9730
India/Pakistan	Hospitals	Professional	11704.98	88	82	9	73.7259	4.9532
India/Pakistan	Health Service, exc. Hos.	Professional	5987.34	95	75	5	56.5365	3.3040
American Indian	Construction	Construction Trade	33604.62	203	196	30	43.9765	4.6738
American Indian	Other Transportation	Trans. & Material Move	9295.66	190	163	13	29.1761	1.9487
American Indian	Eating and Drinking	Food Services	7983.12	205	197	13	11.1558	4.3768
American Indian	Health Service, exc. Hos.	Health Services	5555.82	180	147	8	23.0597	1.47361
African American	Construction	Laborers, Pvt. HH.	62498.48	173	126	34	53.6751	1.26549
African American	Other Transportation	Admin. Support	150133.00	159	112	20	76.8947	2.12198
African American	Other Transportation	Trans. & Material Move	128610.94	177	148	29	71.7596	1.94787
African American	General Merchandise	Sales	14042.38	176	145	9	11.7004	1.30438
African American	Eating and Drinking	Sales	104463.80	171	95	55	85.5796	1.32665
African American	Eating and Drinking	Food Services	141754.32	208	197	55	36.9067	4.17439
African American	Fin, Ins, Real Est.	Admin. Support	5340.06	150	112	6	4.2839	1.35479

table continues

TABLE 5, continued

ETHNICITY	INDUSTRY	OCCUPATION	Labor Force in Niches (1)	No. MSAs (2)	No. MSAs w/333+ Wkrs. per Sector (3)	No. MSAs w/ Niches in Sector (4)	% Sector Labor Force in Niches (5)	% Total Labor Force in Sector (6)
African American	Bank. & Credit	Admin. Support	29972.66	164	126	5	20.7184	1.57229
African American	Business Services	Admin. Support	35456.56	164	97	8	32.5789	1.18283
African American	Business Services	Cleaning & Building	93747.72	173	95	56	80.0430	1.27291
African American	Private Household	Laborers, Pvt. HH.	79615.44	163	82	49	77.2101	1.12069
African American	Hospitals	Admin. Support	89540.40	164	99	35	81.9888	1.18693
African American	Hospitals	Health Services	139380.96	171	92	67	92.2089	1.64283
African American	Health Service, exc. Hos.	Health Services	187333.62	182	143	88	93.9834	2.16634
African American	Element. & Second. Schs.	Professional	17854.14	180	170	6	6.2417	3.10881
African American	Soc. Serv., Relig. & Memb.	Professional	47988.62	177	121	17	43.1667	1.20823
African American	Public Admin.	Admin. Support	203407.74	173	124	44	86.1943	2.56478
African American	Public Admin.	Protective Services	41156.22	166	110	15	36.3680	1.22992
Canada	Construction	Construction Trade	6023.30	144	141	6	20.2662	3.82064
Other N. America	Agriculture	Farm., For., Fishery	50649.66	212	186	34	22.4910	1.89177
Other N. America	Construction	Construction Trade	156569.84	216	203	46	31.9454	4.11719
Other N. America	Construction	Laborers, Pvt. HH.	45956.88	213	143	47	30.4394	1.26828
Other N. America	Other Transportation	Trans. & Material Move	40077.42	214	175	40	20.6446	1.63077
Other N. America	Wholesale	Sales	5627.74	211	141	8	3.3351	1.41751
Other N. America	Groc, Dair, Ret. Bakeries	Sales	13880.56	213	182	16	6.9406	1.68001
Other N. America	Motor Veh. Deal.& Gas Sta.	Sales	7731.40	214	171	14	4.2394	1.53199
Other N. America	Eating and Drinking	Food Services	12675.90	216	204	13	2.6221	4.06100
Other N. America	Bank. & Credit	Admin. Support	5376.02	213	145	10	3.4627	1.30423
Other N. America	Health Service, exc. Hos.	Health Services	6598.66	213	157	12	5.3986	1.02677
Austria	Element. & Second. Schs.	Professional	7335.84	102	101	3	51.1920	5.52322

table continues

TABLE 5, continued

ETHNICITY	INDUSTRY	OCCUPATION	Labor Force in Niches (1)	No. MSAs (2)	No. MSAs w/333+ Wkrs. per Sector (3)	No. MSAs w/ Niches in Sector (4)	% Sector Labor Force in Niches (5)	% Total Labor Force in Sector (6)
Austria	Leg, Eng. & Oth. Prof. Serv.	Professional	7048.16	66	59	6	68.7719	3.95010
England	Agriculture	Farm., For., Fishery	7965.14	206	185	4	9.7879	1.42558
England	Wholesale	Sales	14473.90	202	140	15	14.7869	1.71473
England	Fin, Ins, Real Est.	Sales	53130.90	208	144	33	39.4210	2.36106
England	Hospitals	Professional	7929.18	210	151	12	8.1486	1.70465
England	Health Service, exc. Hos.	Professional	7515.64	205	125	16	10.7621	1.22337
England	Element. & Second. Schs.	Professional	98548.38	215	203	72	38.2271	4.51613
England	College & Univ.	Professional	34126.04	198	115	31	45.6469	1.30967
England	Soc. Serv., Relig. & Memb.	Professional	7227.96	210	131	9	10.4470	1.21203
England	Leg, Eng. & Oth. Prof. Serv.	Professional	81035.86	202	108	45	73.2250	1.93868
Netherlands	Agriculture	Farm., For., Fishery	7641.50	148	144	9	36.1088	2.25691
Netherlands	Construction	Construction Trade	5789.56	180	173	4	17.0280	3.62601
Germany	Agriculture	Farm., For., Fishery	122084.20	207	186	40	53.9574	2.06547
Germany	Construction	Construction Trade	13233.28	214	203	10	3.4601	3.49130
Germany	Other Transportation	Trans. & Material Move	5447.94	209	175	10	3.5294	1.40909
Germany	Wholesale	Sales	14276.12	210	141	14	7.8739	1.65513
Germany	Fin, Ins, Real Est.	Sales	10446.38	209	145	13	5.4243	1.75804
Germany	Hospitals	Professional	7947.16	212	151	14	4.4723	1.62214
Germany	Element. & Second. Schs.	Professional	6778.46	215	203	9	1.8689	3.31092
Germany	Leg, Eng. & Oth. Prof. Serv.	Professional	5250.16	197	108	8	4.1290	1.16076
Ireland	Wholesale	Sales	8450.60	205	141	10	8.1484	1.67451
Ireland	Fin, Ins, Real Est.	Sales	14527.84	205	143	13	11.1096	2.11143
Ireland	Public Admin.	Protective Services	49265.20	203	118	16	53.8310	1.47768

table continues

TABLE 5, continued

ETHNICITY	INDUSTRY	OCCUPATION	Labor Force in Niches (1)	No. MSAs (2)	No. MSAs w/333+ Wkrs. per Sector (3)	No. MSAs w/ Niches in Sector (4)	% Sector Labor Force in Niches (5)	% Total Labor Force in Sector (6)
Norway	Element. & Second. Schs.	Professional	6778.46	158	155	7	20.5674	4.24955
Portugal	Construction	Construction Trade	9367.58	65	65	5	52.4673	4.62614
Portugal	Construction	Laborers, Pvt. HH.	5322.08	32	31	2	69.6471	1.97997
Scotland	Wholesale	Sales	7245.94	187	135	8	16.9684	1.82879
Scotland	Fin, Ins, Real Est.	Sales	24165.12	188	138	26	40.3240	2.56647
Scotland	Health Service, exc. Hos.	Professional	6526.74	185	124	9	20.4507	1.36678
Scotland	Element. & Second. Schs.	Professional	43835.24	212	201	43	40.3709	4.65014
Scotland	College & Univ.	Professional	8324.74	170	112	11	28.0097	1.27284
Scotland	Soc. Serv., Relig. & Memb.	Professional	6742.50	186	128	10	21.1149	1.36755
Scotland	Leg, Eng. & Oth. Prof. Serv.	Professional	25082.10	180	106	26	53.4278	2.01052
Scotland	Public Admin.	Protective Services	5681.68	167	114	8	22.7338	1.07033
Russia	Wholesale	Sales	21432.16	94	87	12	80.0537	2.70050
Russia	Other Retail	Sales	10446.38	118	115	10	25.8913	4.06979
Russia	Fin, Ins, Real Est.	Exec., Admin., Man.	10752.04	61	54	7	76.3729	1.42007
Russia	Fin, Ins, Real Est.	Sales	26250.80	90	83	13	77.3305	3.42414
Russia	Business Services	Professional	8055.04	58	45	6	73.6842	1.10269
Russia	Entertain. & Recreat.	Professional	8972.02	65	42	6	76.4165	1.18430
Russia	Health Service, exc. Hos.	Professional	32903.40	115	100	17	82.1364	4.04077
Russia	Element. & Second. Schs.	Professional	40257.22	126	125	11	73.8700	5.49712
Russia	College & Univ.	Professional	14132.28	112	92	11	64.7446	2.20175
Russia	Leg, Eng. & Oth. Prof. Serv.	Management Rela.	15031.28	64	46	8	81.1650	1.86804
Russia	Leg, Eng. & Oth. Prof. Serv.	Professional	45381.52	102	90	19	87.9443	5.20512
Russia	Public Admin.	Professional	6994.22	71	60	5	66.0441	1.06823

table continues

TABLE 5, continued

ETHNICITY	INDUSTRY	OCCUPATION	Labor Force in Niches (1)	No. MSAs (2)	No. MSAs w/333+ Wkrs. per Sector (3)	No. MSAs w/ Niches in Sector (4)	% Sector Labor Force in Niches (5)	% Total Labor Force in Sector (6)
Hungary	Leg, Eng. & Oth. Prof. Serv.	Professional	6436.84	74	65	5	59.3698	2.21082
Greece	Eating and Drinking	Exec., Admin., Man.	8756.26	93	70	7	61.0276	3.25861
Greece	Eating and Drinking	Food Services	19849.92	129	129	12	67.6471	6.66422
Italy	Wholesale	Sales	16577.56	159	123	10	21.0887	1.75885
Italy	Fin, Ins, Real Est.	Sales	7659.48	157	120	9	7.8525	2.18248
Italy	Oth. Personal Services	Personal Services	47341.34	138	98	23	80.7174	1.31230
Italy	Public Admin.	Protective Services	5951.38	150	103	4	10.7747	1.23586
Poland	Health Service, exc. Hos.	Professional	7407.76	131	101	9	22.0321	1.37204
Poland	Leg, Eng. & Oth. Prof. Serv.	Professional	6760.48	118	93	6	18.4314	1.49678
Other S.E./Cen. Europe	Leg, Eng. & Oth. Prof. Serv.	Professional	5465.92	53	51	6	72.0379	5.97734
Sweden	Element. & Second. Schs.	Professional	12873.68	181	178	10	27.9469	4.36873
England/Germany	Fin, Ins, Real Est.	Sales	6113.20	186	141	8	9.8408	2.11779
England/Germany	Element. & Second. Schs.	Professional	66921.56	211	203	53	46.5949	4.89635
England/Germany	College & Univ.	Professional	13916.52	181	116	17	32.4664	1.46130
England/Germany	Soc. Serv., Relig. & Memb.	Professional	6077.24	189	130	7	15.8909	1.30377
England/Germany	Leg, Eng. & Oth. Prof. Serv.	Professional	24057.24	169	105	22	43.0779	1.90386
England/Ireland	Fin, Ins, Real Est.	Sales	6796.44	172	139	11	14.2052	2.18875
England/Ireland	Element. & Second. Schs.	Professional	22277.22	204	196	16	23.6225	4.31417
England/Scotland	Fin, Ins, Real Est.	Sales	14437.94	161	128	16	52.1090	2.74815
England/Scotland	Element. & Second. Schs.	Professional	33820.38	195	192	34	59.6764	5.62114
England/Scotland	College & Univ.	Professional	8540.50	148	112	14	44.0222	1.92424
England/Scotland	Leg, Eng. & Oth. Prof. Serv.	Professional	15480.78	151	102	15	58.8115	2.61084
Germany/Ireland	Public Admin.	Protective Services	14545.82	188	117	6	31.0915	1.09311

