Sixty Years after the Magic Carpet Ride: The Long-Run Effect of the Early Childhood Environment on Social and Economic Outcomes*

ERIC D. GOULD
HEBREW UNIVERSITY, SHALEM CENTER, CEPR, AND IZA

VICTOR LAVY
HEBREW UNIVERSITY, CEPR, AND NBER

M. DANIELE PASERMAN
HEBREW UNIVERSITY, CEPR, IZA, AND NBER

January 2008

Abstract

This paper estimates the effect of the childhood environment on a large array of social and economic outcomes lasting almost 60 years, for both the affected cohorts and for their children. To do this, we exploit a natural experiment provided by the 1949-1951 Magic Carpet operation, where over 50,000 Yemenite immigrants were airlifted to Israel. The Yemenites, who lacked any formal schooling or knowledge of a western-style culture or bureaucracy, believed that they were being "redeemed," and put their trust in the Israeli authorities to make decisions about where they should go and what they should do. As a result, they were scattered across the country in essentially a random manner. This quasi-random assignment produced a natural experiment whereby the environmental conditions of the immigrant children can be considered exogenous to their family background and parental decisions. We construct three summary measures of the childhood environment: 1) whether the home had running water, sanitation and electricity; 2) whether the locality of residence was in an urban environment with a good economic infrastructure; and 3) whether the locality of residence was a Yemenite enclave. We find that children who were placed in a good environment (a home with good sanitary conditions, in a city, and outside of an ethnic enclave) were more likely to achieve positive long-term outcomes. They were more likely to obtain higher education, marry at an older age, have fewer children, be more assimilated into Israeli society, be less religious, and have more worldly tastes in music and food. These effects are much more pronounced for women than for men. We find weaker and somewhat mixed effects on health and employment outcomes, and no effect on political views. We do find an effect on the next generation – children who lived in a better environment grew up to have children who achieved higher educational attainment.

Key Words: neighborhood effects, childhood environment
JEL Codes: J24

*We thank Yossef Bashara of Taldor for coordinating and managing the Yemenite survey. Yaron Aronshtam, Shahaf Cohen and Dorit Hofnung provided able research assistance.

I. Introduction

The long-term social and economic effects of an individual's early childhood conditions are of major interest to social scientists. Yet drawing causal inference about this relationship is complicated by the possibility of unmeasured individual or family-level attributes that influence both an individual's outcomes in life and the conditions of his or her childhood environment. In this paper, we exploit the airlift of Yemenite immigrants in 1949, known as "Operation Magic Carpet," as a natural experiment to overcome this identification problem. As a result, we provide rare evidence on the very long run effect of the early childhood environment on an array of social and economic outcomes, including the educational attainment of the next generation.

In September 1949, a rescue operation began to airlift the entire Yemenite Jewish community to Israel. By the end of the operation in early 1950, approximately 50,000 Yemenite Jews had been flown to the new state.[1] The immigrants were uprooted from their traditional way of life, and suddenly found themselves in a modern society and culture which they did not understand very well. Upon their arrival, the Yemenites were dispersed throughout the country into makeshift absorptions camps. After about six months to a year, most of the immigrants were moved to other predominantly new settlements throughout the country, while others stayed in their original camps, some of which later evolved into established communities or cities. Conditions in the camps were sparse – they often slept in tents with no running water, bathrooms, and electricity.

During this time period, Israel had just won its War of Independence, and struggled to absorb immigrants from all over the world – Holocaust survivors from Europe and refugees fleeing Arab and Muslim countries. For security reasons, the new immigrants were often strategically placed in areas across the country where the population needed to be bolstered. The Yemenites, who received rigorous religious training but lacked any formal schooling or knowledge of a western-style culture or bureaucracy, believed that they were being "redeemed," and put their trust in the Israeli authorities to make decisions about where they should go and what they should do. As a result, they were scattered across the country in a manner irrespective of their background characteristics – which was not difficult to do since they all lacked formal schooling and arrived essentially without any belongings or wealth.

[1] The airlift itself was performed by adventurous pilots from the US and Britain, who fought in World War II and subsequently established a company specializing in flying dangerous missions around the globe (the Berlin Airlift, airlifting Jews from Shanghai during the Chinese Civil War, etc). The airlift of the Yemenite Jews is commonly known as "Operation Magic Carpet," even though its official name is "Operation on the Wings of Eagles."

This quasi-random allocation of immigrants to locations presents a unique opportunity to estimate the long-run effect of the environment on the social and economic conditions of the individual. In general, studying this issue is complicated by the fact that individuals are not randomly sorted into locations. Therefore, any correlation between the conditions of their environment and later outcomes cannot be interpreted as a causal relationship. To establish causality, one needs to find a situation where individuals do not sort themselves into locations according to their income and other personal characteristics which affect their outcomes directly. The historical episode of the Yemenite immigration appears to satisfy this criterion -- due to their homogenous background, lack of understanding of spoken Hebrew, complete culture shock, and reliance on Israeli bureaucrats to tell them where to live and what to do. Furthermore, the overall chaotic and precarious situation of the entire country was reflected in the absorption process of the Yemenite immigrants. As a result, this episode is a rare opportunity to study the long-run effect of the childhood environment on various social and economic outcomes.

However, to exploit this situation, panel data on the Yemenite immigrants is needed in order to link the conditions of their initial placement with their outcomes later on in life. This information does not exist in any Israeli data set. To overcome this obstacle, during the summer of 2006, we conducted a survey of the entire population of immigrants who were born in Yemen between 1945 and 1950, and arrived in Israel during 1949-50. The sample was restricted to immigrants who arrived as children, since our focus is to estimate the effect of the early childhood environment.[2] Each respondent answered a series of questions regarding: (i) their family background in Yemen; (ii) the location of residence and living conditions upon arrival to Israel, and for up to two moves afterwards; (iii) a variety of social and economic outcomes over the course of their lives (employment, income, marriage, fertility, health, cultural tastes, and their children's educational outcomes). In 2006, the individuals in our sample were between 56 and 61 years old, so the outcomes that we are studying are very much "long term outcomes."

The data are supportive of the idea that the Yemenites were indeed sorted initially into locations in a manner uncorrelated with their income, education (which everyone lacked), and ability. However, over time, the data show that some effort was probably made to enable immigrants with an agricultural background to live in remote farming communities versus cities in Israel. However, the size of this selection process appears to be modest, and as we present in

[2] Also, many of the immigrants who arrived at older ages are no longer alive.

detail, controlling for having an agricultural background (or many other types of occupations) in Yemen does not have a significant effect on our results.

We construct three summary measures of the childhood environment: 1) whether the home had running water, sanitation and electricity; 2) whether the locality of residence was in an urban environment (which typically has a more advanced economic infrastructure than remote towns and villages); and 3) whether the locality of residence was a Yemenite enclave. After linking information about the individual's early childhood environment with their later outcomes, we find that children of families that were placed in a good environment (i.e good sanitary conditions, in an urban locality, and not in an ethnic enclave) experienced better economic and social outcomes throughout their lives. Specifically, we find that individuals who grew up in better conditions accumulated more human capital, got married at an older age, had fewer children, were more likely to be employed at the age of 55, were more likely to work in white-collar jobs, were less likely to be religious, and were more likely to have worldly tastes in music and food.

On the other hand, we find no effect on political views and only weak evidence that an adverse childhood environment had a negative effect on the health outcomes of individuals. When stratifying the sample by gender, we find most of the significant effects are due to the effect on females rather than males. In addition, we find an effect on the next generation. That is, children who lived in a better childhood environment grew up to have children who were better educated.

The effects seem to operate through predictable channels: holding all other conditions constant, it is the sanitary conditions that appear to have affected educational outcomes, while assimilation outcomes (such as inter-ethnic marriage and cultural preferences) are mostly affected by growing up in a Yemenite enclave.

The literature most related to our study includes Oreopoulos (2003) and several papers on the "Moving to Opportunity" (MTO) program (see Katz, Kling, and Liebman (2001); Ludwig, Duncan, and Hirschfield (2001); Goering and Feins (2003); Kling, Ludwig, and Katz (2005); Sanbonmatsu, Kling, Duncan, and Brooks-Gunn (2006); and Kling, Liebman, and Katz (2007)). The MTO literature exploits the random assignment of housing vouchers as a source of exogenous variation in the quality of the neighborhood. This exogenous variation is used to examine a variety of social and economic outcomes. For example, Kling, Liebman, and Katz (2007) found that being in a safer neighborhood had beneficial effects on education, risky behavior, and health for girls, but not for boys. In contrast, we examine outcomes that span

almost 60 years. Oreopoulos (2003) examines the effect of the neighborhood on labor market outcomes thirty years later. This study is the closest to ours in terms of the long-term nature of the outcomes, but the time horizon is only half of our study, and we examine an array of social and economic outcomes, not just labor market activity.[3] Our focus on very long-run outcomes (up to 60 years later) and on the effect of early childhood environment across generations is one if the key distinguishing features of the paper.

By looking at how the early childhood environment affects outcomes of individuals later on in life, this paper contributes also to the debate over whether investments in the early stages of a child's development have long-term payoffs. Heckman (2000) argues that early investments in human capital for children have a larger payoff than interventions at a later stage, which aim to close the gap between troubled students and regular students. Some evidence for this claim has been found by Krueger and Whitmore (2001), Currie (2001), Currie and Thomas (2001), and Garces, Thomas, and Currie (2002).[4]

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. The next section describes the Magic Carpet operation and its historical background. Section III describes the survey and the data that we collected, while section IV describes the empirical strategy. Section V tests for whether the data accord with the random placement of Yemenite children into different environments in the early 1950's. Section VI presents the empirical estimates of the effect of the early childhood environment on a variety of social and economic outcomes. Section VII provides concluding remarks.

II. Operation Magic Carpet and its Historical Background[5]

There are many legends about the origins of the Yemenite Jews. Some claim that they descended from a group of Israelites that rebelled against Moses during the Exodus from Egypt. Another theory is that they descended from traders that were sent to the region by the Queen of Sheba, or that they fled from Jerusalem before the destruction of the Second Temple. According to most sources, however, there was a Jewish community in Yemen from at least the time of the

[3] Our focus is on the long-term effect of neighborhood conditions rather than the contemporaneous effect of neighborhood characteristics on labor market outcomes (Weinberg, Reagan, and Yankow (2004).

[4] Our analysis is also related to the literature on the role of the environment and peer effects in the creation of human capital. This literature examines whether students benefit from being in contact with better students (Arnott and Rowse (1987), Sacerdote (2001), Zimmerman (2003)) or immigrant students (Gould, Lavy, and Paserman (2004b)), or whether neighborhoods affected student outcomes (Jacob (2003) and Goux and Maurin, (2007)). This issue has also guided other researchers, who have looked at whether desegregation policies in the United States (such as bussing) help or hurt the achievements of blacks and whites ((Hoxby (2000); Angrist and Lang (2002); Hanushek, Kain, and Rivkin (2002)).

[5] This section relies on Barer (1952) and Sachar (1979)

Second Temple. Once there, they enjoyed times of relative prosperity until the rise of Islam in the 7th Century, when a variety of restrictions and bans were imposed on Jews, including seclusion in ghettos and special taxes. The Jews of Yemen often worked in occupations avoided by Muslims, including trades such as blacksmiths, tool makers, pottery, tailoring, and carpentry. Formal schooling was not available, but Yemenite boys received a rigorous education in biblical texts.

The harsh conditions in Yemen, combined with news about the Zionist resettlement of Palestine, spurred a "messianic" movement to move to the Holy Land at the end of the19th Century. These initial immigrants settled in agricultural communities in Jerusalem and Jaffa. Although they were quite poor, they sent back money and letters to their relatives in Yemen, encouraging them to immigrate as well. There was a steady, low stream of immigration from Yemen in the early part of the 20th Century, but during the 1930's and 1940's Jews were forbidden from leaving by the local authorities, due to political considerations.

The drought of 1942-43 and the impending war between the Arabs and Jews in Palestine led to a dramatic deterioration in the conditions of the Jews in Yemen. These conditions spurred many Yemenite Jews to flee to Aden, which was under British rule at the time. Under a cloud of secrecy, a limited number of flights were allowed to take them to Israel. Thus, "Operation Magic Carpet" secretly began in late 1948 and lasted for a few months. After the armistice agreement between Egypt and Israel was signed in February 1949, the ruler of Yemen agreed in April 1949 to let the Jews leave for Israel, on the condition that they teach their trades to their Arab neighbors and leave their property behind. In May, news of this decree and the free transport to Israel spread through Yemen. At the time, there were roughly 40,000 Jews in Yemen, and they responded by trekking on foot to Aden, a journey that lasted weeks and sometimes months under treacherous conditions. In Aden, they waited in a makeshift refugee camp to be flown to Israel. The actual airlift was carried out by American and British pilots who ran a renegade airline, Alaska Airlines, which specialized in dangerous missions after World War II.