table continues

TABLE 5, continued

ETHNICITY	INDUSTRY	OCCUPATION	Labor Force in Niches (1)	No. MSAs (2)	No. MSAs w/333+ Wkrs. per Sector (3)	No. MSAs w/ Niches in Sector (4)	% Sector Labor Force in Niches (5)	% Total Labor Force in Sector (6)
Germany/Scotland	Element. & Second. Schs.	Professional	16110.08	193	190	17	41.0444	4.97754
Germany/Scotland	Leg, Eng. & Oth. Prof. Serv.	Professional	8522.52	120	95	12	50.2651	2.15017
Germany/Italy	Eating and Drinking	Food Services	9924.96	170	166	13	26.4621	4.71882
Ireland/Italy	Eating and Drinking	Food Services	7281.90	146	145	10	19.2857	4.64294
Ireland/Italy	Public Admin.	Protective Services	7066.14	83	69	4	56.7919	1.52996
Russia/Poland	Fin, Ins, Real Est.	Sales	6185.12	54	52	5	64.7834	3.39775
Russia/Poland	Health Service, exc. Hos.	Professional	8468.58	65	58	7	69.3667	4.34477
Russia/Poland	Element. & Second. Schs.	Professional	11525.18	74	73	4	67.0502	6.11723
Russia/Poland	Leg, Eng. & Oth. Prof. Serv.	Professional	12352.26	64	58	7	77.8912	5.64372

Few ethnic groups dominate employment in an industry in individual metropolitan areas with respect to niche concentration. This is indicated by the results reported in Table 6, which shows that only 24 of the 102 ethnic groups identified have niches associated with four or more occupations within an industry. In fact, most groups have fewer than two niches in any one sector (not shown). Only Mexicans and African Americans have four or more occupational niches in a variety of industries. Moreover, African American is the only group with eight or more occupational niches in more than three industries, including employment in hospitals in the Washington/Baltimore CMSA, social services, religion, and membership organizations in the New York CMSA, and public administration in the Detroit, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, and Washington/Baltimore CMSAs.

In addition to occupational concentration, Table 6 also lists the individual metropolitan areas in which an ethnic group has established specific kinds of niches. Industries with four or more occupational niches are located in fewer than four metropolitan areas, except some that are associated with Mexicans, African Americans, Other North Americans, and Germans. Again, African Americans stand out as having more individual industries associated with niches located in a large number of metropolitan areas. For example, this group has workers present in business services in 15 metropolitan areas, hospitals in 22, elementary and secondary schools in 14, and public administration in 15.

Several conclusions can be drawn from the results reported in Tables 5 and 6. First, the presentation of ethnic niching according to industry and occupation sectors for individual metropolitan areas suggests that the use of industry as a reference for identifying niches may be somewhat misleading, because an ethnic group may be disproportionately concentrated in a limited number of occupations within that industry in an individual metropolitan area. Second, one can conclude that while niching in the aggregate may be extensive for an individual group, the geographic distribution of niche concentration in a specific sector may be limited to a small number of metropolitan areas. Substantively, this suggests that local labor market conditions probably play a major role in determining which sectors ethnic groups are likely to specialize.

TABLE 6
Number of Occupations Associated with Industry Sectors by Ethnicity and Metropolitan Area

Metropolitan Area	Ethnicity	Industry	Labor Force in Sector	No. of Occupations in Sector	% Ethnic Labor Force in Sector
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	Mexico	Agriculture	86447.84	8	5.0374
SFRANCI-OAK-SJOSE,CA	Mexico	Agriculture	23895.42	4	7.8030
FRESNO, CA	Mexico	Agriculture	31195.30	5	31.8699
SALINAS-SEASID-MO,CA	Mexico	Agriculture	19778.00	4	41.7141
DALLAS-FRT. WRTH, TX	Mexico	Construction	23445.92	4	11.9305
HOUSTON-GLVSTN-BRZ, TX	Mexico	Construction	40311.16	5	15.4578
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	Mexico	Construction	150870.18	4	8.7914
SFRANCI-OAK-SJOSE,CA	Mexico	Construction	28246.58	4	9.2238
SAN ANTONIO, TX	Mexico	Construction	19885.88	4	8.3252
CHCGO-GARY-KNSHA IL-IN-WI	Mexico	Food & Kindred	9619.30	5	4.2103
DALLAS-FRT. WRTH, TX	Mexico	Food & Kindred	5034.40	5	2.5618
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	Mexico	Food & Kindred	32292.08	7	1.8817
SFRANCI-OAK-SJOSE,CA	Mexico	Food & Kindred	12118.52	7	3.9573
MODESTO, CA	Mexico	Food & Kindred	7174.02	5	21.6612
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	Mexico	Other Nonduable	26700.30	6	1.5559
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	Mexico	Textile Mill Product	14491.88	7	0.8445
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	Mexico	Apparel & Oth. Fin. Text.	67676.72	7	3.9436
EL PASO, TX	Mexico	Apparel & Oth. Fin. Text.	13502.98	4	7.1279
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	Mexico	Paper & Allied	10464.36	4	0.6098
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	Mexico	Chemical & Allied	18411.52	7	1.0729
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	Mexico	Lumb, Wood & Furn.	39196.40	8	2.2840
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	Mexico	Other Durables	23913.40	5	1.3935
CHCGO-GARY-KNSHA IL-IN-WI	Mexico	Primary Metal	7335.84	4	3.2108
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	Mexico	Primary Metal	12801.76	5	0.7460

table continues

TABLE 6, continued

Metropolitan Area	Ethnicity	Industry	Labor Force in Sector	No. of Occupations in Sector	% Ethnic Labor Force in Sector
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	Mexico	Fabricated Metals	33406.84	7	1.9467
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	Mexico	Machinery, exc. Elect.	33820.38	5	1.9707
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	Mexico	Electric Mach. & Equip.	39879.64	5	2.3238
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	Mexico	Motor Veh. & Equip	15624.62	5	0.9105
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	Mexico	Miscel. Manufact.	14437.94	4	0.8413
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	Mexico	Not Spec. Manufact.	41102.28	8	2.3951
CHCGO-GARY-KNSHA IL-IN-WI	Mexico	Wholesale	12424.18	5	5.4379
HOUSTON-GLVSTN-BRZ, TX	Mexico	Wholesale	12729.84	6	4.8814
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	Mexico	Wholesale	86196.12	8	5.0227
SFRANCI-OAK-SJOSE,CA	Mexico	Wholesale	13413.08	7	4.3800
EL PASO, TX	Mexico	Wholesale	8702.32	4	4.5938
MCALLEN-PHARR-EDI,TX	Mexico	Wholesale	7353.82	4	6.1301
SAN DIEGO, CA	Mexico	Wholesale	7138.06	4	3.8902
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	Mexico	General Merchandise	29217.50	6	1.7025
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	Mexico	Eating and Drinking	129833.58	6	7.5655
DALLAS-FRT. WRTH, TX	Mexico	Other Retail	8019.08	4	4.0805
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	Mexico	Other Retail	68539.76	6	3.9939
SAN ANTONIO, TX	Mexico	Other Retail	10680.12	4	4.4712
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	Mexico	Business Services	60700.48	4	3.5371
HOUSTON-GLVSTN-BRZ, TX	Mexico	Repair Services	6778.46	4	2.5993
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	Mexico	Repair Services	39573.98	6	2.3060
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	Mexico	Oth. Personal Services	53778.18	6	3.1337
SAN ANTONIO, TX	Mexico	Oth. Personal Services	9007.98	4	3.7712
SAN ANTONIO, TX	Mexico	Public Admin.	18825.06	6	7.8811

table continues

TABLE 6, continued

Metropolitan Area	Ethnicity	Industry	Labor Force in Sector	No. of Occupations in Sector	% Ethnic Labor Force in Sector
NY-NJ-L.I. NY-NJ-CT-PA	Puerto Rico	Apparel & Oth. Fin. Text.	9097.88	4	2.7169
NY-NJ-L.I. NY-NJ-CT-PA	Puerto Rico	Not Spec. Manufact.	6742.50	4	2.0135
NY-NJ-L.I. NY-NJ-CT-PA	Puerto Rico	Wholesale	15840.38	4	4.7305
NY-NJ-L.I. NY-NJ-CT-PA	Puerto Rico	Fin, Ins, Real Est.	19418.40	5	5.7990
NY-NJ-L.I. NY-NJ-CT-PA	Puerto Rico	Business Services	15534.72	4	4.6392
NY-NJ-L.I. NY-NJ-CT-PA	Puerto Rico	Hospitals	20641.04	6	6.1641
MIAMI-FT LDRDALE, FL	Cuba	Apparel & Oth. Fin. Text.	10428.40	4	3.8090
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	San Salvador	Apparel & Oth. Fin. Text.	10716.08	4	8.0671
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	San Salvador	Eating and Drinking	10680.12	4	8.0401
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	San Salvador	Repair Services	5016.42	4	3.7764
NY-NJ-L.I. NY-NJ-CT-PA	Dominican Republic	Apparel & Oth. Fin. Text.	10050.82	5	7.0948
NY-NJ-L.I. NY-NJ-CT-PA	Dominican Republic	Not Spec. Manufact.	7174.02	4	5.0641
NY-NJ-L.I. NY-NJ-CT-PA	Dominican Republic	Groc,Dair, Ret. Bakeries	9799.10	4	6.9171
NY-NJ-L.I. NY-NJ-CT-PA	Dominican Republic	Oth. Personal Services	5699.66	4	4.0234
NY-NJ-L.I. NY-NJ-CT-PA	Halti	Hospitals	6634.62	4	12.2024
NY-NJ-L.I. NY-NJ-CT-PA	Other Caribbean	Hospitals	8270.80	5	12.2275
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	China	Apparel & Oth. Fin. Text.	8882.12	4	4.8632
NY-NJ-L.I. NY-NJ-CT-PA	China	Apparel & Oth. Fin. Text.	19993.76	5	12.2332
SFRANCI-OAK-SJOSE,CA	China	Apparel & Oth. Fin. Text.	10284.56	4	5.2252
SFRANCI-OAK-SJOSE,CA	China	Electric Mach. & Equip.	11489.22	4	5.8372
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	China	Wholesale	13359.14	6	7.3144
NY-NJ-L.I. NY-NJ-CT-PA	China	Wholesale	8666.36	4	5.3025
SFRANCI-OAK-SJOSE,CA	China	Oth. Personal Services	6472.80	5	3.2886
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	Philippines	Electric Mach. & Equip.	5394.00	4	3.0899

table continues

TABLE 6, continued

Metropolitan Area	Ethnicity	Industry	Labor Force in Sector	No. of Occupations in Sector	% Ethnic Labor Force in Sector
SFRANCI-OAK-SJOSE,CA	Philippines	Electric Mach. & Equip.	13754.70	5	9.0244
CHCGO-GARY-KNSHA IL-IN-WI	Philippines	Hospitals	7983.12	4	23.2826
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	Philippines	Hospitals	25495.64	7	14.6050
NY-NJ-L.I. NY-NJ-CT-PA	Philippines	Hospitals	15031.28	4	25.9708
SFRANCI-OAK-SJOSE,CA	Philippines	Hospitals	13880.56	6	9.1070
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	Korea	Oth. Personal Services	6059.26	4	5.7430
NY-NJ-L.I. NY-NJ-CT-PA	Korea	Oth. Personal Services	5879.46	5	11.4616
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	Vietnam	Electric Mach. & Equip.	6364.92	4	9.8497
SFRANCI-OAK-SJOSE,CA	Vietnam	Electric Mach. & Equip.	7659.48	5	21.4826
CHCGO-GARY-KNSHA IL-IN-WI	African American	Food & Kindred	9637.28	4	1.8030
ATLANTA, GA	African American	Food & Kindred	8666.36	4	2.0941
NORFOLK-VIB-PO,VA-NC	African American	Food & Kindred	8180.90	4	3.9776
DETROIT-AA-FLINT MI	African American	Motor Veh. & Equip	39843.68	5	12.6491
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	African American	Oth. Trans. Equip.	24308.96	8	4.7532
NY-NJ-L.I. NY-NJ-CT-PA	African American	Not Spec. Manufact.	11183.56	4	1.1575
CHCGO-GARY-KNSHA IL-IN-WI	African American	Other Transportation	47431.24	8	8.8735
HOUSTON-GLVSTN-BRZ, TX	African American	Other Transportation	21342.26	4	6.8328
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	African American	Other Transportation	39142.46	8	7.6536
NY-NJ-L.I. NY-NJ-CT-PA	African American	Other Transportation	77979.26	9	8.0706
PHL-WLM-AT PA-NJ-DE-MD	African American	Other Transportation	20856.80	5	5.3314
SFRANCI-OAK-SJOSE,CA	African American	Other Transportation	18555.36	4	7.9710
WA-BALTI DC-MD-VA-WV	African American	Other Transportation	49714.70	6	5.8453
ATLANTA, GA	African American	Other Transportation	25189.98	4	6.0868
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	African American	Communications	11129.62	4	2.1762

table continues

TABLE 6, continued

Metropolitan Area	Ethnicity	Industry	Labor Force in Sector	No. of Occupations in Sector	% Ethnic Labor Force in Sector
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	African American	Utilities, Sanitary Service	8055.04	7	1.5750
NORFOLK-VIB-PO,VA-NC	African American	Wholesale	5861.48	4	2.8499
CHCGO-GARY-KNSHA IL-IN-WI	African American	General Merchandise	14563.80	5	2.7246
NY-NJ-L.I. NY-NJ-CT-PA	African American	General Merchandise	21054.58	4	2.1791
WA-BALTI DC-MD-VA-WV	African American	Other Retail	32364.00	5	3.8053
NY-NJ-L.I. NY-NJ-CT-PA	African American	Fin, Ins, Real Est.	48725.80	5	5.0430
WA-BALTI DC-MD-VA-WV	African American	Fin, Ins, Real Est.	32274.10	5	3.7947
CHCGO-GARY-KNSHA IL-IN-WI	African American	Business Services	26700.30	6	4.9951
CNCNTTI-HMLTN, OH-KY-IN	African American	Business Services	6023.30	4	5.7285
CLEVELAND-AKRON, OH	African American	Business Services	7084.12	4	4.7659
DALLAS-FRT. WRTH, TX	African American	Business Services	16559.58	5	6.1754
DETROIT-AA-FLINT MI	African American	Business Services	16217.96	4	5.1487
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	African American	Business Services	30458.12	4	5.9556
MIAMI-FT LDRDALE, FL	African American	Business Services	8540.50	4	4.5007
NY-NJ-L.I. NY-NJ-CT-PA	African American	Business Services	54946.88	7	5.6869
PHL-WLM-AT PA-NJ-DE-MD	African American	Business Services	16271.90	4	4.1594
SACRAMENTO-YOLO, CA	African American	Business Services	8414.64	4	5.1937
SFRANCI-OAK-SJOSE,CA	African American	Business Services	14977.34	4	6.4339
WA-BALTI DC-MD-VA-WV	African American	Business Services	47629.02	6	5.6001
ATLANTA, GA	African American	Business Services	21971.56	5	5.3091
CHARLOTTE-GASTON, NC	African American	Business Services	5429.96	4	3.8359
NORFOLK-VIB-PO,VA-NC	African American	Business Services	7641.50	4	3.7154
PHL-WLM-AT PA-NJ-DE-MD	African American	Oth. Personal Services	13251.26	4	3.3873
WA-BALTI DC-MD-VA-WV	African American	Oth. Personal Services	25819.28	4	3.0357

table continues

TABLE 6, continued

Metropolitan Area	Ethnicity	Industry	Labor Force in Sector	No. of Occupations in Sector	% Ethnic Labor Force in Sector
CHCGO-GARY-KNSHA IL-IN-WI	African American	Hospitals	34989.08	7	6.5458
CNCNTTI-HMLTN, OH-KY-IN	African American	Hospitals	8720.30	5	8.2934
CLEVELAND-AKRON, OH	African American	Hospitals	12621.96	5	8.4916
DALLAS-FRT. WRTH, TX	African American	Hospitals	14941.38	5	5.5719
DETROIT-AA-FLINT MI	African American	Hospitals	20659.02	5	6.5586
HOUSTON-GLVSTN-BRZ, TX	African American	Hospitals	23014.40	6	7.3682
KANSAS CITY,KA-MO	African American	Hospitals	5250.16	5	7.3496
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	African American	Hospitals	36481.42	8	7.1333
MIAMI-FT LDRDALE, FL	African American	Hospitals	14419.96	5	7.5990
NY-NJ-L.I. NY-NJ-CT-PA	African American	Hospitals	81647.18	8	8.4503
PHL-WLM-AT PA-NJ-DE-MD	African American	Hospitals	28390.42	6	7.2571
PITTS-BEA VAL,PA	African American	Hospitals	5609.76	4	10.1794
SACRAMENTO-YOLO, CA	African American	Hospitals	11669.02	5	7.2023
SFRANCI-OAK-SJOSE,CA	African American	Hospitals	16757.36	6	7.1986
WA-BALTI DC-MD-VA-WV	African American	Hospitals	54191.72	12	6.3717
ATLANTA, GA	African American	Hospitals	18195.76	5	4.3968
BIRMINGHAM, AL	African American	Hospitals	8216.86	5	8.7264
CHARLOTTE-GASTON, NC	African American	Hospitals	5951.38	4	4.2042
GREENSBO-WI-SA-HP,NC	African American	Hospitals	5034.40	4	4.7643
INDIANAPOLIS, IN	African American	Hospitals	5268.14	4	7.2597
NASHVILLE-DAVIDSN,TN	African American	Hospitals	6059.26	6	8.8151
NEW ORLEANS, LA	African American	Hospitals	12010.64	5	7.0913
RICHMOND, VA	African American	Hospitals	9709.20	5	7.0459
DALLAS-FRT. WRTH, TX	African American	Health Service, exc. Hos.	10716.08	4	3.9962

table continues

TABLE 6, continued

Metropolitan Area	Ethnicity	Industry	Labor Force in Sector	No. of Occupations in Sector	% Ethnic Labor Force in Sector
NY-NJ-L.I. NY-NJ-CT-PA	African American	Health Service, exc. Hos.	47844.78	4	4.9518
CHCGO-GARY-KNSHA IL-IN-WI	African American	Element. & Second. Schs.	33730.48	4	6.3103
CLEVELAND-AKRON, OH	African American	Element. & Second. Schs.	8846.16	4	5.9514
DALLAS-FRT. WRTH, TX	African American	Element. & Second. Schs.	15444.82	4	5.7597
HOUSTON-GLVSTN-BRZ, TX	African American	Element. & Second. Schs.	23589.76	5	7.5524
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	African American	Element. & Second. Schs.	35330.70	7	6.9083
MIAMI-FT LDRDALE, FL	African American	Element. & Second. Schs.	16361.80	7	8.6223
NY-NJ-L.I. NY-NJ-CT-PA	African American	Element. & Second. Schs.	55270.52	5	5.7203
PHL-WLM-AT PA-NJ-DE-MD	African American	Element. & Second. Schs.	24956.24	4	6.3793
SFRANCI-OAK-SJOSE,CA	African American	Element. & Second. Schs.	10590.22	4	4.5493
WA-BALTI DC-MD-VA-WV	African American	Element. & Second. Schs.	44914.04	4	5.2808
BATON ROUGE, LA	African American	Element. & Second. Schs.	6203.10	4	10.2556
MEMPHIS, TN-AR-MS	African American	Element. & Second. Schs.	13754.70	4	6.7099
NEW ORLEANS, LA	African American	Element. & Second. Schs.	15031.28	4	8.8747
NORFOLK-VIB-PO,VA-NC	African American	Element. & Second. Schs.	14743.60	4	7.1685
CHCGO-GARY-KNSHA IL-IN-WI	African American	Soc.Serv., Relig. & Memb.	20874.78	6	3.9053
DETROIT-AA-FLINT MI	African American	Soc.Serv., Relig. & Memb.	12226.40	5	3.8815
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	African American	Soc.Serv., Relig. & Memb.	21504.08	8	4.2048
NY-NJ-L.I. NY-NJ-CT-PA	African American	Soc.Serv., Relig. & Memb.	50595.72	11	5.2365
PHL-WLM-AT PA-NJ-DE-MD	African American	Soc.Serv., Relig. & Memb.	16379.78	6	4.1870
WA-BALTI DC-MD-VA-WV	African American	Soc.Serv., Relig. & Memb.	33245.02	5	3.9088
WA-BALTI DC-MD-VA-WV	African American	Leg, Eng. & Oth. Prof. Serv.	32687.64	4	3.8433
CHCGO-GARY-KNSHA IL-IN-WI	African American	Public Admin.	33029.26	7	6.1792
CLEVELAND-AKRON, OH	African American	Public Admin.	8055.04	5	5.4191

table continues

TABLE 6, continued

Metropolitan Area	Ethnicity	Industry	Labor Force in Sector	No. of Occupations in Sector	% Ethnic Labor Force in Sector
DETROIT-AA-FLINT MI	African American	Public Admin.	20892.76	10	6.6328
HOUSTON-GLVSTN-BRZ, TX	African American	Public Admin.	14671.68	4	4.6972
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	African American	Public Admin.	34917.16	14	6.8275
NY-NJ-L.I. NY-NJ-CT-PA	African American	Public Admin.	64584.16	11	6.6843
PHL-WLM-AT PA-NJ-DE-MD	African American	Public Admin.	32417.94	10	8.2866
SFRANCI-OAK-SJOSE,CA	African American	Public Admin.	19040.82	9	8.1795
WA-BALTI DC-MD-VA-WV	African American	Public Admin.	148856.42	14	17.5021
ATLANTA, GA	African American	Public Admin.	25549.58	7	6.1737
COLUMBUS, OH	African American	Public Admin.	8180.90	4	11.4754
MEMPHIS, TN-AR-MS	African American	Public Admin.	12100.54	4	5.9030
NORFOLK-VIB-PO,VA-NC	African American	Public Admin.	17944.04	5	8.7245
SACRAMENTO, CA	African American	Public Admin.	9205.76	5	21.6674
SAN DIEGO, CA	African American	Public Admin.	6760.48	6	11.4809
WA-BALTI DC-MD-VA-WV	Oth. N. America	Construction	39214.38	5	10.9099
CHATTANOOGA, TN-GA	Oth. N. America	Construction	8846.16	5	8.5357
GREENSBO-WI-SA-HP,NC	Oth. N. America	Construction	14258.14	4	7.8835
INDIANAPOLIS, IN	Oth. N. America	Construction	12172.46	4	8.4194
KNOXVILLE, TN	Oth. N. America	Construction	10212.64	4	9.3237
RICHMOND, VA	Oth. N. America	Construction	10230.62	5	11.0421
SYRACUSE, NY	Oth. N. America	Construction	5034.40	4	9.4851
ATLANTA, GA	Oth. N. America	Textile Mill Product	16577.56	6	3.6329
CHARLOTTE-GASTON, NC	Oth. N. America	Textile Mill Product	23517.84	6	12.1268
CHATTANOOGA, TN-GA	Oth. N. America	Textile Mill Product	10644.16	5	10.2706
GREENSBO-WI-SA-HP,NC	Oth. N. America	Textile Mill Product	19526.28	6	10.7963