The awe of the immigrants with respect to the operation is described aptly by one of the pilots involved in the mission:

> *It's difficult to put into words, but it gives me a strange feeling to see these Jews . . . They wander about on foot for weeks till they reach the camp near Aden. They arrive hungry and sick and naked . . . But you'll find every man carrying his Bible, and every other man clinging to a huge holy parchment scroll clasped in front of him. That camp is just a piece of desert with almost nothing on it, just a few tents and straw mats, but they behave as if they had just stepped into Paradise. Then we pile them into those planes and they're terribly confused, but they keep mum. When*

> *they climb out at Lydda (the airport in Israel), you feel they're so excited they ought to throw themselves on the ground and kick, yet what do they do? They move about with shining eyes and don't say a word. They look to me like people going awake through a dream.*[6]

The pilots also testified to the Yemenites' submissive demeanor:

> *"They look like prophets stepping out of the bible . . . their average weight was seventy or eighty pounds, and up to a hundred and forty of them could be put on a plane normally carrying less than half that number. It was a strange experience for them to travel by air – not only were they unfamiliar with airplanes, but the steep metal ladders used for climbing aboard planes had to be replaced with wooden ramps with shallow steps to enable them to go aboard. However, they behaved admirably and gave little trouble."*[7]

Despite perilous conditions flying over enemy territory, about 50,000 Yemenite Jews arrived in Israel without a single loss of life by the summer of 1950. They landed, however, into a chaotic environment as Israel was struggling to absorb immigrants from Europe, Africa, and other Arab countries. The Jewish population in Israel was 650,000 in 1948, and this number would more than double in the next few years. Upon arrival, the Yemenites were taken to absorption camps, consisting of tents with no running water, kitchens, bathrooms, and other sanitation facilities. There were four main absorption camps which were spread out all over the country: Ein Shemer, Beit Lid, Rosh Ha'ayin, and Atlit. Some of the immigrants stayed in the camps for up to a year, but most were moved to other arrangements after a month or two. The second placement was usually in a small agricultural community ("*moshav*"), or a somewhat more permanent type of camp in which immigrants were required to work for their sustainment ("*ma'abara*"). These camps consisted of canvas huts or aluminum houses, but often lacked running water, bathrooms, and other sanitation facilities.

During this period, the Israeli government strategically placed immigrants in settlements throughout the country and steered the immigrants into low-skill agricultural jobs for ideological reasons. Many Yemenites were placed in their own communities, but many were mixed with immigrants from all over the world. Rosh Ha'ayin, which was one of the biggest immigrant camps built exclusively for Yemenites, later turned into a permanent immigrant camp ("ma'abara"). Today, it is a thriving city in Israel, still heavily populated by Yemenite immigrants and their descendants.

---

[6] Barer (1952).
[7] Robert Maguire and Hank Mullineaux, quoted in Barer (1952).

Without knowing modern Hebrew and generally lacking any understanding of the workings of a modern society and bureaucracy, the Yemenites placed their fate at the mercy of the Israeli government. Perhaps it is also part of their nature, but they believed they were being redeemed, and did as they were told. However, tensions did arise as many Yemenites complained about being forced into a secular environment. Zameret (2001) reports that about two-thirds of them were sent to agricultural communities associated with the secular Mapai party, while only a third were sent to places associated with the religious parties. The fact that many were sent to secular agricultural communities demonstrates how powerless they were to determine where to live.

Gradually, the Yemenites moved into more permanent housing, or the camp itself transformed into a modern community. Over the years, the adults tended to work in low-skill jobs in manufacturing, agriculture, skilled trades, and cleaning jobs. To this day, Yemenite immigrants and their children complain that they were not treated as well as immigrants from Europe. Indeed, Yemenites have not been immune to discrimination by Israelis of European origin.[8] However, despite being very well integrated into all aspects of society, they still represent a distinctive sector in Israeli society – often living in predominantly Yemenite communities and marrying within the group. Each generation becomes increasingly assimilated into mainstream Israeli society, and overall they are not considered as underachieving as other immigrant groups.

III. The Survey and Data

In order to study the effect of the initial childhood environment on long-term social and economic outcomes, we need three types of information about each Yemenite immigrant: (1) the immigrant's family background in Yemen; (2) where the immigrant was placed upon arrival in Israel and in subsequent years; and (3) the immigrant's social and economic outcomes over the course of almost 60 years. This information does not exist in any existing data set, since governmental surveys do not ask about the person's family background in Yemen and the person's living situation in Israel over 55 years ago. Therefore, we conducted our own survey to obtain this information.

[8] A major source of resentment revolves around the case of the missing Yemenite infants. According to some allegations, hundreds of Yemenite babies who were reported to have died or to have disappeared after their parents came to Israel were actually kidnapped and given or sold for adoption to European-born Israelis and American Jews. A number of Government Commission of Inquiries have investigated these allegations, and confirmed that some cases of missing babies cannot be accounted for, but the actual extent of the phenomenon is still controversial.

From the Ministry of Interior, we received a list of names and addresses of the entire population of people born in Yemen between 1945 and 1950, and were still alive as of January 2006.[9] We restricted the age range to include only people who immigrated as a young child, since the focus of the study is to examine the effect of the early childhood environment. At the time that the survey was conducted in the summer of 2006, these immigrants were between the ages of 56 and 61.

The list received by the Ministry of Interior included 5,776 individuals. We contracted with a private company (Taldor) to administer a telephone survey to this population. Taldor was able to locate valid telephone numbers for 4,160 individuals on the list. All the subjects were sent a letter in advance, which explained the purpose of the research and indicated that they would soon be contacted by phone by Taldor. 796 subjects either refused or were unable to answer the survey. Out of the remaining 3,364 respondents, 373 were discarded because they did not match our requirements in terms of year of birth (between 1945 and 1950) and year of immigration (between 1948 and 1951).[10] This left us with a sample of 2,991 completed surveys. This represents more than 50% of the original list, and a nearly 80% response rate among people whom we were able to contact. Since one of the key variables for our analysis is the childhood environment, we also called back 264 individuals for whom it was difficult to establish the locality in which they grew up based on the original survey. In the end, we were able to establish the childhood environment for 2,927 individuals. The survey questionnaire included more than 130 questions, and usually took between 20 and 30 minutes to complete.[11]

It is important to keep in mind that although we contacted the immigrants themselves, we asked many questions which concern details about the time before they were born (their family background in Yemen) or when they were very young. Therefore, they most likely responded to these questions according to what they were told from their parents as they grew up.[12] For this reason, we often asked multiple questions in order to elicit similar types of information. Since many people could answer some questions and not others, the sample size varies significantly

[9] In our request to the Ministry of the Interior, we were limited to two dimensions along which to cut the data: year of birth and country of birth. Therefore, our sample included some people who migrated before 1948 or after 1950. These observations were not used in our analysis.

[10] Most of the discarded observations did not meet the year of immigration requirement. A small number of observations were discarded because their reported year of birth fell out of the 1945-1950 range, in contradiction with the official birth date available in the Ministry of the Interior data.

[11] We first ran a pilot survey in June 2006 with approximately 100 subjects. We then made some minor modifications to the survey questionnaire, and conducted the full-scale survey between August and October 2006.

across questions, depending on what they remember or recall being told. We now describe the specific information that we collected concerning the three general areas listed above.

Family Background Information

The critical assumption for our empirical strategy is that the immigrants were essentially randomly placed into their childhood environments. To support this assumption, we need to demonstrate that the placement of immigrants into various locations was not correlated with their personal or family background characteristics. A typical measure used to capture the "family background" is the educational attainment of the person's parents. However, modern education was non-existent in Yemen at the time. As a result, we built the questionnaire to acquire information about other relevant variables indicating the person's socio-economic status: the occupation of the head of the household, whether the family owned animals or a farm, whether the family was considered rich or poor, whether the family employed workers, whether the head of the family was a religious or political leader, whether they came from a big city or remote village, and whether they had relatives already in Israel. Descriptive statistics for the key background variables are presented in Table 1.

Table 1 indicates that the head of the household for most immigrants was a craftsman (58 percent) or a merchant (25 percent). A sizable minority came from a major city in Yemen (44 percent) and had relatives already in Israel (40 percent), although we do not know when those relatives arrived. Only two percent came from a female-headed household, while roughly a quarter came from families where the head was a religious or community leader. Thirty percent came from families which were considered “rich,” while only 16 percent were considered poor. It is important to note that Table 1 shows that the means across all of the background variables are very similar for boys and girls. There is no systematic gender difference in their responses, which is a result that will be important for us later.

Although some of these variables reflect subjective assessments, there are distinct patterns in the data which support the notion that these variables are accurately reflecting the socio-economic background of Yemenite immigrants. In Table 2, we regress the variable for whether the person described their household as "rich" on several of the other characteristics individually. Table 2 also contains similar regressions where the dependent variable is for being "poor" in

[12] The letters sent in advance created a “buzz” among this population, and it is possible that some of the information for our questionnaire was obtained from older siblings who were not part of our sample. We received numerous phone calls from Yemenites who were eager to share their personal stories or to volunteer their help.

Yemen. The results indicate that being rich in Yemen is strongly positively correlated with the head being a merchant (not a craftsman or farm worker), living in a city, owning a farm and animals, employing workers, having relatives already in Israel, and being a community or religious leader in Yemen. We find similar but opposite-signed relationship between all these variables and the indicator for being poor.

Information about the Childhood Environment

The survey asked each immigrant about their initial placement upon arrival to Israel, and about two subsequent placements after that. Specifically, we asked whether the immigrant was placed in one of the four main absorption camps: Atlit, Bet Lid, Rosh Ha'ayin, or Ein Shemer. If the immigrant was placed in a different location, we asked for the name and location of the place (region of the country), and whether it was in a city, an agricultural community ("moshav"), a communal agricultural community ("kibbutz"), an immigration camp other than the four main ones listed above, or an abandoned Arab village. We also asked if the place had been built exclusively for Yemenite immigrants, and about their living conditions -- whether they slept in a tent or a more permanent house, and whether the house had running water, a bathroom, or electricity. Finally, we asked how long they stayed in that particular place, and whether their family chose to live there or whether they were directed to go there by the government. The same set of information was gathered for the second and third locations they lived in after arriving in Israel. This information is summarized in Table 3.

Most of the immigrants did indeed start out in one of the four immigrant camps (86 percent). The majority started out in Rosh Ha'ayin (22.3 Percent) and Ein Shemer (46 percent), while 84.5 percent were placed in a location built exclusively for Yemenite immigrants. Almost all of them (98 percent) were sent to their initial placement by the government. Roughly 8 percent are still living in the same place today, while the initial location was also the primary childhood environment for about 12.5 percent. Most of the immigrants moved away from the initial placement after only a few months or a year at most. For those that moved, most of them moved to a place built exclusively for Yemenites (51 percent), which usually was another immigrant camp or a small agricultural community. About 80 percent reported that the government chose the location for them, which again reflects their heavy dependence on the authorities at the time. Half of these people never left the second placement, which demonstrates just how important this location decision was at the time. Note also that the immigrants' second

residence was much more geographically dispersed, with most of the immigrants concentrated in the Northern and Central regions, but a substantial minority moving to Jerusalem and the South.

Given that most immigrants left their initial placement and moved to many different kinds of environments, we needed to derive standard measures to characterize the early childhood environment in a consistent way for every child. To do this, we used the information gathered on the duration of stay in each of the first three locations to determine their location as of 1955 (or the closest year that we could confidently place them). We examined the responses of each person to determine how long they stayed in each location. It is important to note that some of the respondents did not remember the exact dates of transitions between places of residence, given that they were young children at the time. Therefore, the interviewers asked for verbal answers (e.g., "less than a year", "a few months," etc.), to the question of how long they stayed in each place, and our research assistants had to use these often vague statements to determine where they were living as of 1955. In order to reduce the uncertainty about some cases, 264 respondents were re-interviewed by our research assistants to clarify the information they provided.

After determining the individual's "childhood location" as of 1955, the list of "childhood places" consisted of 233 different locations. In order to characterize each location in a consistent way, we choose to focus on three broad measures of the environment: a summary of sanitary and other living conditions in the home, the urban/rural status of the locality, and whether the place of residence was a settlement built specifically for Yemenite immigrants. These three measures are meant to capture, respectively, the health, economic, and social infrastructure available to immigrants.

There is a substantial literature that shows the importance of these channels for a variety of labor market and other socioeconomic outcomes. It is well documented that workers in cities earn a substantial wage premium, and there is mounting evidence that this premium is not due just to selectivity, but reflects the notion that cities foster the accumulation of human capital (Glaeser and Maré, 2001; Gould, 2007). Health conditions, and in particular the prevention or eradication of infectious diseases, has been shown to have large impacts on children' educational outcomes (Kremer and Miguel, 2004; Bleakley, 2007). Finally, there is a significant debate about whether ethnic enclaves, and more generally, ghettos are good or bad for immigrants and minorities (Borjas, 1995; Cutler and Glaeser, 1997; Bertrand, Luttmer and Mullainathan, 2000; Edin, Fredriksson and Åslund, 2003). Summary statistics for the three summary measures are presented in Table 4.

The first summary measure is an indicator for whether the respondent lived in a home with all three of the following: running water (48 percent), a bathroom (29 percent), and electricity (31 percent). Only 22 percent had all three amenities in their houses. Overall, most of the immigrants lived in fairly rugged conditions during their childhood.

The second measure is simply an indicator for whether the locality of residence was a "city". We define a locality as a city if the place of residence was classified as such in the 1961 Israeli Census, *and* the respondent described it as a city, an "abandoned Arab village," or "other."[13,14] Close to 20 percent of immigrants lived in a city according to this measure.

Our third measure is a self-assessed indicator for whether the place of residence was built exclusively for Yemenite immigrants. Many Yemenite immigrants were sent to settle in remote agricultural communities in frontier areas, established in the early 1950s and built exclusively for new immigrants. This variable is meant to capture the extent to which the place of residence was a segregated ethnic enclave. The table shows that 44 percent of the respondents lived in such an enclave.

Each of the three measures of the childhood environment capture different avenues through which individuals may have been affected, but it is worth noting that two of them (having all three amenities and the indicator for living in a Yemenite enclave) concern objective facts and are not subject to interpretation. The indicator for city status is more open to interpretation, since it depends on how a city is defined. However, in unreported results, our findings are robust to multiple ways of defining city status. In addition, since city status and household amenities could be changing over time (even if the respondent did not move), the indicator for living in an ethnic enclave is probably the most objective and stable measure of the early environment.