table continues

TABLE 6, continued

Metropolitan Area	Ethnicity	Industry	Labor Force in Sector	No. of Occupations in Sector	% Ethnic Labor Force in Sector
GREENVILLE-SPART, SC	Oth. N. America	Textile Mill Product	13538.94	4	12.0538
ATLANTA, GA	Oth. N. America	Apparel & Oth. Fin. Text.	11255.48	4	2.4666
ATLANTA, GA	Oth. N. America	Lumb, Wood &Furn.	6490.78	5	1.4224
GREENSBO-WI-SA-HP,NC	Oth. N. America	Lumb, Wood &Furn.	15948.26	5	8.8180
ATLANTA, GA	Oth. N. America	Machinery, exc. Elect.	6976.24	4	1.5288
ATLANTA, GA	Oth. N. America	Utilities, Sanitary Service	6940.28	5	1.5209
WA-BALTI DC-MD-VA-WV	Oth. N. America	Motor Veh. Deal. & Gas Sta.	11453.26	5	3.1864
NY-NJ-L.I. NY-NJ-CT-PA	Oth. N. America	Soc. Serv., Relig. & Memb.	27922.94	4	2.8918
NY-NJ-L.I. NY-NJ-CT-PA	Austria	Fin, Ins, Real Est.	6095.22	4	7.9727
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	England	Business Services	20353.36	4	5.1000
CHCGO-GARY-KNSHA IL-IN-WI	England	Leg, Eng. & Oth. Prof. Serv.	7048.16	4	6.7481
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	England	Leg, Eng. & Oth. Prof. Serv.	24308.96	4	6.0912
WA-BALTI DC-MD-VA-WV	Germany	Construction	37488.30	4	9.1781
CHCGO-GARY-KNSHA IL-IN-WI	Germany	Chemical & Allied	7695.44	4	1.8228
HOUSTON-GLVSTN-BRZ, TX	Germany	Chemical & Allied	7389.78	4	3.5203
NY-NJ-L.I. NY-NJ-CT-PA	Germany	Chemical & Allied	14276.12	4	2.0110
NY-NJ-L.I. NY-NJ-CT-PA	Germany	Other Durables	7048.16	6	0.9928
NY-NJ-L.I. NY-NJ-CT-PA	Germany	Primary Metal	5088.34	5	0.7168
CHCGO-GARY-KNSHA IL-IN-WI	Germany	Machinery, exc. Elect.	13179.34	6	3.1218
DETROIT-AA-FLINT MI	Germany	Machinery, exc. Elect.	10338.50	4	4.5158
NY-NJ-L.I. NY-NJ-CT-PA	Germany	Machinery, exc. Elect.	15912.30	4	2.2415
PHL-WLM-AT PA-NJ-DE-MD	Germany	Machinery, exc. Elect.	7102.10	6	2.3156
WA-BALTI DC-MD-VA-WV	Germany	Machinery, exc. Elect.	5088.34	5	1.2458
WA-BALTI DC-MD-VA-WV	Germany	Electric Mach. & Equip.	6688.56	4	1.6375

table continues

TABLE 6, continued

Metropolitan Area	Ethnicity	Industry	Labor Force in Sector	No. of Occupations in Sector	% Ethnic Labor Force in Sector
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	Germany	Oth. Trans. Equip.	27419.50	5	4.9023
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	Germany	Utilities, Sanitary Service	6472.80	4	1.1573
NY-NJ-L.I. NY-NJ-CT-PA	Germany	Utilities, Sanitary Service	10680.12	5	1.5044
DALLAS-FRT. WRTH, TX	Germany	Wholesale	15588.66	4	6.4910
NY-NJ-L.I. NY-NJ-CT-PA	Ireland	Utilities, Sanitary Service	11866.80	4	1.4932
NY-NJ-L.I. NY-NJ-CT-PA	Portugal	Construction	9799.10	4	16.5503
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	Scotland	Oth. Trans. Equip.	7605.54	4	5.0435
NY-NJ-L.I. NY-NJ-CT-PA	Russia	Print, Publish & Allied	8846.16	4	2.9580
NY-NJ-L.I. NY-NJ-CT-PA	Russia	Wholesale	17188.88	4	5.7476
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	Russia	Business Services	6418.86	4	5.4537
NY-NJ-L.I. NY-NJ-CT-PA	Russia	Business Services	17584.44	5	5.8799
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	Russia	Entertain. & Recreat.	7821.30	4	6.6453
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	Russia	Leg, Eng. & Oth. Prof. Serv.	12945.60	5	10.9991
NY-NJ-L.I. NY-NJ-CT-PA	Russia	Leg, Eng. & Oth. Prof. Serv.	31429.04	4	10.5092
NY-NJ-L.I. NY-NJ-CT-PA	Italy	Oth. Trans. Equip.	10770.02	4	0.7512
NY-NJ-L.I. NY-NJ-CT-PA	Italy	Utilities, Sanitary Service	20659.02	6	1.4410
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	Italy	Entertain. & Recreat.	9835.06	5	4.2919
NY-NJ-L.I. NY-NJ-CT-PA	Italy	Element. & Second. Schs.	96193.00	4	6.7094
NY-NJ-L.I. NY-NJ-CT-PA	Poland	Chemical & Allied	9745.16	4	2.0781
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	Poland	Leg, Eng. & Oth. Prof. Serv.	7102.10	4	6.8612
NY-NJ-L.I. NY-NJ-CT-PA	Ireland/Italy	Entertain. & Recreat.	5825.52	5	2.5514
NY-NJ-L.I. NY-NJ-CT-PA	Russia/Poland	Business Services	6059.26	4	5.8578

An important issue for future research, then, is the investigation of the role that metropolitan context plays in shaping the employment options available to groups that show a tendency to form niches. Why, for example, are individual ethnic groups concentrated in one employment sector in one group of metropolitan areas and in a different sector in another group of metropolitan areas? Four factors might be associated with intermetropolitan variation in sector-specific niche concentrations by an individual ethnic group. First is the presence of a critical mass of group members to promote the emergence of institutional and organizational arrangements in response to member-unique needs, and the presence of a sufficient number of members with similar labor market attributes who can secure jobs in a given sector through social networking. Second is selective immigration from an origin reflecting the application of occupational criteria as a basis for securing entrance visa to the United States. Third is the presence of other ethnic groups with members with similar labor market attributes competing for the same jobs. Fourth is variation in the industrial structure of places, which would determine the types of industries and occupations present, and thus the types of jobs available.

Some indication of the role of metropolitan context in providing opportunities for and constraints on the extent of ethnic niching can be gleamed from geographic variations in ethnicity and industrial structure. For example, it has long been know that urban context plays a major role in structuring labor market opportunities for populations of diverse backgrounds (see Fischer, 1995). Fischer's (1975, 1995) reformulation of Louis Wirth's theory of urbanism suggests that size, through migration and structural differentiation, promotes the development, nurturing, and persistence of a diversity of subcultures via group differences in cultural background, language, religion, and ancestry. The competition for scarce resources, such as housing, jobs, and services provided by government, and the desire to maintain distinctive world views and life styles aid in providing salience to social formations that preserve a group's prerogatives and identity.

To what extent is labor force size and ethnic diversity associated with ethnic niching? The results reported in Table 7, which presents zero-order correlations between size of metropolitan labor force and

TABLE 7
Correlation of Labor Force Indicators for Metropolitan Areas, 1990

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Labor Force Size	1.000							
2. % in Niches	.433	1.000						
3. Number Employment Sectors	.556	.572	1.000					
4. % Sectors with Niches	.904	.665	.724	1.000				
5. Number of Ethnic Groups	.430	.434	.854	.578	1.000			
6. % Ethnic Groups with Niches	.924	.491	.744	.937	.578	1.000		
7. % Foreign-Born	.386	.500	.251	.407	.392	.427	1.000	
8. % Non-European	.924	.492	.148	.233	.257	.194	.834	1.000
Mean	453,888	6.42	538	4.45	79.92	9.93	5.22	8.24
Standard deviation	1,094,377	5.43	133	6.84	15.01	12.32	6.43	12.65
Minimum	10,159	0.000	191	0.000	31.0	1.25	0.37	0.56
Maximum	10,843,271	26.19	840	47.84	101	86.14	38.83	81.11
Number of metropolitan areas = 216								

Note: All correlations are statistically significant at $p < .05$.

indicators of industrial and ethnic diversity, address this question. These correlations are based on the results reported in Appendix Table 1. As seen in Table 7, size of metropolitan labor force is moderately associated with the percentage of the labor force concentrated in niches, number of distinct employment sectors (measure of industrial diversity), number of ethnic groups, and percentage of the labor force foreign-born. Although these associations are in the expected direction, it is clear that size alone cannot account for all the variation in the other variables. On the other hand, size is highly correlated with the pervasiveness of niching across employment sectors and among ethnic groups, and with the percentage of the population of non-European origin. The contrast in the correlation of labor force size with foreign-born share and share non-European ancestry indicates that large size places are far more attractive to non-Europeans than to the foreign-born. While these variables are highly correlated (r=.834), the higher correlation of size with the presence of individuals of non-European ancestry suggests the presence of multiple generations of an ethnic group continuing to reside in the same place.

There are several other correlations of interest in Table 7, including first, the positive correlations of the number of distinct employment sectors present in a metropolitan area with the number of ethnic groups and the percentage of ethnic groups concentrated in niches, and second, the strong positive correlation of the share of the labor force concentrated in niches and the percentage of ethnic groups concentrated in niches. These associations reflect the mutual influence of the diversity of employment opportunities present in large size places and the fact that ethnic groups themselves play a major role in the diversification of the employment structure of places through market demand and the emergence of new products and services related to specialized skills that individual ethnic may possess.

Ethnically Homogeneous Workplaces and Niching

The analysis of ethnic niching assumes an association between the ethnic composition of industry/occupation sectors and the ethnic composition of the jobs occupied by individuals at a given work site. In this section, I explore this connection. An employment sector, as defined previously,

contains workers who are located at separate work sites scattered throughout a metropolitan area. The questions I now wish to explore are (1) the extent to which workers are employed in jobs at work sites that are ethnically homogeneous and (2) whether jobs consisting of an ethnically homogeneous workforce are also associated with ethnic niches as defined in the previous section. A sample drawn from the Multi-City Study of Urban Inequality (MCSUI) is used to address these issues. With regard to ethnicity, we use four pan-ethnic categories, including Asian, non-Hispanic white, non-Hispanic black, and Hispanic. Sample size restrictions and the absence of detailed information on ancestry in the MCSUI file preclude the use of the detailed classification developed from census data.

The MCSUI surveys were conducted in 1992–94 in Atlanta, Boston, Detroit, and Los Angeles and include samples of Asians, blacks, Hispanics, and whites. Respondents were randomly selected members of households, 21 years of age and older. Because information on the ethnic composition of the workplace job was not ascertained from respondents in the Detroit portion of the study, we focus on workers in Atlanta, Boston, and Los Angeles who have worked since 1990 (N= 4,517). Whether a worker was employed at a job that was ethnically homogeneous at his workplace was determined from information provided in response to the following question: “What (is/was) the race and ethnicity of most of the employees doing the kind of work you (do/did) at this location?” If a respondent indicated that s/he worked in a job in which most of the workers were co-ethnics, that job was defined as being ethnically homogeneous.

Table 8 reports the percentage of workers employed in ethnically homogeneous jobs by ethnicity and metropolitan area of residence. The table clearly indicates that workers were more likely to be employed in jobs in which members of their ethnic group predominate. Six in ten workers were employed in jobs that consist mainly of co-ethnics. For blacks and Asians, the number was eight in ten, and was seven in ten for Hispanics. Two-thirds of workers in Atlanta and Los Angeles and one-half in Boston worked in jobs shared with co-ethnics.

TABLE 8
Percentage Working in Ethnically Homogeneous Workplace Jobs, by Ethnicity and Place of Residence

	Residence			
Ethnicity	Atlanta	Boston	Los Angeles	Total
White	61.5	51.1	50.4	53.5 (1,833)
Black	88.5	67.0	84.9	83.9 (825)
Hispanic	18.8	86.1	70.7	72.9 (1,009)
Asian	50.0	16.7	88.7	85.1 (489)
Total	64.5 (931)	52.0 (1,003)	65.9 (2583)	62.5 (4,517)

Source: Multi-City Study of Urban Inequality.

Note: Values in parentheses are sample observations.

If the average worker was employed in a job that was ethnically homogeneous, what is the likelihood that such a job is associated with an ethnic niche? To address this question, I merged the concentration index for individual employment sectors calculated from the 1990 PUMS onto the records of MCSUI respondents, using the four pan-ethnic categories and the major occupation and industry categories to establish the link. Next I estimated a logistic regression equation of the odds of working in an ethnically homogeneous workplace job as follows:

$$\text{Log}(P/1-P) = \alpha + \beta_i\text{NICHE} + \Sigma\beta_i\text{ETHNIC}_j + \Sigma\beta_i\text{RESIDE}_k + \Sigma\beta_i\text{ETHNIC}_j\text{*NICHE} \quad (1)$$

where Log(P/1 P) is the log odds of working in an ethnically homogeneous workplace job; NICHE is 1 if an ethnic group is concentrated in an industry/occupation sector with a concentration index value for that group of 1.5 or more; ETHNIC represents three dummy variables coded 1 for blacks, Hispanics, and Asians, and 0 otherwise; and RESIDE represents two dummy variables coded 1 for residence in Atlanta and Boston, and 0 otherwise.

Estimated coefficients for equation 1 are reported in Appendix Table 2. These estimates were used to calculate the partial odds coefficients reported in Table 9. Only the results reported in Table 9 are discussed. The results indicate that the likelihood of workers being employed in ethnically homogeneous jobs is greater than one for all subgroups, except blacks working in nonniche employment sectors.[1] For whites, blacks, and Hispanics, the partial odds of working in jobs that consist predominantly of co-ethnics is greater for niche than nonniche sector workers. This is particularly true for Hispanics where the difference in the odds between niche and nonniche sectors is three to one. Why Asians in nonniche sectors have a greater likelihood of working among co-ethnics than those working in niches may be an

[1]Technically, the results reported in this table apply to working and living in Los Angeles. This is because the intercept, which is used to estimate the partial odds coefficients, represents the effect of being white, working in a nonniche sector, and living in Los Angeles. Moreover, because the coefficient for Atlanta is not statistically significant, only residents of Boston have different partial odds of being employed in an ethnically homogeneous workplace job. In this case, the partial odds are lower than those in Table 9.

TABLE 9

Partial Odds of Being Employed in an Ethnically Homogeneous Workplace Job, by Ethnicity and Niche Affiliation

Ethnicity Niche Affiliation	Partial Odds*
White	
Nonniche	3.131
Niche	4.310
Black	
Nonniche	.910
Niche	1.254
Hispanic	
Nonniche	1.486
Niche	5.370
Asian	
Nonniche	1.741
Niche	1.249

*For blacks, Hispanics and Asians, the partial odds coefficients were calculated using the coefficients derived from estimating equation 1 as follows:

1) Nonniche = Exp(Intercept + $Ethnic_i$);
2) Niche = Exp(Intercept + $Ethnic_i$ + Niche + Niche(X)$Ethnic_i$).

For whites, nonniche sector is represented by the intercept and niche sector is Expl(Intercept + Niche).

anomaly, although it could be a consequence of the high concentration of this group in Los Angeles where concentration in ethnically homogeneous workplaces is almost 90 percent (see Table 8).

DISCUSSION

As previously noted, the literature on ethnic niching is weakest with respect to studies that have focused comparatively on the extent of ethnic group differences in niching, and the extent of metropolitan variation in niching for individual ethnic groups. The analysis reported in the previous section suggests the following as the point of departure for subsequent analyses. First, approximately 12 percent of the labor force of the 216 metropolitan areas studied is employed in ethnic niches. The percentage in niches is substantially higher for indigenous minority groups (blacks, Puerto Ricans, and American Indians) and non-European groups, including those from Latin American, the Caribbean, and Asia. Second, 59 percent of employment sectors, formed by cross-classifying 47 major industries and 19 major occupations, had at lest 1 percent of their workforces employed in niches, with the percentage so concentrated being higher for construction, manufacturing, and selected consumer market and professional service sectors, and selected managerial/professional, service, and blue-collar occupations. Third, ethnic groups differ considerably with respect to the types of sectors in which they have niches. Niches in service and blue-collar occupations associated with construction, manufacturing, and consumer market industries are primarily occupied by indigenous minority and non-European groups. Niches in professional/managerial and technical occupations are dominated by European, Middle Eastern, and selected Asian groups. Fourth, although niching appears to be pervasive among some ethnic groups, for individual groups there is considerable discontinuity in the sectors in which niching occurs across metropolitan areas; few groups have multiple occupational niches within a given industry in one or more metropolitan areas. Finally, it is shown that workers employed in workplace jobs in which the workforce is majority co-ethnic are also likely to work in ethnic niches.

What drives ethnic niching? I have advanced the claim that ethnic niching is a social formation driven by the needs of ethnic groups to acquire material resources beneficial to the well-being of members, and the need to maintain members' access to these resources through the purposeful coalescence of the boundaries defining affiliation with those that delineate the positions from which the resources flow. Labor markets are structured to facilitate a match of the skills and experiences of individual workers with the labor market positions linked to the production of goods and services. Moreover, since individuals of diverse ethnic affiliations may be similarly qualified for a large array of labor market positions, structuring access through group affiliation narrows the pool of candidates for any one position. Individual ethnic groups that have established a presence in an employment sector will tend to pursue strategies designed to limit access to co-ethnics, particularly under conditions of labor surplus, or when opportunities to employment in other sectors are limited. In addition, concern for the maintenance of productivity goals may lead employers to exploit the supply of labor from a single group, believing that this recruitment strategy will reduce uncertainty as to the quality of the labor supply, or that drawing labor from a single group could minimize disruption in production which might result from reliance on a heterogeneous labor supply.

In sum, as previously noted, the process underlying the formation, persistence, and changes in the extent of ethnic niching is driven by economic competition resulting from changes in the relative number and sizes of ethnic populations in conjunction with the expansion and contraction of employment opportunities in local labor markets. In addition, in multi-ethnic societies in which market exchange is the predominant mode of economic organization, ethnic groups not only may compete for existing labor market opportunities but, through marshaling their own resources, may exploit opportunities to produce and distribute goods and services for which no previous demand existed.

Although this paper identifies a number of factors that should be considered in explaining the observed patterns of ethnic group and metropolitan variations in niching, this task is beyond the scope of this paper. A useful point of departure for such an analysis would be an analysis of ethnic groups with

respect to the distribution of labor force attributes among members; their resource base with respect to population size, nativity composition, and the extent of business ownership; and geographic residence, post-1965 immigration flow, residential segregation, and the presence of institutions and community organizations. These attributes and resources of groups interact with characteristics of metropolitan areas, such as ethnic diversity, industrial structure, and general supply and demand conditions in local economies, to produce particular outcomes for individual ethnic groups. As previously mentioned, niching probably has consequences for individuals with respect to the opportunities available to them and ultimately in material well-being. Moreover, if labor market competition is the mechanism driving niche formation and sector changes in niche concentrations, then modeling ethnic niching comparatively necessarily requires a focus on changes in the status of ethnic groups relative to other changes occurring in local labor markets. This strategy will be pursued in subsequent analyses (see Olzak, 1992, for examples).

Finally, a comparative analysis involving a large number of ethnic groups living in a large number of metropolitan areas would provide the opportunity to assess the salience of ethnicity as a form of affiliation with respect to labor force participation, particularly as this is reflected in ethnic niching. By studying generational differences in ethnic niching among individuals of a given ethnic group, and by studying ethnic groups that differ with respect to the timing of their arrival in the United States, we can provide insight into the role that assimilation plays in the niching process. Indeed, one can ask whether native-immigrant differences in niching are associated with generational differences in attributes that promote labor market success.

APPENDIX TABLE 1
Characteristics of Metropolitan Labor Force, 1990

	Metropolitan Labor Force		Employment Sectors		Ethnic Groups			
CMSA	Number (1)	% Niches (2)	Number (3)	% w/ Niches (4)	Number (5)	% in Niches (6)	% Foreign-Born (7)	% Non-European (8)
NY-NJ-L.I. NY-NJ-CT-PA	10843270.52	15.4954	840	42.9762	101	86.1386	18.2438	16.4943
LA-RVRSD-ORAN CTY,CA	8374814.30	26.1891	832	47.8365	101	77.2277	31.9413	37.8550
WA-BALTI DC-MD-VA-WV	4009665.86	16.7026	782	29.4118	100	66.0000	10.2957	9.2302
CHCGO-GARY-KNSHA IL-IN-WI	3976510.74	14.0471	799	29.5369	101	53.4653	13.1804	12.2832
SFRANCI-OAK-SJOSE,CA	3862985.02	15.8698	788	28.4264	101	62.3762	22.4541	26.8835
PHL-WLM-AT PA-NJ-DE-MD	3177839.14	9.7712	794	23.0479	100	45.0000	5.2942	4.9603
DALLAS-FRT. WRTH, TX	2446916.18	14.8349	775	23.7419	101	34.6535	8.8596	13.1118
HOUSTON-GLVSTN-BRZ, TX	2164450.38	18.0327	776	23.8402	100	31.0000	13.3327	19.6784
DETROIT-AA-FLINT MI	2106374.98	10.6000	756	17.5926	101	38.6139	5.4340	4.2339
ATLANTA, GA	2041197.48	18.9921	765	24.5752	101	26.7327	4.0599	3.7366
BSTN-WSTR-LRN MA-NH-ME-CT	1937416.92	6.6986	750	16.2667	100	33.0000	6.1752	4.0620
MIAMI-FT LDRDALE, FL	1792947.62	15.8405	748	17.2460	100	40.0000	38.8339	39.4318
SEATTLE-TAC-BREM, WA	1470080.76	5.1821	742	10.3774	100	32.0000	8.1639	8.3388
SACRAMENTO-YOLO, CA	1415313.68	8.3668	740	12.8378	99	21.2121	1.9069	2.1063
CNCNTTI-HMLTN, OH-KY-IN	1368206.08	8.1095	742	13.4771	101	16.8317	2.2117	1.7530
SAN DIEGO, CA	1366587.88	12.0109	732	14.4809	101	33.6634	19.3000	24.3849
MINNEAPOLIS-SP,MN-WI	1295099.40	4.2913	718	8.6351	98	24.4898	2.7780	2.5892
TAMPA-ST.PETERBRG,FL	1188729.72	6.1379	726	11.2948	101	21.7822	6.9638	8.4808
PHOENIX, AZ	1185043.82	7.1629	730	10.6849	99	26.2626	7.9443	14.6991
DENVER-BLDR-GRLY, CO	1121412.60	6.4069	724	9.9448	100	25.0000	5.2621	11.3147
CLEVELAND-AKRON, OH	1092878.34	8.8890	739	12.7199	97	25.7732	4.7941	3.6178
PITTS-BEA VAL,PA	1069198.68	4.7288	717	8.7866	96	22.9167	2.0129	1.6598
PORTLAND-SALEM OR-WA	964123.56	3.7541	722	5.4017	97	20.6186	6.4936	6.6670