Table 4 also shows that the means of the childhood environment variables are roughly similar for men and women, although women tended to report slightly better conditions than men, and these differences are statistically significant.

The correlations between all of the childhood environment measures are presented in Table 5. There is a clear pattern that immigrants who lived in cities had better conditions – they were more likely to have a bathroom, running water, and electricity. On the other hand,

[13] The 1961 Census lists the places which were defined as a city in 1954 or 1957. A place is defined as a city if the population was over 10,000, so we considered places as cities if they were characterized as a city in 1957 and had at least 9,500 residents as of 1954.

[14] All our results are essentially unchanged if we exclude from this definition localities that were described as "abandoned Arab village" or "other" by the respondents.

immigrants who lived in a place built exclusively for Yemenites lived in more rugged living conditions – they were less likely to have a bathroom, electricity, and running water.

Overall, the data reveal that the Yemenites lived in generally sparse conditions, but there is considerable variation to exploit – roughly half of the immigrant children lived without water in their home, or in a new settlement built exclusively for Yemenite immigrants. Roughly a quarter of them lived with electricity, a bathroom, or near a city. Taken as whole, the Yemenites did not wind up in uniform conditions, and this variation will be exploited to test for their long-run effects on various social and economic outcomes.

Social and Economic Outcomes over the Lifetime

The goal of the paper is to study whether the childhood environment affects a broad array of social and economic outcomes throughout the life of an individual. To this end, we asked each respondent about outcomes related to educational attainment, marriage and fertility, health, employment, political views, religious observance, cultural tastes, and children's educational attainment. Table 6 presents the means for each outcome.

We find that 28 percent of the respondents obtained a high school matriculation degree, and 21.5 percent obtained some sort of post-secondary degree (not necessarily a four-year college). The average years of schooling is 11.6. These averages are roughly comparable to those obtained in the 1995 Israeli Census for Yemenites born between 1945 and 1950: the percentage with a high school diploma is 29.2% (std. error 1.4%), average years of schooling is 10.9 (std. error 0.09), and the percentage with some sort of post-secondary degree is 25.4% (std. error 1.3%). The similarity between the survey and the census holds (as we show below) for many other measures, and it supports the credibility and accuracy of the survey data that we use in this study.

The means for the fertility outcomes show that the average number of children is 4.04, while 93.2% were married at least once (slightly lower than in the Census, where the percentage of people ever married is 96.1). The divorce rate is quite low (a total of 6.25% are currently divorced), and 4.58% are widowed. The mean age at first marriage was 23.8 years old. In terms of health outcomes, 40 percent reported having some health problems, while only 12.5 reported receiving disability income support from the government. The latter number comes from a standard question that is asked on the Israeli Labor Force Survey, and is perhaps a more objective measure of health status.

Regarding the employment outcomes, 68.7 percent of the men are employed today, and this number drops to 58.3 percent for women. Only about a quarter of the men and women worked in white-collar jobs.[15] About 10 percent of men and 12 percent of the women worked in high skilled, white-collar occupations (called "academic jobs" in Table 6).[16] A significant number of women, roughly a quarter, worked as a caregiver (for children, the elderly, or the disabled).

The next set of variables in Table 6 captures political and religious attitudes. The political attitudes index ranges from 1 (strongly right wing) to 4 (strongly left), and the religious index ranges from 1 (ultraorthodox) to 5 (secular). The results indicate that the Yemenites are generally on the right end of the political spectrum, and slightly on the religious side. However, the Yemenites are clearly not monolithic in their views -- there appears to be considerable variation in both of these variables. Marrying a fellow Yemenite is very common in our sample, with 72 percent marrying within the group.

We then created two variables that are meant to capture the extent of an immigrant's cultural assimilation, by measuring preferences for typically Yemenite foods or performing artists. We asked each respondent to give a rating from 1 to 5 for nine Israeli performing artists that were very popular over the last few decades. Four of them are of Yemenite origin, four of them are of European descent, and the last one is from a Muslim country other than Yemen. To summarize their tastes in music, we use the first principal component from their responses to all nine singers. This variable gave positive weights to Yemenite singers versus non-Yemenite singers.[17] Therefore, a higher value of this variable is indicative of stronger tastes for their own culture versus the music of other cultures. Similarly, each respondent was asked to rate nine different foods from 1 to 5. Three of the food items are considered traditional Yemenite food, one is considered to be exclusively European, one is considered to be very modern, two are considered mainstream Israeli, and two originate in other Middle Eastern countries. The first

[15] This variable records either the current occupation, or the main occupation in the respondent's last spell of employment.

[16] These are occupations classified as Major Occupational Group 0: Academic Professionals, in the standard Classification of occupations of the 1995 Israeli Census.

[17] The factor loadings for the principle component of preferences for singers are: Boaz Sharabi (0.081), Ofra Haza (0.354), Shimi Tavori (0.571), Zohar Argov (0.643) (all these four singers are from a Yemenite origin], Chava Alberstein (-0.718), Arik Einstein (-0.756), Yehoram Gaon (0.047), Shlomo Artzi (-0.486) and Haim Moshe (0.528). Before computing the factor loadings on the variables for each singer, the mean rating an individual gave for all singers was subtracted from the rating the individual gave to each particular singer, in order to remove the fixed-effect for individuals who like all singers versus individuals that do not like singers in general. We did this in order to focus on explaining differences in tastes for a given individual across different artists, rather than capturing variation across individuals in tastes for all music in general.

principal component of all these nine foods put a higher positive weight on Yemenite food.[18] Therefore, a higher value is indicative of someone who is more loyal to Yemenite food (less assimilated in their tastes in food).

Finally, since Operation Magic Carpet occurred about 60 years ago, we are able to observe outcomes for each immigrant in the next generation. These variables are presented in the last panel of Table 6, and indicate that 77.9 percent of the offspring of these immigrants obtained a high school matriculation degree while 45 percent graduated from college (this analysis was restricted to children old enough to complete college).

IV. The Empirical Strategy

Our primary question is whether the quality of the childhood environment affected the economic and social outcomes of the individual. In general, answering such a question is non-trivial due to the non-random assignment of children to neighborhoods. Naturally, parents will sort themselves into neighborhoods according to their education, income, place of work, and other personal and family characteristics. These characteristics, rather than the neighborhood, may be responsible for any correlation between the neighborhood quality and the individual's later outcomes. Therefore, it is not legitimate to interpret this correlation as representing a causal relationship.

The Yemenite airlift in "Operation Magic Carpet" provides a unique opportunity to overcome these estimation problems. The placement of Yemenite children in camps and settlements across the country can be thought of as a natural experiment in the sense that it produced variation in the quality of the childhood environment which is exogenous to the characteristics and choices of their parents. Consequently, our empirical strategy is to exploit the essentially random placement of Yemenite children across different kinds of living conditions in order to identify the causal effect of changing the child's environment on an array of economic and social outcomes measured 60 years later.

For any given outcome of individual *i* measured nearly 60 years after arriving in Israel, our basic regression model explains the outcome of person *i* who lived in a childhood environment with characteristic *j* with the following equation:

[18] The factor loadings for the first principal component for preferences for different types of food are: jachnun (0.693), schug (0.190), malawach (0.753) [Yemenite], gefilte fish (-0.591) [European], sushi (-0.44) [modern], hummus (-0.032), falafel (0.223) (Israeli], couscous (-0.241), kubeh (-0.476) [Middle Eastern]. Similar to the procedure used for computing the principal component of singers, the overall mean for each respondent for all foods was subtracted from the individual's rating for each particular food before conducting the factor analysis.

$$\text{Outcome}_{ij} = \lambda_0 + \alpha(\text{Childhood Quality})_j + \lambda_1(\text{Personal and Family Background})_i + u_{ij}$$

The quasi-randomization of immigrant children to settlements and camps throughout Israel guarantees that the key explanatory variable, childhood quality, is uncorrelated with the residual, thus estimates for the parameter α can be interpreted as causal. Although α is identified without further controls for the person's individual and family characteristics, these additional measures are included in order to reduce the standard errors of the estimates. However, we present results with and without an extensive set of personal and family control variables in order to present evidence in support of the validity of our critical assumption that the Yemenite immigrants were essentially randomly placed into their childhood environment.

V. Evidence on the Validity of the Identification Strategy: Balancing Tests

The key assumption for the identification strategy outlined previously is that variation in the quality of the early childhood environment for Yemenite immigrants was indeed random. Anecdotal evidence is consistent with this hypothesis, given the chaotic nature of the country at the time, the strategic policy of scattering immigrants throughout the country, and the homogenous background of the Yemenites themselves (no formal schooling, no understanding of a modern culture, arriving with no belongings, etc). To this day, Yemenite immigrants complain about how the government treated them differently than other immigrant groups. The idea that the Yemenites lacked any significant power of choice is supported in our data by the high rate of immigrants who claim that the government chose their location of residence. This diminishes the possibility of a significant selection problem. Nevertheless, to address this issue, we checked whether our various measures of the quality of the early childhood environment are correlated with their family background characteristics in Yemen. If the assignment was indeed random, we would expect to find no significant correlation. This is not necessarily proof of a random assignment, as the assumption requires there to be no correlation between the childhood environment and both observable and *unobservable* background characteristics. However, the lack of a significant relationship between the childhood environment and observable characteristics suggests that it is unlikely that such a relationship exists with the unobservable characteristics.

Since the Yemenites were homogenous in terms of parental education, we checked for selection based on observable measures such as parental wealth, occupation, location, and

whether their father was a religious or community leader. We present the test statistics for the three summary measures of the environment, and for the three individual components of the "living conditions" measure. The results of these tests are presented in Tables 7a, 7b, and 7c, which present "balancing tests" for the full sample, the female sub-sample, and the male sub-sample respectively.

For each measure of the early childhood environment and each background variable in these tables, we present three numbers. For example, for "Water" and "Household head occupation: merchant" in Table 7a, the three numbers are: 0.045, (0.017), and 0.105. The first number is the coefficient obtained from regressing the background measure ("household head was a merchant") on the childhood environment measure (had running water in the home). The second number in parentheses (0.017) is the standard error from this regression. The third number (0.105), which appears in italics, is the ratio of the mean difference in the background variable between the two groups defined by the childhood environment variable to its "average" standard deviation. [19] In this example, 0.045 is the mean difference in the dependent variable ("household head was a merchant") between the treatment and the control groups (i.e., those with "Water" equal to 1 and zero, respectively), divided by the average standard deviation. Imbens (2007) recommends using this ratio as a way of assessing whether the covariates are balanced between different treatment groups. He argues that using this ratio (which we will refer to as the "Imbens ratio"), instead of the looking at the significance of the regression coefficient, is more appropriate because it is not sensitive to sample size. The regression coefficient will tend to show statistically significant differences when the sample size is large, even if the difference in magnitude between the two groups are not meaningful.[20] Imbens suggests using 0.25 standard deviations as a "critical value," where values of the standardized difference that exceed this value indicate a severe problem of imbalance in the covariates.

The background characteristics tested in Tables 7a-7c are classified into three groups. The first group describes the head of household's occupation, location of residence in Yemen, and whether the family had relatives in Israel. The second group measures family wealth status in Yemen based on indicators of being rich or poor, owning a farm or animals, and employing

[19] The average standard deviation is the simple average of the standard deviations in the treatment and in the control groups.

[20] The t-statistic, which is equal to the standardized difference multiplied by the square root of the sample size, does increase with the sample size. For a given standardized difference between the two groups in terms of average covariate values, "a larger t-statistic just indicates a larger sample size, and therefore in fact an easier problem in terms of finding credible estimators for average treatment effects," as Imbens acutely observes.

workers. The third group uses measures of the family's social status, i.e., whether the household head was a religious or a community leader in Yemen.

Overall, many of the regression coefficients in Tables 7a-7c show statistically significant differences, but according to the Imbens ratios, the differences are not very meaningful economically (i.e., most of the respective Imbens ratios are smaller then 0.25). In Tables 7a-7c, only 27 out of the possible 216 ratios are larger than 0.25 (9 in Table 7a, 7 in Table 7b, and 11 in Table 7c) and only one of the ratios is above 0.5. These results indicate that the background characteristics are generally well balanced with respect to the various treatment indicators (the childhood environment measures).

It is important, however, to note some discernable patterns in the balancing tables. First, whether the family was rich or poor in Yemen is completely orthogonal to any of the childhood indicators – this is true for both the regression coefficients and the Imbens ratios. Only 3 of the 36 regression coefficients are significant and none of the Imbens ratios are higher than 0.25. On the other hand, the characteristics that seem to be imbalanced by treatment status are mainly related to whether the family resided in a city in Yemen and whether they owned a farm or animals. The results show a pattern whereby immigrants from a farming background in Yemen had a higher probability to be placed in a farming community in Israel, and similarly urban residents in Yemen were more likely to end up in a city in Israel. This pattern is more evident for men than women. For females, owning a farm in Yemen is perfectly balanced with respect to the city indicator and with respect to living in a farming community in Israel (not shown), while this is not the case for males. The fact that the male sample appears to be slightly more imbalanced than the female sample will be discussed later.

An additional variable that appears to be imbalanced is the "head of household is a community leader," which is negatively correlated with all of the treatment indicators. The sign of these imbalances is counter-intuitive, since we would expect community leaders to find their way into better living conditions in Israel. However, based on the Imbens ratios, these imbalances are not meaningful in magnitude.

Overall, the evidence is reasonably consistent with the idea that the process of placing immigrants into the four camps and subsequently re-locating them over time occurred in a rather random fashion. There is some evidence that authorities may have tried to match the occupational background of the families with their occupation in Israel, but there is no indication that authorities directed high ability or wealthy immigrants into certain locations. In any case, in the outcome regressions, we present estimates with and without controlling for the background

variables from Yemen, and show that the estimates are not sensitive to these controls. This finding indicates that there was no strong pattern of selection into childhood environmental conditions which seems to be affecting our estimated results.