table continues

APPENDIX TABLE 1, continued

CMSA	Metropolitan Labor Force		Employment Sectors		Ethnic Groups			
	Number (1)	% Niches (2)	Number (3)	% w/ Niches (4)	Number (5)	% in Niches (6)	% Foreign-Born (7)	% Non-European (8)
SACRAMENTO, CA	855650.22	7.8274	686	7.8717	101	19.8020	9.9523	16.3084
CHARLOTTE-GASTON, NC	824041.38	16.7070	710	12.9577	98	14.2857	2.3063	1.9986
COLUMBUS, OH	796442.08	7.6689	706	9.6317	99	17.1717	2.6684	2.5691
NORFOLK-VIB-PO,VA-NC	779702.70	15.4341	719	14.4645	99	15.1515	4.0078	4.3699
KANSAS CITY,KA-MO	770676.74	7.2907	703	8.1081	97	11.3402	2.4310	3.6325
INDIANAPOLIS, IN	707333.20	10.3508	691	10.4197	97	9.2784	1.9472	1.9802
ORLANDO, FL	699745.64	6.1591	673	7.7266	98	19.3878	8.1402	11.1234
SAN ANTONIO, TX	697318.34	16.6362	691	14.3271	96	14.5833	9.0529	41.4872
ROCHESTER, NY	682718.58	4.4929	698	5.3009	100	19.0000	4.7852	3.8845
BUFFOLO-NIAG.FALLS,NY	662185.42	5.8948	702	5.9829	97	13.4021	4.1353	2.5713
GREENSBO-WI-SA-HP,NC	638415.86	17.0727	689	11.7562	92	13.0435	1.5603	1.4758
MILWAUKEE-RACINE, WI	635449.16	6.7370	679	7.2165	99	12.1212	3.4973	3.6218
NEW ORLEANS, LA	628490.90	15.4112	700	11.0000	100	15.0000	4.6202	6.1622
AUSTIN, TX	603444.76	10.1841	687	8.1514	97	14.4330	6.8947	18.8040
MEMPHIS, TN-AR-MS	570811.06	20.8965	689	12.7721	91	8.7912	1.4647	1.7702
NASHVILLE-DAVIDSN,TN	565614.84	10.9893	692	9.5376	91	12.0879	2.0027	2.0472
SALTLAKECITY-OGDN,UT	529457.06	2.8594	692	3.0347	96	12.5000	4.5404	7.3318
RICHMOND, VA	528935.64	17.0950	683	11.1274	98	12.2449	3.0390	2.9404
ALBANY-SCHEN-TROY,NY	521204.24	4.0189	656	4.2683	97	16.4948	4.4363	3.3014
SYRACUSE, NY	515019.12	3.7704	677	3.3973	97	10.3093	3.0828	2.3216
W.PALMBEACH-BO,RA,FL	505849.32	6.9560	652	5.5215	100	18.0000	13.3895	11.8895
HONOLULU, HI	484668.88	15.1617	637	10.2041	92	13.0435	19.3797	58.3173
BIRMINGHAM, AL	466814.74	15.7301	683	9.9561	87	8.0460	1.0939	1.1555
LAS VEGAS, NV	426683.38	8.1455	635	3.7795	99	15.1515	11.2932	14.4537

table continues

APPENDIX TABLE 1, continued

CMSA	Metropolitan Labor Force		Employment Sectors		Ethnic Groups		%	%
	Number (1)	% Niches (2)	Number (3)	% w/ Niches (4)	Number (5)	% in Niches (6)	Foreign-Born (7)	Non-European (8)
GREENVILLE-SPART, SC	405287.18	14.9638	661	8.9259	88	11.3636	1.9032	1.6326
JACKSONVILLE, FL	371862.36	8.4373	628	6.2102	98	10.2041	4.2259	5.2413
TUSCON, AZ	360463.04	5.8310	617	3.8898	97	10.3093	9.4224	22.4312
HARRISBURG, PA	358754.94	5.5530	635	4.0945	88	7.9545	1.7391	1.7391
FRESNO, CA	352228.20	16.6769	619	7.1082	98	14.2857	19.8826	36.1715
KNOXVILLE, TN	349495.24	12.5887	648	7.4074	89	8.9888	1.4868	1.4662
EL PASO, TX	347121.88	20.6930	655	8.5496	93	10.7527	26.1473	62.6748
GRAND RAPIDS, MI	329897.04	4.6599	637	2.6688	87	8.0460	3.4936	3.6898
FORT WAYNE, IN	328368.74	6.3243	636	4.2453	86	8.1395	1.5167	1.9274
WATERLOO-CEDARFAL,IA	321931.90	7.8749	638	3.7618	78	11.5385	0.7819	1.5191
PEORIA, IL	294494.42	4.5851	611	2.7823	83	9.6386	1.6790	1.7645
CHATTANOOGA, TN-GA	291743.48	13.5462	627	6.3796	80	10.0000	1.2572	1.3004
UTICA-ROME, NY	287158.58	3.4375	634	2.8391	89	8.9888	2.2855	2.4357
BAKERSFIELD, CA	281980.34	12.1469	596	4.3624	95	11.5789	15.2075	25.9899
LANSING-E LANSING,MI	276927.96	3.8891	593	2.36088	91	7.6923	2.8438	4.4345
MELBOURNE-TIT-COC,FL	263856.50	2.9983	579	2.59067	99	8.0808	5.8194	5.3083
CANTON, OH	261662.94	2.3638	619	2.10016	78	8.9744	1.3949	1.3674
COLUMBIA, SC	261537.08	12.6976	621	5.95813	89	10.1124	2.2962	2.3305
DAVENPRT-RI-MO,IA-IL	259864.94	3.7916	600	1.83333	83	12.0482	1.8820	3.3695
STOCKTON, CA	259199.68	7.1171	585	2.22222	95	8.4211	17.7164	27.4001
ALBUQUERQUE, NM	258390.58	9.5470	579	4.14508	94	11.7021	5.9008	32.6630
BATON ROUGE, LA	251432.32	12.9005	614	6.18893	90	8.8889	2.3813	3.3109
MOBILE, AL	247656.52	9.1622	622	4.01929	85	4.7059	1.6480	2.1853
CHARLESTON-N CHAR,SC	244456.08	12.9744	602	5.81395	86	9.3023	2.2286	2.6699

table continues

APPENDIX TABLE 1, continued

CMSA	Metropolitan Labor Force		Employment Sectors		Ethnic Groups		%	%
	Number (1)	% Niches (2)	Number (3)	% w/ Niches (4)	Number (5)	% in Niches (6)	Foreign-Born (7)	Non-European (8)
LAKELAND-WINTERHA,FL	240230.78	6.9680	602	2.82392	90	8.8889	4.1763	4.6479
YOUNGSTOWN-WARREN,OH	240194.82	3.9524	583	2.22985	80	7.5000	2.0960	1.8639
SANTABARBRA-SM-LO,CA	238468.74	7.3664	583	2.91595	97	7.2165	18.7213	25.9067
OKLAHOMA CITY, OK	236383.06	3.6206	615	2.27642	77	7.7922	2.4188	3.8488
YORK, PA	231708.26	5.6801	590	3.38983	84	3.5714	1.7227	1.4588
LANCASTER, PA	228202.16	5.9565	611	2.61866	84	7.1429	2.3716	3.6480
HARTFORD-NB-MI-BR,CT	226979.52	2.4715	604	1.82119	92	7.6087	4.7766	3.2082
RENO, NV	223868.98	2.5942	572	2.09790	89	6.7416	8.5053	10.0153
MADISON, WI	217234.36	4.2129	583	1.54374	89	7.8652	2.8969	2.4913
DAYTONA BEACH, FL	212703.40	4.4970	556	2.69784	95	9.4737	5.9172	5.3085
READING, PA	211732.48	3.0571	607	1.81219	85	3.5294	2.7259	3.1844
AUGUSTA, GA-SC	210348.02	13.9585	592	4.72973	85	7.0588	2.6754	2.7267
MODESTO, CA	207579.10	9.4067	552	2.17391	93	8.6022	17.3755	24.2529
CORPUS CHRISTI, TX	202382.88	10.6876	577	3.81282	93	5.3763	5.0195	43.7544
COLORADO SPRINGS, CO	201951.36	1.9498	556	1.07914	89	5.6180	5.0392	8.8586
SPOKANE, WA	200764.68	1.7912	579	1.38169	81	7.4074	2.9375	3.2241
BROWNSVILLE-HA-SB,TX	198966.68	22.8899	561	5.34759	82	4.8780	26.5317	72.4562
PENSACOLA, FL	197276.56	6.8629	573	2.79232	86	8.1395	2.8709	3.7824
FORT MYERS-CP COR,FL	192044.38	3.8011	543	2.02578	93	7.5269	5.7392	5.6455
ROCKFORD, IL	189904.76	3.0203	589	1.69779	79	8.8608	3.8913	3.7588
SALINAS-SEASID-MO,CA	185463.70	14.6680	529	2.83554	94	8.5106	28.5410	38.7106
APPLETON-OSHKOSH, WI	181903.66	6.4841	569	1.75747	75	5.3333	1.1466	0.9983
MACON, GA	171996.68	12.9835	565	4.60177	79	6.3291	1.6203	1.6412
JOHNSTOWN, PA	169713.22	4.1212	549	1.63934	72	5.5556	0.4767	0.6568

table continues

APPENDIX TABLE 1, continued

CMSA	Metropolitan Labor Force		Employment Sectors		Ethnic Groups			
	Number (1)	% Niches (2)	Number (3)	% w/ Niches (4)	Number (5)	% in Niches (6)	% Foreign-Born (7)	% Non-European (8)
EUGENE-SPRINGFLD, OR	167969.16	2.1409	545	1.46789	88	3.4091	3.7037	4.3353
MCALLEN-PHARR-EDI,TX	162071.72	24.2179	516	4.65116	71	4.2254	30.4526	81.1072
SHREVEPORT, LA	161298.58	10.9352	564	4.07801	79	6.3291	1.3153	2.0622
SAGINAW, MI	158709.46	1.8353	562	1.06762	78	3.8462	1.5181	2.1072
ERIE, PA	157396.92	0.9139	562	0.35587	78	3.8462	1.7021	1.3708
MONTGOMERY, AL	157073.28	12.6030	566	4.77032	77	6.4935	1.3393	1.4309
WICHITA, KS	153890.82	6.6363	551	1.99637	74	9.4595	1.4488	2.1848
VISALIA-TUL-PORT, CA	153477.28	17.0220	514	2.52918	82	7.3171	22.7156	36.2348
RALEIGH-DURHAM, NC	153459.30	12.9467	538	4.46097	79	6.3291	2.3784	2.3784
BINGHAMTON, NY-PA	145224.46	2.1790	550	0.90909	90	4.4444	4.5438	4.3333
SOUTH BEND, IN	143786.06	1.4881	541	0.92421	84	3.5714	2.9511	3.1137
SARASOTA, FL	143246.66	1.0920	515	0.77670	92	4.3478	5.0082	3.6651
ROANOKE, VA	139956.32	5.6012	541	2.03327	82	4.8780	1.7857	1.6444
SPRINGFIELD, IL	131703.50	2.3345	485	1.44330	78	6.4103	1.5700	1.4334
FORT PIERCE, FL	130624.70	3.9092	484	1.65289	90	5.5556	6.4281	5.4233
DES MOINES, IA	129438.02	2.4448	505	1.38614	78	6.4103	2.2364	2.1809
LUBBOCK, TX	128628.92	6.2203	504	1.98413	82	8.5366	3.7462	20.5619
PROVO-OREM, UT	125428.48	1.8635	531	0.94162	84	2.3810	4.4008	4.4581
GAINESVILLE, FL	123216.94	4.3922	476	2.31092	93	3.2258	6.3622	7.0480
JAMESTOWN,NY	122731.48	1.2306	532	0.56391	78	3.8462	1.6701	2.0803
CHAMPAIGN-URB-RA, IL	122731.48	2.7688	478	0.83682	87	4.5977	6.2115	5.8306
SPRINGFIELD, MO	121760.56	4.0165	517	1.54739	72	5.5556	0.8122	1.1518
WACO, TX	121508.84	4.9423	527	1.70778	75	8.0000	4.2616	10.7428
DULUTH-SUPER, MN-WI	121490.86	1.9979	500	0.80000	67	5.9701	0.7400	0.5624

table continues

APPENDIX TABLE 1, continued

CMSA	Metropolitan Labor Force		Employment Sectors		Ethnic Groups		%	%
	Number (1)	% Niches (2)	Number (3)	% w/ Niches (4)	Number (5)	% in Niches (6)	Foreign-Born (7)	Non-European (8)
BRADENTON, FL	119117.50	1.2528	504	0.39683	81	2.4691	5.1774	5.1321
DAYTON, OH	118614.06	3.4864	506	0.98814	66	4.5455	0.6518	0.8186
GREELEY, CO	117499.30	3.9174	503	1.39165	75	6.6667	5.0650	17.3068
FAYETTEVILLE, NC	117229.60	7.3773	494	3.23887	83	3.61446	4.5706	5.2454
AMARILLO, TX	116582.32	3.8402	517	0.96712	71	7.04225	4.6114	12.8624
JACKSON, MS	115521.50	10.9105	538	3.53160	69	5.79710	0.8093	1.4630
FORT COLLINS, CO	112914.40	0.3344	510	0.19608	80	1.25000	2.8185	6.7197
OCALA, FL	104859.36	3.3436	521	0.95969	85	2.35294	3.0864	3.9952
HUNTNGTN-AS,WV-KY-OH	104301.98	4.5165	512	1.17188	59	5.08475	0.5344	0.6723
LEXINGTON-FAYETTE,KY	103600.76	5.3801	514	1.36187	64	3.12500	0.7636	0.8157
BREMERTON, WA	102791.66	1.3644	463	0.64795	82	3.65854	4.8452	6.5419
BLOOMINGTON-NORM, IL	102270.24	3.0591	473	1.26850	74	4.05405	2.0745	2.4965
BENTON HARBOR, MI	101353.26	3.1577	491	1.22200	76	5.26316	3.4948	2.5723
YAKIMA, WA	97559.48	11.5002	464	1.29310	75	5.33333	14.1356	22.9819
STATE COLLEGE, PA	96732.40	5.0929	467	1.49893	81	6.17284	3.1413	3.0112
WILLIAMSPORT, PA	95959.26	6.1645	502	2.19124	63	3.17460	0.7682	0.9931
CHICO, CA	95923.30	1.2933	459	0.21786	80	1.25000	6.5230	9.7657
HICKORY, NC	95815.42	13.2858	446	2.46637	67	4.47761	0.6568	0.6943
KILLEEN-TEMPLE, TX	93118.42	3.2053	479	0.83507	77	5.19481	4.3252	11.0446
LONGVIEW-MARSHALL,TX	92075.58	5.9949	496	1.61290	63	6.34921	2.4995	3.3782
ELKHART, IN	90619.20	3.5714	470	1.27660	72	2.77778	2.6389	2.3413
ASHEVILLE, NC	89971.92	4.2166	502	1.59363	69	4.34783	1.8785	1.5588
HAGERSTOWN, MD	89342.62	4.0853	486	1.23457	75	4.00000	1.2075	1.3484
GREEN BAY, WI	89018.98	0.7877	466	0.42918	70	2.85714	1.2119	1.0301

table continues

APPENDIX TABLE 1, continued

CMSA	Metropolitan Labor Force		Employment Sectors		Ethnic Groups		%	%
	Number (1)	% Niches (2)	Number (3)	% w/ Niches (4)	Number (5)	% in Niches (6)	Foreign-Born (7)	Non-European (8)
TYLER, TX	88749.28	5.7739	492	1.82927	74	6.75676	4.5583	6.5032
JOPLIN, MO	88533.52	3.0666	470	1.27660	70	2.85714	0.8123	1.4825
BOISE CITY, ID	88191.90	0.9786	450	0.44444	71	2.81690	2.4465	2.7727
OLYMPIA, WA	87616.54	0.0000	449	0.00022	81	.	5.4997	5.3766
MERCED,CA	87562.60	11.4784	434	1.38249	88	2.27273	25.0924	34.2300
LAFAYETTE-WLAFAY, IN	87256.94	3.3175	471	1.06157	81	4.93827	5.0896	5.2339
SHARON, PA	87095.12	1.9199	476	0.42017	67	2.98507	0.7845	0.6813
REDDING, CA	86753.50	1.8860	467	0.42827	71	1.40845	2.5492	4.4352
CLARKSVILLE-HO,TN-KY	86519.76	2.9510	472	1.05932	62	4.83871	0.6442	0.8936
WAUSAU, WI	86034.30	9.0073	460	1.08696	64	4.68750	1.2957	0.8359
SAVANNAH, GA	85944.40	10.0000	479	2.71399	76	6.57895	1.7992	2.5523
DUBUQUE, IA	84667.82	1.0618	450	0.22222	68	1.47059	1.5502	2.0174
HOUMA-THIBODAUX, LA	84326.20	6.4179	450	1.33333	57	3.50877	1.1087	2.4307
BATTLE CREEK, MI	82743.96	0.6519	468	0.21368	68	1.47059	1.3690	2.6293
BELLINGHAM, WA	82366.38	1.6372	461	0.43384	76	2.63158	8.5353	4.6278
CEDAR RAPIDS, IA	82348.40	1.5284	449	0.66815	70	1.42857	1.6594	2.0087
RICHLAND-KE-PA, WA	82312.44	4.6745	416	0.72115	78	2.56410	9.5020	12.4072
MEDFORD, OR	81053.84	1.1979	444	0.22523	76	2.63158	3.9485	4.2369
ANDERSON, SC	80892.02	8.0462	464	2.15517	60	5.00000	0.7335	0.7780
ANDERSON, IN	80460.50	2.0112	448	0.89286	63	4.76190	0.6257	0.8268
EAU CLAIRE, WI	79237.86	5.8997	444	1.12613	68	2.94118	1.2026	1.0211
DECATUR,AL	77871.38	6.5112	473	1.47992	60	6.66667	0.6234	0.6234
JACKSON, MI	77655.62	0.5788	461	0.21692	70	1.42857	1.5050	1.4818
BILOXI-GULFPORT, MS	77529.76	4.1512	460	1.30435	71	4.22535	3.0844	4.0584

table continues

APPENDIX TABLE 1, continued

CMSA	Metropolitan Labor Force		Employment Sectors		Ethnic Groups			
	Number (1)	% Niches (2)	Number (3)	% w/ Niches (4)	Number (5)	% in Niches (6)	% Foreign-Born (7)	% Non-European (8)
BRYAN-COLLEGE STN,TX	77170.16	2.4464	411	0.72993	89	3.37079	8.0848	15.6104
DECATUR, IL	76738.64	2.0853	454	0.66079	68	2.94118	0.9138	1.1012
ALTOONA, PA	74455.18	1.6663	460	0.65217	59	3.38983	0.6520	0.5554
SANTA FE, NM	74131.54	4.1960	401	1.24688	80	2.50000	4.5355	39.5828
JANESVILLE-BELOIT,WI	73412.34	1.1021	445	0.44944	66	3.03030	1.3960	1.3960
MUNCIE, IN	72801.02	2.3463	441	0.90703	68	4.41176	1.2349	1.5559
COLUMBIA, MO	72279.60	1.2189	405	0.49383	77	2.59740	3.3333	3.5572
WILMINGTON, NC	71830.10	3.8048	452	1.32743	67	4.47761	1.7522	1.1014
LIMA, OH	70967.06	12.0345	443	2.48307	54	3.70370	0.4814	0.7347
MONROE, LA	70895.14	7.8620	431	2.55220	65	4.61538	1.0652	1.6231
FLORENCE, SC	70607.46	17.2142	457	3.71991	57	7.01754	0.9677	0.7385
MANSFIELD, OH	70014.12	0.9759	458	0.43668	64	3.12500	2.0801	1.5408
ABILENE, TX	68827.44	1.8025	426	0.70423	68	4.41176	4.1275	13.8976
FLORENCE, AL	68593.70	8.5452	450	1.77778	53	3.77358	0.3670	0.6029
WICHITA FALLS, TX	68000.36	1.0841	433	0.46189	68	2.94118	4.1777	9.7039
LAYFAYETTE, LA	67748.64	9.2091	420	2.61905	61	3.27869	2.2558	3.9544
DANVILLE, VA	66957.52	10.9023	430	1.86047	51	5.88235	0.6176	0.5639
TUSCALOOSA, AL	66472.06	3.8951	455	0.87912	71	1.40845	1.7041	1.6500
ALEXANDRIA, LA	65770.84	7.7365	415	2.40964	65	4.61538	1.3122	2.4057
TOLEDO, OH-MI	65447.20	1.7308	425	0.47059	56	3.57143	1.1813	2.7473
PUEBLO, CO	64889.82	1.3577	427	0.23419	71	1.40845	2.1058	30.7564
TERRE HAUTE, IN	64817.90	1.3870	457	0.43764	60	1.66667	0.5548	0.5825
BURLINGTON, NC	64440.32	6.0547	438	0.91324	56	3.57143	1.1161	0.7533
YUBA CITY, CA	63846.98	5.3224	414	0.24155	79	2.53165	13.9961	18.9524