VI. Empirical Results

Tables 8-14 present the estimated effects of our summary measures of the childhood environment on the long-run social and economic outcomes, for males and females separately. We report results using the three summary measures of the environment as treatment indicators, plus results using the three individual components of the living conditions indicator. In the top panel of each table, each row presents the coefficients for each treatment indicator from separate regressions. The bottom panel presents coefficients for the three treatment indicators after including all three in the same regression.

We present estimates for two specifications. The "limited controls" specification includes only dummies for birth year (1945-1950), immigration year (1949-1951), and whether or not the person was in the sample of 264 individuals that were re-interviewed. The "full controls" specification adds four dummy variables indicating which of the four camps the immigrant was initially placed in, an indicator for whether the individual already had relatives in Israel when he/she arrived, and indicators for the family background in Yemen: whether the household was rich or poor; whether it owned a farm, owned livestock, or employed workers; whether it lived in a major city in Yemen; whether the head of household was a religious or a community leader in Yemen; and the head of the household's occupation – dummies for merchants, craftsmen, construction workers, academic professions (mostly teachers and rabbis), free professions (legal officials, ritual scribes, healer) and public sector workers, with unknown household head's occupation as the omitted category. To preserve as large a sample as possible, for each of the background variables we set missing values to zero, and included dummies for missing status.

A. The Effect on Educational Outcomes

We estimate the effect of these treatments on three educational outcomes: matriculation status in high school (an indicator of whether an individual passed all of the high school matriculation exams), number of years of schooling, and an indicator of successful completion of some type of post secondary schooling (not necessarily an undergraduate degree). These results are presented in Table 8. We first focus on the top part of the table, which shows the effect of the different treatment indicators from separate regressions. The results indicate that a better early childhood

environment had a positive and significant effect on the educational attainment for females but not for males. The signs and the size of the coefficients for all of the alternative measures of the quality of the early environment present a consistent picture. The estimated coefficients in the "full controls" specification are almost always somewhat lower than the coefficients in the specification with only limited controls. However, the change in the coefficient is typically small (on the order of 10-15%), confirming that the various treatment measures are reasonably balanced in terms of the observable background characteristics of the immigrants. This pattern tends to hold throughout the analysis, so we focus our discussion on the results with the full set of control variables. We should also mention that finding differential effects for males and females reinforces the notion that the effects reported can be interpreted as causal. There would be no reason to observe a different effect of the environment on males and females if it was all due to endogenous sorting, especially given the fact that we did not observe meaningful gender differences in the balancing tests (if anything, they pointed to more sorting for males than for females).

According to Table 8, growing up in a house with running water, WC, or electricity increases the probability that a female obtains a matriculation diploma by between 5.7 and 8.6 percentage points. The estimated effect of having all three is 8.8 percentage points, which implies a 30 percent increase in the matriculation rate relative to the 26.7 percent matriculation rate observed among females. The estimated effect of growing up in an urban childhood environment is similar: an increase of 6.3 percentage points. On the other hand, living in an ethnic enclave lowers the high school matriculation rate by 4.1 percentage points.

The early environment also affects females' total years of schooling and the probability of obtaining a post-secondary degree. For example, having all three conditions increases years of schooling by 0.6 years relative to the observed mean of 11.4 years, and the probability of obtaining a post secondary degree increases by 6.2 percentage points relative to the overall rate of 22.2 percent. The latter effect is particularly large in magnitude. The effects of living in an urban environment and in an ethnic enclave are smaller and not always statistically significant.

The three summary measures of the environment are highly correlated, so the similarity in the results is not surprising. In the bottom part of the table, we report the results when all three variables are entered simultaneously. Interestingly, we now find that most of the effect comes from the living conditions variable. This is consistent with the findings in the development literature that health conditions can have large effects on children's educational outcomes. On the

other hand, the findings also suggest that urban environments and ethnic enclaves do not have any beneficial or detrimental effects *per se*, once living conditions are controlled for.

Relative to the large estimated effects for females, we find no effect at all for males. For example, the estimate for "all conditions" on having a high school matriculation diploma is 0.013 (s.e. 0.032) versus 0.088 (s.e 0.028) for women. The estimated effects of the early conditions on total years of schooling and post-secondary degree for men are even negative (though not significant) in comparison to the positive and large estimated effects for women. This is a striking contrast, and is a pattern which tends to repeat itself throughout the rest of the paper. It is worth noting that a similar pattern was found by Kling, Liebman, and Katz (2007), who found that being in a safer neighborhood, had beneficial effects on education, risky behavior, and health for girls, but not for boys.

B. The Effect on Marriage and Fertility Outcomes

We consider three marriage and fertility related outcomes: age at first marriage, currently being divorced, and total number of children. The mean age of marriage is 22.5 for women and 25.1 for men. Almost 7 percent of women in the sample are divorced versus 5.7 percent among men. The mean number of children among women and men in the sample is almost identical, four children per family.

Table 9 presents the estimated effects for men and women separately on these three outcomes. Again, significant effects are found for women and no effect is found for men. For women, a better childhood environment tends to raise the age at first marriage and the divorce rate, but lowers their fertility. These effects are seen in particular for the living conditions indicator; the coefficient on whether the place was built for Yemenites has the expected sign, but is significant only for the fertility outcome, while growing up in a city has no effect on any of the outcomes. The effects are substantial in magnitude: the estimates for the "all conditions" measure indicates that a good early childhood environment increases women's age of marriage by two-thirds of a year, raises the divorce rate by almost 5 percentage points, and lowers the number of children by about one fifth. When all three indicators are included together, we find that most of the effect on age at first marriage and on divorce is coming through the living conditions variable, but it is the ethnic enclave indicator that drives the variation in fertility.

For men, we find mostly insignificant results for the living conditions and the ethnic enclave indicators, but growing up in an urban environment significantly raises the age at first marriage and lowers fertility. The urban effect remains significant even in the regressions with all

treatments included simultaneously. These results suggest that the larger choice set in urban marriage markets may have enabled Yemenite men to deviate more from the norm of marrying at at a young age and having a large family. We later will see that growing up in a city also lowered the probability of men marrying within the Yemenite community.

C. The Effect on Health Outcomes

Table 10 studies the effects of the early childhood environment on health outcomes. We use three measures of health status: an indicator of whether the individual has health problems (self-assessed); an ordered discrete variable indicating the extent to which these problems limit the ability to carry out daily activities; and an indicator for whether the individual receives disability income support from the National Social Security System, which can be viewed as a more objective measure of health. Forty percent of men and women report that they have health problems. About 56 percent of these men and 63 percent of these women report that these health problems limit in some way their daily activity. Fourteen percent of men and 11 percent of women receive disability income.

Many of the estimates in Table 10 are small and not significantly different from zero, both for men and women, painting a somewhat mixed picture about the relationship between the quality of the early childhood environment and health outcomes later in life. For women, there is evidence that growing in an urban environment had a positive effect on health outcomes, even when holding constant the other indicators of the quality of the environment. The effect is non-negligible: growing up in a city lowers the probability of reporting a health problem by 6.2-8.2 percentage points, and raises the health index by 0.16-0.19 points. On the other hand, neither the summary measure of living conditions, nor any of the individual measures appear to have any effect on health outcomes. For men, the pattern is reversed: poor living conditions lower self-reported health status by 4.8-6.8 percentage points, but living in a city has no effect on health outcomes. Of course, it is possible that poor sanitary conditions early in life had an effect primarily on child mortality, and we only observe a sample of individuals who reached an advanced age.[21]

D. The Effect on Employment Outcomes

[21] Unfortunately, we did not have information on deceased individuals, and we did not feel comfortable asking the respondents about siblings who died as children because of the sensitivity of the subject matter, especially given the controversy surrounding the case of the "missing Yemenite children." See also footnote 8.

We study two employment outcomes that are common to both genders (whether the respondent was employed at the time of the interview in the summer of 2006 and whether the person's main profession during his career was in a white-collar occupation) and one additional outcome specific to each gender: for males, whether the respondent's main occupation was an academic/professional one, which we view as a positive outcome; for females, whether the respondent's main occupation was a care-giver, which we view as a negative outcome. The results are presented in Table 11.

For women, we find evidence that growing up in a good environment had a positive effect on employment outcomes, even though the results are not always uniform. For example, we find that current employment is affected only by childhood living conditions (living in a household with all conditions raises the employment rate by 6.8 – 7.5 percentage points), while the quality of employment is affected mostly by the "city" variable, which raises the probability of working in a white-collar occupation by 6.6 – 8.3 percentage points. There is some evidence that growing up in a city or outside of a Yemenite enclave lowers the probability of working as a care-giver, but when all three treatments are include together, the two treatments are indistinguishable from each other.

For men, the results are mixed: there appears to be a zero or even negative effect of having better childhood conditions on current employment, while a positive effect is found on the quality of employment – having all three amenities raises the probability of having a white-collar job by roughly 6 percentage points, and growing up in a city raises the probability of an academic job by about 4 percentage points, though this effect is no longer statistically significant when all the treatments are included simultaneously.

Altogether, the effect of the early childhood environment on employment outcomes is not as sharply estimated as the effect on other outcomes. This is not entirely surprising given that we are examining a very long-term outcome, and many mediating factors could have intervened to weaken the impact of living conditions during childhood. The fact that we do find some residual effect, which is in fact not negligible in magnitude, is quite notable.

E. The Effect on Political Attitudes, Religiosity, and Social Assimilation

Table 12 analyzes the effect of the early childhood environment on political and religious attitudes, and on three measures of social assimilation. The first column in the table shows that the early childhood environment has no effect on the political attitudes of either men or women. The second column, on the other hand, shows that good living conditions and living outside of a

Yemenite enclave strongly reduce the probability of being religious for women.[22] The two effects are statistically significant even when the variables are entered simultaneously. For men, the probability of being religious is negatively affected by childhood living conditions, but positively affected by living in a city.

We next use three indicators of the extent of social integration into Israeli society. The first is an indicator for being married to a spouse of Yemenite origin (i.e., a spouse either born in Yemen or whose father was born in Yemen). Seventy-one percent of the men and 73 percent of the women married within their group. This probability increases substantially for both men and women if they grew up in a Yemenite enclave, but the effect for women is larger by about 60 percent. Interestingly, growing up in a city reduced the probability of marrying within the Yemenite community for men, but had no effect on women. These results suggest that women were less likely to take advantage of the increased matching opportunities available in cities, and were more likely to be shielded by their families. It appears that growing up in an immigrant enclave slows down the process of assimilation into society at large.

Finally, Table 12 shows that the early childhood environment affected the individual's tastes in food and music. In particular, both men and women who grew up in an immigrant enclave were more likely to develop a loyalty to Yemenite cultural tastes, and less likely to develop worldly tastes in music and food. These results join the growing literature on the importance of culture in shaping economic outcomes (Guiso, Sapienza and Zingales, 2006; Bisin and Verdier, 2000, 2004; Fernández, Fogli and Olivetti, 2004; Fernández and Fogli, 2005; Alesina and Giuliano, 2008), and contribute to the understanding of the dynamics of cultural assimilation. They are consistent with the theoretical predictions and the empirical findings of Lazear (1999), who documents that immigrant cultural assimilation (as measured by language proficiency) is inversely related to the relative size of the immigrant community.[23] Our results show that this prediction extends also to other dimensions of cultural assimilation, as well as to the generation who migrated at a very young age, and has therefore strong language proficiency. Importantly, our results show that the transmission of cultural traits and preferences across generations is not fixed and immutable, but is also mediated by the outside environment.

[22] The model is estimated using an ordered probit given that the dependent variable is ordered and discrete. Hence, the coefficients represent the effect of the childhood environment on the latent index.

[23] Similarly, Fernández and Fogli (2005) find that the effect of cultural proxies on the work and fertility behavior of second-generation immigrant women is amplified the greater the tendency of immigrant groups to cluster in ethnic neighborhoods.

F. The Effect on Human Capital of the Second Generation

In this section, we assess whether the childhood environment affects not just the individual's outcomes, but also the outcomes of the next generation. We focus on the human capital of the first three children because other children are most likely too young to complete their schooling at the time of the survey. Also, we want to compare the outcomes of children across families, and therefore, not controlling for family size may confound the estimated treatment effect on human capital with the treatment effect on family size.

In the survey, we asked each respondent for the education levels of their first three children over the age of 18. Specifically, we know whether each child has a matriculation diploma, and then we average this measure over all three children. Similarly, we compute the average of the variable for whether each child over the age of 25 obtained a B.A. degree. For these two outcomes, we estimate reduced form equations focusing on the three summary measures of the early childhood environment. We consider these "reduced form" in the sense that we do not estimate the distinct channels through which there might be an effect – such as through observed effects on the parents (perhaps their level human capital) or unobserved channels (through the quality of the spouse if there is assortative matching based on different childhood conditions).

The left-hand side of the Table 13 presents the effect of the childhood environment on the matriculation rate of the second-generation immigrants, while the right-hand panel presents the results regarding college completion. In each panel, we present the effects for all children and for male and female children separately. Specifically, the dependent variable is the proportion of relevant children (i.e., the proportion of male children, female children, or all children, depending on the specification) with a high school matriculation degree or a B.A. degree. In addition, we present the results for the entire sample of respondents (in the top part of the table), and for female and male respondents separately (bottom part of the table). This distinction is important because we have no information about the childhood conditions of the respondent's spouse, and it is natural to think that fathers and mothers may affect their male and female children differently.

In the full sample, the estimated effect of the childhood environment is generally positive: good living conditions of the parents lead to a 3.1 – 3.3 percentage point higher matriculation rate and a 3.3 – 3.4 percentage point higher B.A. completion rate among the children. This effect is mostly concentrated among male children, and it appears that the transmission mechanism is gender-specific, at least as far as the matriculation rate is concerned: fathers growing up with

good living conditions lead to a 7.2 – 8.8 percentage higher matriculation rate among sons. There is also some evidence that growing up in a city leads to positive educational outcomes for the second generation. This effect appears to be concentrated among women, and is also gender specific. Mothers growing up in urban environments had daughters with matriculation rates that are 3.3 – 4.6 percentage points higher. Somewhat surprisingly, we find that growing up in a Yemenite enclave led to higher matriculation rates for children, with the effect being mostly concentrated among the daughters of female respondents.

VII. Conclusion

This paper exploits a unique situation where 50,000 Yemenites were airlifted to Israel in 1949 over the course of a few months. The Yemenites lacked any formal schooling, and literally arrived to Israel without any money or belongings. Being completely unfamiliar with the environment they suddenly found themselves in, the Yemenites essentially followed the instructions of governmental authorities who scattered them across the country for strategic reasons.

As a result, this operation presents a rare opportunity to estimate the effect of the childhood environment on a large array of social and economic outcomes. Our focus on long-term outcomes lasting almost 60 years, including the educational attainment of the next generation, is a key distinguishing feature of the paper.

Our analysis indicates that children who were placed in a good environment (lived in homes with good living conditions, in an urban area, and outside of an immigrant enclave) were more likely to obtain higher education, marry at an older age, have fewer children, and be more assimilated into Israeli society. There is also evidence that the early childhood environment affected health and employment outcomes, but the results are not as sharp. We also find an effect on the next generation – children who lived in a better environment grew up to have children who had higher educational attainment. Most of these effects are much more pronounced for girls than boys.

Our finding that the environment has a stronger effect on girls versus boys highlights the need to perform a separate analysis for each gender. Grouping them together is likely to produce much more modest effects. Also, the pattern of our findings is similar to Kling, Liebman, and Katz (2007), who show that being in a safer neighborhood had beneficial effects on education, risky behavior, and health for girls, but not for boys. Understanding why the environment seems

to affect girls more than boys, and what aspects of the environment are responsible for this pattern, is an important topic for future research.

Finally, in addition to shedding light on the long-run impact of the childhood environment, our results have implications for immigration and welfare policies. All industrialized countries have seen a sharp increase in immigration rates from the developing world in the past two decades. Some of these immigration waves have gaps between the immigrants and natives similar in magnitude to those between the Yemenites and native Israelis in the 1950's. Our results suggest that encouraging lower income families and immigrants to locate into better neighborhoods could have long-lasting effects, even on the next generation.

References

Alaska Air Website. http://www.alaskaair.com/as/www2/company/History/MagicCarpet.asp.

Ammermueller, Andreas, and Pischke, Jörn-Steffen. "Peer Effects in European Primary Schools: Evidence from PIRLS." Centre for the Economics of Education, Discussion Paper No. 65, May 2006.

Angrist, Joshua D. and Lang, Kevin. "Does School Integration Generate Peer Effects? Evidence from Boston's Metco Program," *American Economic Review*, 94(5), December 2004, 1613-1634.

Barer, Shlomo. *The Magic Carpet*, Harper & Brothers, New York, 1952.

Betts, Julian R. and Zau, Andrew. "Peer Groups and Academic Achievement: Panel Evidence from Adminsitrative Data." Mimeo., UC San Diego, 2004.

Bisin, Alberto and Verdier, Thierry. "'Beyond the Melting Pot': Cultural Transmission, Marriage, and the Evolution of Ethnic and Religious Traits." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 115(3), August 2000, 955-88.

Bisin, Alberto; Topa, Giorgio and Verdier, Thierry. "Religious Intermarriage and Socialization in the United States." *Journal of Political Economy*, 112(3), June 2004, 615-64.

Bleakley, Hoyt. "Disease and Development: Evidence from Hookworm Eradication in the American South." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, February 2007.

Boozer, Michael A. and Stephen E. Cacciola. "Inside the 'Black Box' of Project STAR: Estimation of Peer Effects Using Experimental Data." Economic Growth Center Discussion Paper 832, Yale University, June 2001.

Currie, Janet. "Early Childhood Education Programs." *Journal of Economic Perspectives,* XV (2001), 213-238.

Currie, Janet and Duncan Thomas, "Early Test Scores, School Quality and SES: Longrun Effects on Wage and Employment Outcomes," *Research in Labor Economics,* XX (2001), 103-132.

Edin, Per-Anders, Peter Fredriksson, and Olof Åslund, "Ethnic Enclaves and the Economic Success of Immigrants – Evidence from a Natural Experiment," *Quarterly Journal of Economics,* CXVIII (2003), 329-357.

Fernández, Raquel and Fogli, Alessandra. "Culture: An Empirical Investigation of Beliefs, Work and Fertlity." NBER Working Paper 11268, 2005.

Fernández, Raquel; Fogli, Alessandra and Olivetti, Claudia. "Mothers and Sons: Preference Formation and Female Labor Force Participation." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 119(4) November 2004, 1249-99.

Garces, Eliana, Duncan Thomas, and Janet Currie, "Longer Term Effects of Head Start," *American Economic Review,* XCII (2002), 999-1012.

Glaeser, Edward L. and David C. Maré. "Cities and Skills," *Journal of Labor Economics*, April 2001.

Goering, J.M. and J. D. Feins (eds.), *Choosing a Better Life: Evaluating the Moving to Opportunity Social Experiment*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press, 2003.

Gould, Eric D. "Cities, Workers, and Wages: A Structural Analysis of the Urban Wage Premium." *Review of Economic Studies*, 74, April 2007, 477–506.

Gould, Eric D.; Lavy Victor and Paserman, M. Daniele. "Immigrating to Opportunity: Estimating the Effects of School Quality Using a Natural Experiment on Ethiopians in Israel." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, May 2004a.

Gould, Eric D.; Lavy Victor and Paserman, M. Daniele. "Does Immigration Affect the Long-Term Educational Outcomes of Natives? Quasi-Experimental Evidence." NBER Working Paper 10844, October 2004b.

Goux, Dominique and Maurin, Eric. "Close Neighbours Matter: Neighbourhood Effects on Early Performance at School," *Economic Journal*, 117 (523), October 2007, 1193-1215.

Guiso, Luigi; Sapienza, Paola and Zingales, Luigi. "Does Culture Affect Economic Outcomes?" *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 20(2), Spring 2006, 23-48.

Guryan, Jonathan, "Desegregation and Black Dropout Rates," *American Economic Review*, 94(4), September 2004, 919-943.

Hanushek, Eric; John F. Kain; Jacob M. Markman and Steven G. Rivkin. "Does Peer Ability Affect Student Achievement?" *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 18(5), September/October 2003, pages 527-544.

Hanushek, Eric, John F. Kain, and Steven G. Rivkin, "New Evidence About Brown V. Board of Education: The Complex Effects of School Racial Composition on Achievement," NBER Working Paper No. 8741, 2002.

Heckman, James J, "Policies to Foster Human Capital," *Research in Economics*, LIV (2000), 3-56.

Hoxby, Caroline M. "Peer Effects in the Classroom: Learning from Gender and Race Variation." NBER Working Paper No. 7867, August 2000.

Imbens, Guido. "Estimation of Average Treatment Effects under Unconfoundedness." *What's New in Econometrics Minicourse*, Lecture 1, NBER, Summer 2007. *http://nber15.nber.org/~confer/2007/si2007/WNE/lect_1_match_fig.pdf*

Jacob, Brian A. "Public Housing, Housing Vouchers and Student Achievement: Evidence from Public Housing Demolitions in Chicago," *American Economic Review* 94(1), March 2004, 233-258.

Katz, Lawrence F., Jeffrey R. Kling, and Jeffrey B. Liebman, "Moving to Opportunity in Boston: Early Results from a Randomized Mobility Experiment," *Quarterly Journal of Economics* CXVI (2001), 607-654.

Kling, Jeffrey R., Jeffrey B. Liebman, and Lawrence F.Katz, "Experimental Analysis of Neighborhood Effects," *Econometrica*, Vol. 75, No. 1 (January, 2007), 83–119.

Kling, Jeffrey R., J. Ludwig, and Lawrence F. Katz, "Neighborhood Effects on Crime for Female and Male Youth: Evidence from a Randomized Housing Voucher Experiment," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 120 (1), 2005, 87–130.

Miguel, Edward and Michael Kremer. "Worms: Identifying Impacts on Education and Health in the Presence of Treatment Externalities," *Econometrica,* 72(1), January 2004.

Krueger, Alan B. and Diane M. Whitmore, "The Effect of Attending a Small Class in the Early Grades on College-Test Taking and Middle School Test Results: Evidence from Project STAR," *Economic Journal,* CXI (2001), 1-28.

Lazear, Edward. "Culture and language." *Journal of Political Economy*, 107(6) Part 2, December 1999, S95-126.

Lefgren, Lars. "Educational Peer Effects and the Chicago Public Schools." *Journal of Urban Economics*, 56(2), September 2004, pages 169-191.

Ludwig, Jens, G. J. Duncan, and P. Hirschfield, "Urban Poverty and Juvenile Crime: Evidence from a Randomized Housing-Mobility Experiment," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 116, (2001), 655–679.

Oreopoulos, Philip, "The Long-Run Consequences of Living in a Poor Neighborhood," *Quarterly Journal of Economics,* CXVIII (2003), 1533-1575.

Sacerdote, Bruce, "Peer Effects with Random Assignment: Results for Dartmouth Roommates," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, CXVI (2001), 681-704.

Sanbonmatsu, L. J. R. Kling, G. J. Duncan, and J. Brooks-Gunn (2006): "Neighborhoods and Academic Achievement: Results from the MTO Experiment," *Journal of Human Resources*, forthcoming.

Vigdor, Jacob and Nechyba, Thomas. “Peer Effects in Elementary School: Learning from ‘Apparent’ Random Assignment.” Mimeo., Duke University, October 2004.

Weinberg, Bruce A., Patricia B. Reagan, and Jeffrey J. Yankow, "Do Neighborhoods Affect Hours Worked: Evidence from Longitudinal Data," *Journal of Labor Economics*, 2004, 22 (4), 891-924.

Zameret, Zvi. “The Integration of Yemenites into Israeli Schools,” *Israel Studies* 6 (3), Fall 2001, 1-25.

Zimmerman, David J., “Peer Effects in Academic Outcomes: Evidence from a Natural Experiment,” *Review of Economics and Statistics*, LXXXV (2003), 9-23.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of Family and Personal Characteristics

	Full Sample	Female	Male
Measure	Mean	Mean	Mean
Family Background			
Head of household's occupation: merchant	0.246 (2720)	0.259 (1336)	0.233 (1384)
Head of household's occupation: craftsman	0.578 (2720)	0.585 (1336)	0.572 (1384)
Location in Yemen: major city	0.435 (2339)	0.456 (1135)	0.416 (1204)
Family has relatives living in Israel	0.401 (2656)	0.384 (1316)	0.419 (1340)
Head of household is female	0.021 (2897)	0.021 (2897)	0.011 (1440)
Family Wealth Status in Yemen			
Rich	0.310 (2785)	0.310 (2785)	0.309 (1390)
Poor	0.166 (2785)	0.166 (2785)	0.172 (1390)
Owned farm	0.386 (2424)	0.386 (2424)	0.408 (1238)
Owned animals	0.696 (2565)	0.696 (2565)	0.721 (1320)
Employed workers	0.250 (2615)	0.250 (2615)	0.256 (1311)
Family Social Status in Yemen			
Head of household is religious leader	0.288 (2795)	0.288 (2795)	0.277 (1406)
Head of household is community leader	0.255 (2745)	0.255 (2745)	0.251 (1389)

Notes: Numbers of observations are presented in parentheses. Sample size varies by indicators, reflecting differences in number of missing values. All variables are indicators that assume a 1 or 0 value.

Table 2: Correlation Between Family Background Variables in Yemen (regression estimates)

Measure	Rich	Poor	Sample Size
Family Background			
Head of household's occupation: merchant	0.139* (0.021)	-0.074* (0.016)	2617
Head of household's occupation: craftsman	-0.137* (0.018)	0.026 (0.014)	2617
Location in Yemen: major city	0.062* (0.020)	-0.005 (0.015)	2273
Family has relatives living in Israel	0.123* (0.019)	-0.053* (0.015)	2555
Head of household is female	-0.093 (0.061)	0.126* (0.049)	2762
Family Wealth Indicators in Yemen			
Owned farm	0.243* (0.019)	-0.166* (0.016)	2349
Owned animals	0.123* (0.020)	-0.115* (0.016)	2482
Employed workers	0.444* (0.019)	-0.194* (0.017)	2523
Family Social Status in Yemen			
Head of household is religious leader	0.116* (0.020)	-0.042* (0.016)	2680
Head of household is community leader	0.216* (0.020)	-0.102* (0.016)	2639

Notes: Each coefficient comes from a separate regression whereby the variable indicated in at the top of the column is regressed on the variable in each row. Sample size varies by indicators, reflecting differences in number of missing values. All variables are indicators that assume a 1 or 0 value.