table continues

APPENDIX TABLE 1, continued

CMSA	Metropolitan Labor Force		Employment Sectors		Ethnic Groups		% Foreign-Born	% Non-European
	Number (1)	% Niches (2)	Number (3)	% w/ Niches (4)	Number (5)	% in Niches (6)	(7)	(8)
ODESSA, TX	61329.78	3.0783	399	0.75188	69	1.44928	8.5312	24.9780
ROCHESTER, MN	58381.06	1.8171	354	0.28249	64	1.56250	2.4946	1.8479
SAN ANGELO, TX	57410.14	4.4472	356	1.40449	69	4.34783	7.6730	19.2922
OWENSBORO, KY	56762.86	0.6652	389	0.25707	80	1.25000	4.5613	4.2445
MANCHEST-NASHUA,MA	55702.04	0.6779	389	0.25707	76	1.31579	5.9393	3.2602
PASCAGOULA-MOSSPT,MS	53220.80	2.3311	383	0.52219	63	3.17460	2.0270	2.3311
NEW BRITIAN,CT	51800.38	1.3537	391	0.51151	73	2.73973	13.8146	8.5040
ANNISTON, AL	51548.66	2.8601	411	0.72993	55	3.63636	1.4301	1.5347
BILLINGS, MT	51063.20	0.7394	366	0.27322	64	1.56250	1.3028	2.5704
SHEBOYGAN, WI	50523.80	5.6940	402	0.99502	61	1.63934	1.3523	1.3879
JACKSONVILLE, NC	50487.84	2.0655	350	0.57143	75	2.66667	3.9886	6.0185
YUMA,AR	48815.70	9.4291	383	0.52219	64	3.12500	24.1621	39.2265
EVANSVILLE, IN-KY	25136.04	0.0000	338	0.00030	52	.	0.7153	1.2160
CHARLESTON, WV	20694.98	0.0000	272	0.00037	49	.	1.9983	1.9983
ATHENS, GA	20605.08	0.0000	286	0.00035	57	.	3.0541	2.0070
COLUMBUS, GA-AL	19903.86	2.8907	288	0.34722	52	1.92308	3.2520	3.7037
ANCHORAGE, AK	17440.60	0.0000	237	0.00042	67	.	7.1134	9.0722
GLENS FALLS, NY	17063.02	0.0000	269	0.00037	56	.	3.2666	1.7914
PORTLAND, ME	15696.54	0.0000	244	0.00041	59	.	2.5200	1.6037
TALLAHASSEE, FL	14635.72	0.0000	181	0.00055	61	.	4.5455	5.6511
MUSKEGON-NSH-MUHE,MI	14384.00	0.0000	252	0.00040	49	.	1.8750	2.1250
CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA	14312.08	0.0000	219	0.00046	61	.	4.3970	3.1407
LAKE CHARLES, LA	13395.10	2.5503	229	0.43668	38	2.63158	1.3423	3.0872
LYNCHBURG, VA	13359.14	0.0000	244	0.00041	44	.	1.2113	0.6729
ALBANY, GA	10158.70	0.0000	200	0.00050	31	.	1.0619	1.4159

APPENDIX TABLE 2

Logistic Regression Estimates of the Log Odds of Being Employed in an Ethnically Homogeneous Workplace Job

	Coefficients	
Variables	P	S.E.
Niche	.320	.140
Ethnic		
Black	-1.235	.105
Hispanic	-.746	.114
Asian	-.587	.131
Residence		
Atlanta	.086	.350
Boston	-.545	.085
Niche (X)		
Black	.028	.179
Hispanic	.966	.204
Asian	.652	.221
Intercept	1.141	.094
Log likelihood	-2789.07	
LR chi^2	397.52	df=9
Pseudo R^2	.067	
Observations	4517	

Source: MCSUI

References

Alba, R. D., and V. Nee. 1997. “Rethinking Assimilation Theory for a New Era of Immigration.” *International Migration Review* 31: 826–874.

Aldrich, Howard, and Roger Waldinger. 1990. “Ethnicity and Entrepreneurship.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 16: 111–135.

Bailey, T., and R. Waldinger. 1991. “Primary, Secondary, and Enclave Labor Markets: A Training Systems Approach.” *American Sociological Review*, 56: 432–445.

Bonacich, Edna. 1973. “A Theory of Middle-Man Minorities.” *American Sociological Review* 38: 583–594.

Dickens, William, and Lawrence E. Katz. 1986. “Inter-Industry Wage Differences and Industry Characteristics.” In *Unemployment and the Structure of Labor Markets*, edited by K. Lang and J. Leonard. London: Basil Blackwell. Pp. 48–89.

Eaton, April L. 1998. “Immigration and the Structure of Demand: Do Immigrants Alter the Labor Market Composition of U.S. Cities?” Working Paper 98-11, Seattle Population Research Center, University of Washington, Seattle.

Farley, Reynolds. 1991. “The New Census Question about Ancestry: What Did It Tell Us?” *Demography* 28: 441–430.

Farley, Reynolds. 1993. “The Common Destiny of Blacks and Whites: Observations about the Social and Economic Status of the Races.” In *Race in America: The Struggle for Equality*, edited by H. Hill and J. E. Jones, Jr. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press. Pp. 197–233.

Featherman, David L. and Robert M. Hauser. 1978. *Opportunity and Change.* New York: Academic Press.

Fischer, Claude S., 1975 “Toward a Subcultural Theory of Urbanism.” *American Journal of Sociology* 80: 1319–1341.

Fischer, Claude S. 1995. “The Subcultural Theory of Urbanism: A Twentieth-Year Assessment.” *American Journal Sociology* 101: 543–577.

Granovetter, Mark. 1995. “The Economic Sociology of Firms and Entrepreneurs.” In *The Economic Sociology of Immigration*, edited by A. Portes. New York: Russell Sage Foundation. Pp. 128–165.

Grusky, David B. 1994. *Social Stratification: Class, Race, and Gender in Sociological Perspective.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Lieberson, Stanley. 1980. “A Piece of the Pie.” *Blacks and White Immigrants since 1880.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Lieberson, S., and M. Waters. 1988. *From Many Strands: Ethnic and Racial Groups in Contemporary America*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Light, Ivan, and Carolyn Rosenstein. 1995. *Race, Ethnicity, and Entrepreneurship in Urban America*. New York: Aldine De Gruyter.

Logan, John R. 1999. "Occupational Ranking of Racial and Ethnic Groups in New York, 1880–1970." Unpublished paper. SUNY-Albany.

Logan, John, and Richard D. Alba. Forthcoming. "Minority Niches and Immigrant Enclaves in New York and Los Angeles: Trends and Impacts." In *Immigration and Opportunity: Race, Ethnicity, and Employment in the United States*, edited by F. Bean and S. Bell-Rose. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Logan, John, Richard Alba, and Thomas McNulty. 1994. "Ethnic Economies in Metropolitan Regions: Miami and Beyond." *Social Forces* 72: 691–724.

Massey, Dougles. 1985. "Ethnic Residential Segregation: A Theoretical Synthesis and Empirical Review." *Sociology and Social Research* 69: 315–50.

Massey, Douglas S., Jocquin Arango, Graeme Hugo, Ali Kovaovci, Adela Pellegrino, and J. Edward Taylor. 1994. "An Evaluation of International Migration Theory: The North American Case." *Population and Development Review* 20: 699–752.

Model, S. 1993. "The Ethnic Niche and the Structure of Opportunity: Immigrants and Minorities in New York City." In *The Historical Origins of the Underclass*, edited by M. Katz. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Model, Suzanne. 1997. "Ethnic Economy and Industry in Mid-Twentieth Century Gotham." *Social Problems* 44:445–463.

Model, Suzanne, and David Ladipo. 1996. "Context and Opportunity: Minorities in London and New York." *Social Forces* 75: 999–1024.

Morawska, F. 1990. "The Sociology and Historiography of Immigration." In *Immigration Reconsidered*, edited by V. Yans-McLaughlin, New York: Oxford University Press. Pp. 187–240.

Neidert, Lisa J., and Reynolds Farley. 1985 "Assimilation in the United States: An Analysis of Ethnic and Generation Differences in Status and Achievement." *American Sociological Review* 50: 840–850.

Olzak, Susan. 1992. *The Dynamics of Ethnic Competition and Conflict.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Portes, Alejandro. 1995. "Economic Sociology and the Sociology of Immigration: A Conceptual Overview." In *The Economic Sociology of Immigration*, edited by A. Portes. New York: Russell Sage Foundation. Pp. 1–41.

Portes, Alejandro. 1998. "Social Capital: Its Origins and Applications in Modern Sociology." *Annual Review of Sociology* 24:1–24.

Portes, Alejandro, and Robert Bach. 1985. *Latin Journey: Cuban and Mexican Immigrants in the United States.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Portes, Alejandro, and Robert D. Manning. 1986. "The Immigrant Enclave: Theory and Empirical Examples." In *Competitive Ethnic Relations,* edited by S. Olzak and J. Nagel. New York: Academic Press. Pp 47–68.

Portes, A., and R. G. Rumbaut. 1996. *Immigrant America: A Portrait,* 2nd ed. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Razin, Eran, and Ivan Light. 1998. "Ethnic Entrepreneurs in America's Largest Metropolitan Areas." *Urban Affairs Review* 33: 332–360.

Reitz, Jeffrey G. 1990. "Ethnic Concentrations in Labour Markets and Their Implications for Ethnic Inequality." In *Ethnic Identity and Equality: Varieties of Experience in a Canadian City,* edited by R. Breton, W. W. Isajiw, W. E. Kalbach, and J. G. Reitz. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. Pp. 135–195.

Sassen, Saskia. 1995. "Immigration and Local Labor Markets." In *The Economic Sociology of Immigration,* edited by A. Portes. New York: Russell Sage Foundation. Pp. 87–127.

Scott, Allen J. 1996. "The Manufacturing Economy: Ethnic and Gender Division of Labor." In *Ethnic Los Angeles,* edited by R. Waldinger and M. Bozorgmehr. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Sidanius, Jim, and Felicia Pratto. 1999. *An Intergroup Theory of Social Hierarchy and Oppression.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Tilly, Chris, and Charles Tilly. 1994. "Capitalist Work and Labor Markets." In *The Handbook of Economic Sociology,* edited by N. J. Smelser and R. Swedberg. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Pp 283–312.

van den Berghe. P. L. 1978. *Man in Society: A Biosocial View.* New York: Elsevier North Holland.

Waldinger, Roger. 1994. "The Making of an Immigrant Niche." *International Migration Review* 28: 3–30.

Waldinger, Roger. 1996a. *Still the Promised City? African-Americans and New Immigrants in Post-Industrial New York.* Cambridge: Harvard University.

Waldinger, R. 1996b. "Ethnicity and Opportunity in the Plural City." In *Ethnic Los Angeles,* edited by R. Waldinger and M. Bozorgmehr. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Waldinger, Roger. Forthcoming. "Network, Bureaucracy, Exclusion: Recruitment and Selection in an Immigrant Metropolis." In *Immigration and Opportunity: Race, Ethnicity, and Employment in the United States,* edited by F. Bean and S. Bell-Rose. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Waters, Mary. 1990. *Ethnic Options: Choosing Identities in America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Wilson, Franklin D. Forthcoming. “Ethnic Concentration and Labor Market Opportunities.” In *Immigration and Opportunity: Race, Ethnicity, and Employment in the United States*, edited by F. Bean and S. Bell-Rose. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.