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics of the First Three Locations Upon Arriving to Israel - All Sample

Measure	First Placement	Second Placement	Third Placement
	Percentage of Sample	Percentage of Sample	Percentage of Sample
Location			
Atlit (immigrant camp)	13.66		
	(2892)		
Rosh Haayin (immigrant camp)	22.27	8.72	3.77
	(2892)	(2683)	(1539)
Ein Shemer (immigrant camp)	46.02		
	(2892)		
Beit Lid (immigrant camp)	4.05		
	(2892)		
Other	14.00		
	(2892)		
Type of Settlement (Self Defined)			
Immigrant camp (or *ma'abara*)	95.00	42.15	17.98
	(2740)	(2607)	(1513)
Agricultural community (*moshav* or *kibbutz*)	2.15	28.19	33.64
	(2740)	(2607)	(1513)
City	0.88	12.24	30.87
	(2740)	(2607)	(1513)
Other	1.97	17.42	17.52
	(2740)	(2607)	(1513)
Other Location Characteristics			
Government chose the location	98.12	79.79	39.48
	(2767)	(2429)	(1454)
Place was built for Yemenites	84.51	51.37	27.58
	(2330)	(2488)	(1494)
Never left the placement	8.11	43.01	63.20
	(2898)	(2674)	(1538)
Location was childhood place	12.46	52.27	35.27
	(2858)	(2858)	(2858)
Location Region			
North region	65.02	28.01	18.93
	(2867)	(2635)	(1516)
Center and Tel Aviv region	31.50	41.37	59.70
	(2867)	(2635)	(1516)
Jerusalem region	2.55	16.85	11.61
	(2867)	(2635)	(1516)
South region	0.94	13.78	9.76
	(2867)	(2635)	(1516)

Notes: Numbers of observations are presented in parentheses. Sample size varies by indicators, reflecting differences in number of missing values.

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics of Various Measures of the Early Childhood Environment

	Full Sample	Female	Male
Measure	Mean	Mean	Mean
All conditions	**0.220**	**0.241**	**0.198**
	(2809)	**(1410)**	**(1399)**
Water	0.477	0.515	0.439
	(2744)	(1362)	(1382)
WC	0.285	0.308	0.261
	(2799)	(1404)	(1395)
Electricity	0.311	0.342	0.280
	(2764)	(1377)	(1387)
City	**0.203**	**0.213**	**0.194**
	(2870)	**(1434)**	**(1436)**
Place was built for Yemenites	**0.444**	**0.443**	**0.445**
	(2794)	**(1379)**	**(1415)**

Notes: Number of observations are presented in parentheses. Standard deviations are presented in brackets. The variable "All conditions" is a dummy variable equal to 1 if the respondent lived in a home with running water, WC and electricity during the childhood period.

Table 5: Correlation Coefficients between Measures of Early Childhood Environment

	Water	WC	Electricity	**All conditions**	**City**	**Place was built for Yemenites**
Water	1.000	0.638	0.675	0.571	0.280	-0.245
WC	0.638	1.000	0.669	0.855	0.377	-0.314
Electricity	0.675	0.669	1.000	0.802	0.287	-0.256
All conditions	0.571	0.855	0.802	**1.000**	**0.336**	**-0.298**
City	0.280	0.377	0.287	**0.336**	**1.000**	**-0.340**
Place was built for yemenites	-0.245	-0.314	-0.256	**-0.298**	**-0.340**	**1.000**

Notes: All correlation coefficients have a p-value lower than 0.001 [except Mosav or moshava 0 which Victor suggested to drop from the table]. The principal component measure is based on the water, WC, electricity and city 1 variables. All conditions measure is a dummy variable for having water, WC and electricity during the childhood period.

Table 6: Descriptive Statistics of Outcomes Variables

	Full Sample	Female	Male
Measure	Mean	Mean	Mean
Education Outcomes			
High school matriculation diploma	0.279 (2882)	0.267 (1458)	0.291 (1424)
Years of Schooling	11.613 (2908)	11.397 (1466)	11.832 (1442)
Post Secondary Diploma	0.215 (2873)	0.222 (1452)	0.208 (1421)
Marriage and Fertility			
Age at First Mariiage	23.838 (2798)	22.537 (1392)	25.126 (1406)
Divorced	0.063 (2922)	0.069 (1471)	0.057 (1451)
Number of Children	4.037 (2866)	4.001 (1429)	4.072 (1437)
Health Outcomes			
Has Health Problems	0.399 (2874)	0.402 (1454)	0.396 (1420)
Receiving Disability Income Support	0.125 (2876)	0.110 (1458)	0.140 (1418)
Employment Outcomes			
Currently Employed	0.635 (2908)	0.583 (1464)	0.687 (1444)
White Collar Job	0.281 (2304)	0.286 (1114)	0.276 (1190)
Care Giver	0.116 (2304)	0.231 (1114)	----------
Academic Job	0.115 (2304)	0.127 (1114)	0.105 (1190)
Attitudes and Assimilation			
Political Affiliations (right=1 left=4)	1.619 (2130)	1.589 (1031)	1.648 (1099)
Religiosity Level (religious=1 secular=5)	2.837 (2910)	2.803 (1469)	2.871 (1441)
Married to Yemenite	0.720 (2911)	0.733 (1464)	0.707 (1447)
Preference for Yemenite foods	0.000 (2269)	-0.141 (1171)	0.150 (1098)
Preference for Yemenite singers	0.000 (2762)	-0.117 (1398)	0.120 (1364)

Notes: Numbers of observations are presented in parentheses. Sample size varies by indicators, reflecting differences in number of missing values.

Table 6: Descriptive Statistics of Outcomes Variables (Contd.)

Measure	Full Sample	Female	Male
	Mean	Mean	Mean
Children's Outcomes			
Children's Bagrut Average (Male+Female)	0.779 (2765)	0.788 (1373)	0.770 (1392)
Male Children's Bagrut Average	0.712 (2323)	0.730 (1165)	0.695 (1158)
Female Children's Bagrut Average	0.843 (2323)	0.846 (1154)	0.840 (1169)
Children's B.A. Average (Male+Female)	0.450 (2639)	0.455 (1315)	0.446 (1324)
Male Children's B.A. Average	0.387 (2111)	0.407 (1084)	0.366 (1027)
Female Children's B.A. Average	0.519 (2092)	0.517 (1063)	0.522 (1029)

Notes: Numbers of observations are presented in parentheses. Sample size varies by indicators, reflecting differences in number of missing values.

Table 7A: Balancing Test of Family and Personal Characteristics with Respect to the Treatment Variables, All Sample

	Mean	Water	WC	Electricity	All Conditions	City	Place Was Built for Yemenites
Family Background							
Head of household's occupation: merchant	0.246	0.045*	0.077*	0.073*	0.090*	0.126*	-0.033*
		(0.017)	(0.019)	(0.018)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.017)
		0.105	*0.175*	*0.168*	*0.204*	*0.283*	*-0.076*
Head of household's occupation: craftsman	0.578	-0.034*	-0.045*	-0.073*	-0.074*	-0.108*	0.024
		(0.020)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.023)	(0.024)	(0.019)
		-0.069	*-0.090*	*-0.148*	*-0.149*	*-0.218*	*0.048*
Location in Yemen: major city	0.435	0.109*	0.191*	0.137*	0.202*	0.224*	-0.097*
		(0.021)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.021)
		0.221	*0.389*	*0.278*	*0.413*	*0.460*	*-0.197*
Family has relatives living in Israel	0.401	0.015	0.056*	0.046*	0.073*	0.077*	-0.072*
		(0.020)	(0.022)	(0.021)	(0.023)	(0.024)	(0.020)
		0.031	*0.113*	*0.093*	*0.149*	*0.157*	*-0.146*
Head of household is female	0.021	0.000	0.000	-0.001	-0.003	-0.009	0.000
		(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.005)
		0.003	*-0.001*	*-0.005*	*-0.021*	*-0.069*	*0.001*
Family Wealth Status in Yemen							
Rich	0.310	-0.018	0.027	-0.006	0.048*	0.010	-0.007
		(0.018)	(0.020)	(0.019)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.018)
		-0.038	*0.058*	*-0.014*	*0.103*	*0.022*	*-0.015*
Poor	0.166	0.011	-0.026*	0.010	-0.027	-0.010	0.005
		(0.015)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.017)	(0.018)	(0.014)
		0.029	*-0.072*	*0.026*	*-0.074*	*-0.026*	*0.013*
Owned farm	0.386	-0.078*	-0.120*	-0.093*	-0.117*	-0.103*	0.074*
		(0.020)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.020)
		-0.160	*-0.252*	*-0.194*	*-0.246*	*-0.216*	*0.151*
Owned animals	0.696	-0.083*	-0.136*	-0.124*	-0.164*	-0.155*	0.083*
		(0.019)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.022)	(0.023)	(0.019)
		-0.180	*-0.292*	*-0.266*	*-0.348*	*-0.330*	*0.182*
Employed workers	0.250	0.026	0.034*	0.026	0.045*	0.026	-0.029*
		(0.018)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.017)
		0.060	*0.078*	*0.058*	*0.101*	*0.059*	*-0.067*
Family Social Status in Yemen							
Head of household is religious leader	0.288	-0.039*	-0.047*	-0.043*	-0.049*	-0.061*	0.019
		(0.018)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.018)
		-0.087	*-0.105*	*-0.097*	*-0.109*	*-0.138*	*0.041*
Head of household is community leader	0.255	-0.029*	-0.044*	-0.048*	-0.046*	-0.069*	0.029*
		(0.017)	(0.019)	(0.018)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.017)
		-0.068	*-0.102*	*-0.111*	*-0.108*	*-0.162*	*0.066*

Notes: Standard errors are presented in parentheses. An asterisk denotes significance at 10%. The principal component measure is based on the water, WC, electricity and city 1 variables. All conditions measure is a dummy variable for having water, WC and electricity during the childhood period. Numbers in italics are the ratio of the mean difference by treatment status divided by the mean of the standard deviation of the characteristic. In order to calculate the ratio for the principal component measure, a dummy was created denotiong 0 for all values below zero and 1 for all values above zero.

Table 7B: Balancing Test of Family and Personal Characteristics with Respect to the Treatment Variables, Female

	Mean	Water	WC	Electricity	All Conditions	City	Place Was Built for Yemenites
Family Background							
Head of household's occupation: merchant	0.259	0.065*	0.093*	0.094*	0.103*	0.127*	-0.064*
		(0.025)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.028)	(0.029)	(0.025)
		0.150	*0.209*	*0.212*	*0.231*	*0.282*	*-0.147*
Head of household's occupation: craftsman	0.585	-0.056*	-0.062*	-0.091*	-0.094*	-0.102*	0.048*
		(0.028)	(0.030)	(0.029)	(0.032)	(0.033)	(0.028)
		-0.113	*-0.125*	*-0.185*	*-0.189*	*-0.206*	*0.098*
Location in Yemen: major city	0.456	0.101*	0.179*	0.113*	0.186*	0.176*	-0.077*
		(0.030)	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.035)	(0.036)	(0.030)
		0.203	*0.364*	*0.228*	*0.378*	*0.358*	*-0.154*
Family has relatives living in Israel	0.384	0.019	0.077*	0.048	0.092*	0.074*	-0.077*
		(0.028)	(0.030)	(0.029)	(0.032)	(0.033)	(0.028)
		0.040	*0.158*	*0.098*	*0.187*	*0.152*	*-0.159*
Head of household is female	0.032	0.001	-0.002	-0.009	-0.011	-0.015	0.004
		(0.009)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.009)
		0.006	*-0.010*	*-0.053*	*-0.067*	*-0.095*	*0.022*
Family Wealth Status in Yemen							
Rich	0.311	0.001	0.056*	0.002	0.074*	0.010	-0.006
		(0.026)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.026)
		0.002	*0.120*	*0.003*	*0.157*	*0.021*	*-0.012*
Poor	0.160	0.010	-0.044*	0.005	-0.038	-0.008	0.028
		(0.020)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.023)	(0.024)	(0.020)
		0.029	*-0.124*	*0.013*	*-0.107*	*-0.021*	*0.077*
Owned farm	0.363	-0.067*	-0.124*	-0.089*	-0.101*	-0.050	0.074*
		(0.029)	(0.031)	(0.030)	(0.033)	(0.034)	(0.029)
		-0.139	*-0.264*	*-0.187*	*-0.215*	*-0.104*	*0.155*
Owned animals	0.670	-0.076*	-0.106*	-0.109*	-0.120*	-0.139*	0.076*
		(0.027)	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.031)	(0.033)	(0.028)
		-0.164	*-0.224*	*-0.231*	*-0.251*	*-0.292*	*0.162*
Employed workers	0.245	0.038	0.037	0.031	0.056*	0.017	-0.032
		(0.025)	(0.027)	(0.026)	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.025)
		0.087	*0.084*	*0.072*	*0.127*	*0.038*	*-0.074*
Family Social Status in Yemen							
Head of household is religious leader	0.298	-0.038	-0.060*	-0.042	-0.060*	-0.039	0.020
		(0.025)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.029)	(0.030)	(0.026)
		-0.084	*-0.132*	*-0.092*	*-0.134*	*-0.087*	*0.043*
Head of household is community leader	0.260	-0.057*	-0.051*	-0.063*	-0.047	-0.081*	0.033
		(0.025)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.028)	(0.029)	(0.025)
		-0.131	*-0.118*	*-0.145*	*-0.108*	*-0.191*	*0.075*

Notes: Standard errors are presented in parentheses. An asterisk denotes significance at 10%. The principal component measure is based on the water, WC, electricity and city 1 variables. All conditions measure is a dummy variable for having water, WC and electricity during the childhood period. Numbers in italics are the ratio of the mean difference by treatment status divided by the mean of the standard deviation of the characteristic. In order to calculate the ratio for the principal component measure, a dummy was created denotiong 0 for all values below zero and 1 for all values above zero.

Table 7C: Balancing Test of Family and Personal Characteristics with Respect to the Treatment Variables, Male

	Mean	Water	WC	Electricity	All Conditions	City	Place Was Built for Yemenites
Family Background							
Head of household's occupation: merchant	0.233	0.023 (0.024) *0.054*	0.057* (0.026) *0.133*	0.049* (0.026) *0.114*	0.073* (0.029) *0.168*	0.122* (0.029) *0.279*	-0.003 (0.023) *-0.007*
Head of household's occupation: craftsman	0.572	-0.017 (0.028) *-0.035*	-0.029 (0.031) *-0.058*	-0.057* (0.030) *-0.116*	-0.055 (0.034) *-0.111*	-0.115* (0.034) *-0.232*	0.001 (0.027) *0.002*
Location in Yemen: major city	0.416	0.114* (0.029) *0.231*	0.199* (0.032) *0.407*	0.158* (0.032) *0.322*	0.216* (0.035) *0.442*	0.269* (0.035) *0.558*	-0.117* (0.029) *-0.240*
Family has relatives living in Israel	0.419	0.016 (0.028) *0.032*	0.037 (0.031) *0.074*	0.049 (0.031) *0.099*	0.057* (0.034) *0.115*	0.082* (0.034) *0.166*	-0.066* (0.027) *-0.134*
Head of household is female	0.011	-0.003 (0.006) *-0.029*	-0.001 (0.007) *-0.007*	0.005 (0.006) *0.048*	0.004 (0.007) *0.033*	-0.004 (0.007) *-0.043*	-0.003 (0.006) *-0.031*
Family Wealth Status in Yemen							
Rich	0.309	-0.037 (0.026) *-0.080*	-0.005 (0.029) *-0.011*	-0.016 (0.028) *-0.034*	0.020 (0.032) *0.042*	0.011 (0.031) *0.023*	-0.008 (0.025) *-0.018*
Poor	0.172	0.013 (0.021) *0.035*	-0.005 (0.024) *-0.012*	0.017 (0.023) *0.046*	-0.013 (0.026) *-0.035*	-0.011 (0.026) *-0.029*	-0.017 (0.021) *-0.046*
Owned farm	0.408	-0.083* (0.029) *-0.170*	-0.112* (0.032) *-0.233*	-0.092* (0.032) *-0.191*	-0.129* (0.035) *-0.269*	-0.154* (0.035) *-0.325*	0.074* (0.028) *0.151*
Owned animals	0.721	-0.083* (0.025) *-0.185*	-0.162* (0.028) *-0.353*	-0.133* (0.028) *-0.290*	-0.207* (0.031) *-0.446*	-0.167* (0.032) *-0.361*	0.089* (0.025) *0.200*
Employed workers	0.256	0.016 (0.025) *0.036*	0.032 (0.028) *0.073*	0.020 (0.028) *0.046*	0.033 (0.031) *0.075*	0.036 (0.031) *0.082*	-0.026 (0.025) *-0.059*
Family Social Status in Yemen							
Head of household is religious leader	0.277	-0.043* (0.025) *-0.096*	-0.036 (0.028) *-0.080*	-0.049* (0.027) *-0.111*	-0.039 (0.030) *-0.087*	-0.085* (0.030) *-0.196*	0.017 (0.024) *0.039*
Head of household is community leader	0.251	-0.004 (0.024) *-0.009*	-0.037 (0.027) *-0.087*	-0.033 (0.027) *-0.077*	-0.047 (0.030) *-0.110*	-0.056* (0.030) *-0.133*	0.026 (0.024) *0.059*

Notes: Standard errors are presented in parentheses. An asterisk denotes significance at 10%. The principal component measure is based on the water, WC, electricity and city 1 variables. All conditions measure is a dummy variable for having water, WC and electricity during the childhood period. Numbers in italics are the ratio of the mean difference by treatment status divided by the mean of the standard deviation of the characteristic. In order to calculate the ratio for the principal component measure, a dummy was created denotiong 0 for all values below zero and 1 for all values above zero.

Table 8: Estimates of the Effects of the Childhood Environment on Education Outcomes

	Female						Male					
	High School Matriculation		Years of Schooling		Post Secondary Diploma		High School Matriculation		Years of Schooling		Post Secondary Diploma	
Treatment Measure	Limited Controls	Full Controls	Limited Controls	Full Controls	Limited Controls	Full Controls	Limited Controls	Full Controls	Limited Controls	Full Controls	Limited Controls	Full Controls
Water	0.066*	0.060*	0.592*	0.492*	0.053*	0.053*	0.038	0.022	0.062	-0.059	0.025	0.016
	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.183)	(0.179)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.191)	(0.191)	(0.023)	(0.023)
WC	0.103*	0.086*	0.889*	0.690*	0.066*	0.063*	0.036	0.014	0.029	-0.159	0.012	0.000
	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.193)	(0.194)	(0.024)	(0.025)	(0.028)	(0.029)	(0.213)	(0.217)	(0.025)	(0.026)
Electricity	0.065*	0.057*	0.542*	0.430*	0.045*	0.048*	0.048*	0.035	0.057	-0.056	0.010	0.001
	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.189)	(0.187)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.211)	(0.213)	(0.025)	(0.025)
All conditions	0.108*	0.088*	0.842*	0.607*	0.069*	0.062*	0.039	0.013	0.096	-0.102	0.001	-0.013
	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.208)	(0.208)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.031)	(0.032)	(0.235)	(0.240)	(0.028)	(0.029)
City	0.069*	0.063*	0.690*	0.563*	0.018	0.021	0.067*	0.047	0.346	0.159	0.050*	0.044
	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.216)	(0.215)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.031)	(0.033)	(0.233)	(0.242)	(0.028)	(0.029)
Place was built for Yemenites	-0.057*	-0.041*	-0.503*	-0.299*	-0.038*	-0.031	-0.055*	-0.045*	0.014	0.122	-0.042*	-0.038*
	(0.024)	(0.025)	(0.180)	(0.180)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.186)	(0.189)	(0.022)	(0.023)
Estimates of the regression in which the All conditions, City 1 and Place was built for Yemenites treatments are put in together												
All conditions	0.096*	0.079*	0.761*	0.578*	0.081*	0.075*	0.012	-0.005	-0.016	-0.164	-0.025	-0.035
	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.235)	(0.232)	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.033)	(0.034)	(0.252)	(0.253)	(0.030)	(0.030)
City	0.011	0.022	0.414*	0.407*	-0.023	-0.008	0.047	0.031	0.452*	0.287	0.042	0.036
	(0.033)	(0.033)	(0.244)	(0.242)	(0.031)	(0.031)	(0.035)	(0.036)	(0.263)	(0.268)	(0.031)	(0.032)
Place was built for Yemenites	-0.022	-0.012	-0.162	-0.040	-0.018	-0.010	-0.038	-0.035	0.104	0.156	-0.034	-0.032
	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.205)	(0.204)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.203)	(0.205)	(0.024)	(0.024)

Notes: Standard errors are presented in parentheses. An asterisk denotes significance at 10%. The principal component measure is based on the water, WC, electricity and city 1 variables. All conditions measure is a dummy variable for having water, WC and electricity during the childhood period. The limited controls specification includes birth year dummies (1945-1950), immigration year dummies (1949-1951) and a dummy whether the person was re-interviewed. The full controls specification includes in addition first immigration camp dummies and background in Yemen dummies: rich in Yemen, poor in Yemen, head of household (HH) was a merchant, HH was a craftsmen, HH was a builder, HH had an academic profession, HH had a free profession, HH worked in the public sector, HH was a religious leader, HH was a community leader, family owned a farm, family owned animals, family employed workers, family lived in a major city and family had relatives already living in Israel.

Table 9: Estimates of the Effects of the Childhood Environment on Marriage and Fertility Outcomes

	Female						Male					
	Age at First Mariiage		Divorced		Number of Children		Age at First Mariiage		Divorced		Number of Children	
Treatment Measure	Limited Controls	Full Controls	Limited Controls	Full Controls	Limited Controls	Full Controls	Limited Controls	Full Controls	Limited Controls	Full Controls	Limited Controls	Full Controls
Water	0.944*	0.879*	0.020	0.021	-0.321*	-0.293*	0.008	-0.100	-0.010	-0.010	-0.068	-0.057
	(0.277)	(0.283)	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.094)	(0.096)	(0.234)	(0.237)	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.097)	(0.099)
WC	0.919*	0.894*	0.036*	0.039*	-0.293*	-0.261*	0.477*	0.391	0.010	0.008	-0.128	-0.133
	(0.296)	(0.308)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.099)	(0.103)	(0.267)	(0.275)	(0.014)	(0.015)	(0.109)	(0.113)
Electricity	0.585*	0.537*	0.038*	0.039*	-0.294*	-0.267*	0.043	-0.102	0.016	0.013	-0.011	-0.002
	(0.296)	(0.304)	(0.014)	(0.015)	(0.099)	(0.101)	(0.256)	(0.263)	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.108)	(0.111)
All conditions	0.649*	0.641*	0.045*	0.048*	-0.245*	-0.205*	0.152	0.001	0.018	0.015	-0.040	-0.050
	(0.320)	(0.330)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.108)	(0.111)	(0.295)	(0.305)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.120)	(0.125)
City	0.214	0.189	-0.008	-0.009	-0.183	-0.144	0.857*	0.785*	0.029*	0.026	-0.211*	-0.218*
	(0.334)	(0.347)	(0.016)	(0.017)	(0.112)	(0.116)	(0.289)	(0.304)	(0.016)	(0.017)	(0.119)	(0.126)
Place was built for Yemenites	-0.391	-0.338	-0.021	-0.022	0.272*	0.239*	0.012	0.115	-0.017	-0.020	0.112	0.091
	(0.282)	(0.293)	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.094)	(0.098)	(0.231)	(0.238)	(0.012)	(0.013)	(0.094)	(0.098)
Estimates of the regression in which the All conditions, City 1 and Place was built for Yemenites treatments are put in together												
All conditions	0.674*	0.701*	0.054*	0.054*	-0.103	-0.092	-0.100	-0.128	0.007	0.008	0.049	0.023
	(0.364)	(0.372)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.123)	(0.125)	(0.311)	(0.316)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.130)	(0.132)
City	-0.116	-0.116	-0.033*	-0.031	-0.122	-0.129	1.070*	1.022*	0.011	0.007	-0.161	-0.161
	(0.381)	(0.391)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.128)	(0.130)	(0.324)	(0.334)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.135)	(0.140)
Place was built for Yemenites	-0.398	-0.386	-0.015	-0.017	0.237*	0.206*	0.342	0.417*	-0.010	-0.015	0.081	0.061
	(0.319)	(0.327)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.107)	(0.110)	(0.247)	(0.252)	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.104)	(0.106)

Notes: Standard errors are presented in parentheses. An asterisk denotes significance at 10%. The principal component measure is based on the water, WC, electricity and city 1 variables. All conditions measure is a dummy variable for having water, WC and electricity during the childhood period. The limited controls specification includes birth year dummies (1945-1950), immigration year dummies (1949-1951) and a dummy whether the person was re-interviewed. The full controls specification includes in addition first immigration camp dummies and background in Yemen dummies: rich in Yemen, poor in Yemen, head of household (HH) was a merchant, HH was a craftsmen, HH was a builder, HH had an academic profession, HH had a free profession, HH worked in the public sector, HH was a religious leader, HH was a community leader, family owned a farm, family owned animals, family employed workers, family lived in a major city and family had relatives already living in Israel.

Table 10: Estimates of the Effects of the Childhood Environment on Health Outcomes

	Female						Male					
	Has Health Problems		Health Problem Doesn't Disturb Daily Activity		Receiving Disability Income Support		Has Health Problems		Health Problem Doesn't Disturb Daily Activity		Receiving Disability Income Support	
Treatment Measure	Limited Controls	Full Controls	Limited Controls	Full Controls	Limited Controls	Full Controls	Limited Controls	Full Controls	Limited Controls	Full Controls	Limited Controls	Full Controls
Water	-0.007	-0.002	0.055	0.042	-0.012	-0.008	-0.019	-0.007	0.030	0.002	0.010	0.010
	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.065)	(0.067)	(0.017)	(0.018)	(0.027)	(0.028)	(0.066)	(0.067)	(0.019)	(0.019)
WC	0.001	0.020	0.028	-0.027	-0.007	-0.002	-0.046	-0.035	0.083	0.063	0.024	0.025
	(0.029)	(0.030)	(0.069)	(0.072)	(0.018)	(0.019)	(0.030)	(0.031)	(0.074)	(0.077)	(0.021)	(0.022)
Electricity	0.004	0.015	0.034	0.006	-0.001	0.002	-0.058*	-0.045	0.103	0.082	0.003	-0.001
	(0.028)	(0.029)	(0.068)	(0.070)	(0.018)	(0.019)	(0.030)	(0.031)	(0.073)	(0.076)	(0.021)	(0.022)
All conditions	0.004	0.024	0.051	0.001	-0.017	-0.013	-0.062*	-0.048	0.124	0.100	0.021	0.020
	(0.031)	(0.032)	(0.074)	(0.077)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.033)	(0.034)	(0.082)	(0.086)	(0.024)	(0.025)
City	-0.066*	-0.062*	0.175*	0.159*	-0.033	-0.029	-0.043	-0.013	0.081	0.019	-0.027	-0.027
	(0.032)	(0.033)	(0.078)	(0.080)	(0.020)	(0.021)	(0.034)	(0.036)	(0.081)	(0.085)	(0.024)	(0.025)
Place was built for Yemenites	-0.025	-0.032	0.044	0.070	0.015	0.006	0.014	0.005	-0.039	-0.025	-0.005	-0.001
	(0.027)	(0.028)	(0.064)	(0.067)	(0.017)	(0.018)	(0.027)	(0.028)	(0.064)	(0.066)	(0.019)	(0.020)
Estimates of the regression in which the All conditions, City 1 and Place was built for Yemenites treatments are put in together												
All conditions	0.012	0.030	0.055	0.004	-0.007	-0.004	-0.074*	-0.068*	0.154*	0.148	0.020	0.014
	(0.035)	(0.036)	(0.085)	(0.087)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.036)	(0.037)	(0.090)	(0.092)	(0.025)	(0.026)
City	-0.078*	-0.082*	0.181*	0.188*	-0.031	-0.031	-0.010	0.012	0.021	-0.025	-0.036	-0.033
	(0.037)	(0.037)	(0.089)	(0.091)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.037)	(0.039)	(0.092)	(0.096)	(0.026)	(0.028)
Place was built for Yemenites	-0.040	-0.042	0.103	0.114	0.005	-0.001	-0.003	-0.003	-0.008	-0.006	-0.009	-0.006
	(0.031)	(0.031)	(0.074)	(0.076)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.070)	(0.072)	(0.020)	(0.021)

Notes: Standard errors are presented in parentheses. An asterisk denotes significance at 10%. The Principle component measure is based on the water, WC, electricity and city 1 variables. All conditions measure is a dummy variable for having water, WC and electricity during the childhood period. Ordered probit regression is used for the Health Problem Doesn't Disturb Daily Activity variable.The limited controls specification includes birth year dummies (194 1950), immigration year dummies (1949-1951) and a dummy whether the person was re-interviewed. The full controls specification includes in addition first immigration camp dummies and background in Yemen dummies: rich in Yemen, poor in Yemen, head of household (HH) was a merchant, HH was a craftsmen, HH was a builder, HH had an academic profession, HH had a free profession, HH worked in the public sector, HH was a religious leader, HH was a community leader, family owned a farm, family owned animals, family employed workers, family lived in a major city and family had relatives already living in Israel.

Table 11: Estimates of the Effects of the Childhood Environment on Employment Outcomes

	Female						Male					
	Currently Employed		Has a White Collar Job		Care Giver		Currently Employed		Has a White Collar Job		Academic Job	
Treatment Measure	Limited Controls	Full Controls	Limited Controls	Full Controls	Limited Controls	Full Controls	Limited Controls	Full Controls	Limited Controls	Full Controls	Limited Controls	Full Controls
Water	0.053*	0.058*	0.032	0.028	-0.033	-0.034	-0.031	-0.030	0.056*	0.048*	0.029	0.028
	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.029)	(0.028)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.027)	(0.028)	(0.019)	(0.019)
WC	0.046	0.052*	0.033	0.023	-0.028	-0.031	-0.043	-0.045	0.082*	0.067*	0.025	0.019
	(0.028)	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.031)	(0.028)	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.031)	(0.021)	(0.021)
Electricity	0.039	0.047*	0.009	0.008	-0.039	-0.045	-0.016	-0.008	0.031	0.022	0.002	-0.001
	(0.028)	(0.029)	(0.030)	(0.029)	(0.027)	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.029)	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.020)	(0.021)
All conditions	0.063*	0.072*	0.021	0.008	-0.044	-0.047	-0.036	-0.033	0.060*	0.041	0.015	0.007
	(0.031)	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.033)	(0.030)	(0.031)	(0.031)	(0.033)	(0.033)	(0.034)	(0.023)	(0.023)
City	0.035	0.034	0.073*	0.075*	-0.049	-0.063*	-0.055*	-0.060*	0.013	0.003	0.044*	0.042*
	(0.032)	(0.033)	(0.033)	(0.034)	(0.031)	(0.032)	(0.031)	(0.033)	(0.033)	(0.035)	(0.023)	(0.024)
Place was built for Yemenites	0.006	0.009	-0.028	-0.004	0.059*	0.058*	0.005	0.004	-0.006	0.007	-0.018	-0.015
	(0.027)	(0.028)	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.026)	(0.027)	(0.025)	(0.026)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.018)	(0.019)
Estimates of the regression in which the All conditions, City 1 and Place was built for Yemenites treatments are put in together												
All conditions	0.068*	0.075*	0.006	0.002	-0.024	-0.030	-0.011	-0.006	0.060*	0.042	0.001	-0.007
	(0.035)	(0.035)	(0.037)	(0.037)	(0.034)	(0.035)	(0.034)	(0.035)	(0.036)	(0.036)	(0.024)	(0.025)
City	0.030	0.027	0.066*	0.083*	-0.006	-0.026	-0.060*	-0.064*	0.006	0.006	0.043	0.039
	(0.036)	(0.037)	(0.039)	(0.039)	(0.036)	(0.036)	(0.035)	(0.037)	(0.038)	(0.039)	(0.026)	(0.027)
Place was built for Yemenites	0.028	0.033	-0.007	0.019	0.051*	0.042	-0.011	-0.010	-0.003	0.008	-0.009	-0.009
	(0.030)	(0.031)	(0.033)	(0.033)	(0.030)	(0.031)	(0.027)	(0.028)	(0.029)	(0.030)	(0.020)	(0.021)

Notes: Standard errors are presented in parentheses. An asterisk denotes significance at 10%. The Principle component measure is based on the water, WC, electricity and city 1 variables. All conditions measure is a dummy variable for having water, WC and electricity during the childhood period. The limited controls specification includes birth year dummies (1945-1950), immigration year dummies (1949-1951) and a dummy whether the person was re-interviewed. The full controls specification includes in addition first immigration camp dummies and background in Yemen dummies: rich in Yemen, poor in Yemen, head of household (HH) was a merchant, HH was a craftsmen, HH was a builder, HH had an academic profession, HH had a free profession, HH worked in the public sector, HH was a religious leader, HH was a community leader, family owned a farm, family owned animals, family employed workers, family lived in a major city and family had relatives already living in Israel.

Table 12: Estimates of the Effects of the Childhood Environment on Attitudes and Assimilation Outcomes

	Female					Male				
Treatment Measure	Political Affiliations (right=1 left=4)	Religiosity Level (religious=1 secular=5)	Married to Yemenite	Preferences for Yemenite Food	Preferences for Yemenite singers	Political Affiliations (right=1 left=4)	Religiosity Level (religious=1 secular=5)	Married to Yemenite	Preferences for Yemenite Food	Preferences for Yemenite singers
Water	-0.033	0.008	-0.025	-0.112*	-0.053	0.036	0.115*	0.021	-0.123*	-0.003
	(0.078)	(0.059)	(0.024)	0.062	(0.055)	(0.074)	(0.059)	(0.026)	(0.062)	(0.059)
WC	-0.025	0.101	-0.058*	-0.084	-0.117*	0.017	0.177*	0.010	-0.143*	-0.020
	(0.084)	(0.063)	(0.026)	(0.067)	(0.059)	(0.083)	(0.068)	(0.029)	(0.070)	(0.067)
Electricity	-0.074	0.043	-0.014	-0.121*	-0.088	0.037	0.214*	0.041	-0.059	0.038
	(0.083)	(0.062)	(0.026)	(0.065)	(0.057)	(0.081)	(0.066)	(0.029)	(0.069)	(0.065)
All conditions	-0.095	0.129*	-0.030	-0.073	-0.106*	0.012	0.195*	0.010	-0.113	0.000
	(0.089)	(0.068)	(0.028)	(0.072)	(0.063)	(0.092)	(0.075)	(0.032)	(0.077)	(0.074)
City	-0.066	-0.021	-0.041	-0.107	-0.136*	-0.083	-0.052	-0.077*	-0.070	-0.062
	(0.094)	(0.071)	(0.029)	(0.073)	(0.066)	(0.094)	(0.075)	(0.032)	(0.080)	(0.074)
Place was built for Yemenites	-0.039	-0.136*	0.096*	0.146*	0.173*	-0.059	-0.051	0.062*	0.040	0.121*
	(0.080)	(0.060)	(0.024)	(0.063)	(0.055)	(0.073)	(0.059)	(0.025)	(0.063)	(0.058)
Estimates of the regression in which the All conditions, City 1 and Place was built for Yemenites treatments are put in together										
All conditions	-0.101	0.129*	-0.006	-0.026	-0.047	0.034	0.223*	0.039	-0.094	0.044
	(0.100)	(0.077)	(0.031)	(0.080)	(0.071)	(0.098)	(0.080)	(0.034)	(0.082)	(0.079)
City	-0.028	-0.106	-0.005	-0.046	-0.063	-0.113	-0.177*	-0.067*	-0.032	-0.038
	(0.106)	(0.080)	(0.033)	(0.084)	(0.074)	(0.103)	(0.084)	(0.036)	(0.089)	(0.084)
Place was built for Yemenites	-0.057	-0.133*	0.092*	0.123*	0.144*	-0.056	-0.058	0.054*	0.008	0.116*
	(0.090)	(0.067)	(0.027)	(0.071)	(0.062)	(0.079)	(0.064)	(0.027)	(0.068)	(0.063)

Notes: Standard errors are presented in parentheses. An asterisk denotes significance at 10%. The principal component measure is based on the water, WC, electricity and city 1 variables. All conditions measure is a dummy variable for having water, WC and electricity during the childhood period. Ordered probit regressions are used for the Political Affiliations and the Religiosity Level variables. All regressions include the full set of controls (listed in table's 8 notes). Factor loadings for the Principle Component of Tastes for Food Items are: Falafel: 0.223 Melawach: 0.753 Couscous: -0.241 Hummus -0.032 Gefilte fish: -0.591 Shug: 0.190 Cube: -0.476 Jachnun: 0.693 Sushi: -0.44. Factor loadings for the Principle Component of Prefrences for Singers are: Yehoram Gaon: 0.047 Haim Moshe: 0.528 Chava Alberstein: -0.718 Arik Einstein: -0.756 Boaz Sharabi: 0.081 Shimi Tavori: 0.571 Shlomo Artzi: -0.486 Ofra Haza: 0.354 Zohar Argov: 0.643

Table 13: Estimates of the Effects of the Childhood Environment on Children's Education Outcomes

	High School Matriculation						B.A.					
	Children Average		Male Children Average		Female Children Average		Children Average		Male Children Average		Female Children Average	
	separate regression	all in one regression	separate regression	all in one regression	separate regression	all in one regression	separate regression	all in one regression	separate regression	all in one regression	separate regression	all in one regression
Full Sample												
All conditions	0.033*	0.031*	0.056*	0.050*	0.014	0.015	0.034*	0.033	0.045*	0.038	0.019	0.020
	(0.016)	(0.017)	(0.022)	(0.024)	(0.018)	(0.019)	(0.020)	(0.021)	(0.025)	(0.027)	(0.026)	(0.028)
City	0.021	0.021	0.029	0.019	0.017	0.026	0.009	-0.001	0.019	0.000	0.005	0.004
	(0.016)	(0.018)	(0.022)	(0.025)	(0.018)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.022)	(0.025)	(0.028)	(0.026)	(0.029)
Place was built for Yemenites	0.003	0.019	-0.014	0.003	0.024	0.039*	-0.004	0.002	-0.030	-0.024	0.014	0.019
	(0.013)	(0.014)	(0.018)	(0.020)	(0.015)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.018)	(0.020)	(0.022)	(0.021)	(0.024)
Female Sample												
All conditions	0.025	0.027	0.030	0.037	0.030	0.036	0.038	0.035	0.040	0.036	0.025	0.021
	(0.021)	(0.024)	(0.029)	(0.033)	(0.024)	(0.027)	(0.026)	(0.029)	(0.033)	(0.037)	(0.035)	(0.039)
City	0.032	0.044*	0.028	0.030	0.033	0.046*	0.021	0.010	0.010	-0.026	0.031	0.045
	(0.022)	(0.025)	(0.030)	(0.034)	(0.025)	(0.028)	(0.027)	(0.031)	(0.034)	(0.039)	(0.036)	(0.040)
Place was built for Yemenites	0.009	0.036*	0.016	0.040	0.016	0.049*	-0.014	0.000	-0.036	-0.035	0.008	0.030
	(0.018)	(0.021)	(0.026)	(0.029)	(0.021)	(0.024)	(0.023)	(0.026)	(0.029)	(0.032)	(0.030)	(0.034)
Male Sample												
All conditions	0.045*	0.039	0.088*	0.072*	-0.003	-0.007	0.028	0.029	0.038	0.022	0.018	0.026
	(0.024)	(0.025)	(0.033)	(0.035)	(0.027)	(0.029)	(0.030)	(0.032)	(0.038)	(0.040)	(0.039)	(0.042)
City	0.011	-0.001	0.034	0.010	0.000	0.006	0.000	-0.010	0.027	0.016	-0.019	-0.034
	(0.024)	(0.027)	(0.034)	(0.037)	(0.027)	(0.031)	(0.030)	(0.033)	(0.038)	(0.041)	(0.039)	(0.044)
Place was built for Yemenites	-0.002	0.004	-0.041	-0.031	0.028	0.030	0.004	0.003	-0.028	-0.024	0.018	0.012
	(0.019)	(0.020)	(0.026)	(0.028)	(0.021)	(0.023)	(0.024)	(0.025)	(0.029)	(0.031)	(0.031)	(0.034)

Notes: Standard deviations are presented in parenthesis. The limited controls specification includes birth year dummies (1945-1950), immigration year dummies (1949-1951) and a dummy whether the person was re-interviewed. The full controls specification includes in addition first immigration camp dummies and background in Yemen dummies: rich in Yemen, poor in Yemen, head of household (HH) was a merchant, HH was a craftsmen, HH was a builder, HH had an academic profession, HH had a free profession, HH worked in the public sector, HH was a religious leader, HH was a community leader, family owned a farm, family owned animals, family employed workers, family lived in a major city and family had relatives already living in Israel.