

March 2004

**SCHOOLING FOR NEWCOMERS: VARIATION IN EDUCATIONAL PERSISTENCE IN
THE UNITED STATES IN 1920***

Stewart E. Tolnay
Department of Sociology
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98195-3340

and

Amy K. Bailey
Shanahan Fellow
Center for Studies in Demography and Ecology
Department of Sociology
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98195-3340

* Paper presented at the session on “Educational Differences Among Immigrants in the United States” at the 2004 annual meetings of the Population Association of America. This research was supported by grants to Tolnay from the National Science Foundation (SBR-9529308) and from the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (R01 HD34363). We are grateful to Patty Glynn for expert programming support, and to Brenna Warren for research assistance. Direct correspondence to: Stewart Tolnay, Department of Sociology, Box 353340, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195; email: tolnay@u.washington.edu.

SCHOOLING FOR NEWCOMERS: VARIATION IN EDUCATIONAL PERSISTENCE IN THE UNITED STATES IN 1920

ABSTRACT

During the early 20th Century, children's roles were more discretionary than they are today. Parents and families were freer to make choices between prolonged educations and gainful employment for their adolescent children. In this paper we examine variation in the propensity for children to pursue primarily educational goals, with a special focus on African Americans and immigrants in the North and West. Specifically, we propose a conceptual model for educational persistence among adolescents 14- to-18 years of age which identifies determinants at multiple levels – individual, family, and contextual. We use data from the 1920 Public Use Microdata Sample to conduct logistic regression analysis of the likelihood of attending school. Separate analyses are conducted for male and female adolescents. Six groups defined by race, nativity, and migration status are considered: northern-born native whites, southern-born native whites, northern-born native blacks, southern-born native blacks, Jewish immigrants, non-Jewish immigrants. The results reveal a complex pattern of intergroup variation. Among boys, Jewish immigrants are especially likely to attend school, while non-Jewish immigrants and southern-born blacks exhibit lower levels of attendance. Among girls we find that African Americans, both southern- and northern-born, reported the highest levels of school attendance and non-Jewish immigrants the lowest levels. In addition, individual and family characteristics, as well as residential context, have significant effects on educational persistence.

SCHOOLING FOR NEWCOMERS: VARIATION IN EDUCATIONAL PERSISTENCE IN THE UNITED STATES IN 1920

INTRODUCTION

American society, at the beginning of the 21st Century, is recognized for its racial and ethnic diversity, and its increasingly multicultural character (see e.g., Bean and Stevens 2003; Denton and Tolnay 2002; Lieberson and Waters 1988). Rising immigration, beginning in the last third of the 20th Century, is primarily responsible for this growing population diversity. A generally similar situation existed near the outset of the 20th Century, especially in the larger urban areas of the Northeast and Midwest. At that time, immigration from southern, central, and eastern Europe combined with the internal migration of African Americans from the South to create an amalgam of different racial and ethnic groups that co-resided within the same northern towns and cities (e.g., Lieberson 1963, 1980; White, Dymowski, and Wang 1994). Yet, although the European immigrants and black southern migrants shared the status of “newcomers” in their host communities, ample evidence has demonstrated that there were significant differences in their adjustment processes, as well as in their longer-term social and economic prospects in the North (Lieberson 1980; Massey & Denton 1993; Thernstrom and Thernstrom 1997; Tolnay 2003a).

The adjustment experiences of the children of these newcomers – whether the children of immigrants or of domestic migrants – presented parents with critical, and often difficult, choices. In an era when compulsory schooling requirements and child labor laws were typically weak or poorly enforced (Jacobs and Greene 1994), whether children attended school or worked for wages was a decision that had to be made by individual families. And, in making those decisions, families responded to a variety of factors, operating on different levels, including: (1) the characteristics of the individual children, (2) the family’s structural and economic circumstances, and (3) the opportunities and constraints imposed by the local context within which families were embedded.

In the early 20th Century, European immigrants and African American domestic migrants differed on many important characteristics, at all three levels of aggregation, that likely influenced the decisions they made regarding the appropriate roles for their children. However, we know relatively

little about how these groups compared in their propensity to send children to school, rather than to the work place (See, however, Goldin 1981; Jacobs and Greene 1994; Olneck and Lazerson 1974; Perlmann 1988). We know even less about the various factors that contributed to any group variation that did exist, and about possible group differences or similarities in the operation of the different influences on children's roles. These are unfortunate gaps in our knowledge because there were important consequences that ensued from the decisions that these families of newcomers made about the activities of their children. For *individual* children and families, there were trade offs between the short-term contributions to the family economy that would be enjoyed from children's wages and the long-term benefits associated with the greater accumulation of human capital that result from extending children's educations. And, there were also potential *collective* consequences for the various groups of newcomers, as suggested by the divergent social and economic trends for African Americans and European immigrants in the North throughout the middle decades of the 20th Century (Lieberson 1980; Massey and Denton 1993; Tolnay 2003a).

In this paper we use data from the 1920 Public Use Microdata Sample to study the schooling of adolescents, 14-to-18 years of age, living in the northern United States. Our focus is restricted to families residing in the U.S. North and West because we are especially interested in comparing the educational persistence of international immigrants (primarily those from Europe, Canada and Mexico) and migrants from the southern U.S.. Both groups were recent arrivals in northern U.S. society, but they obviously differed in many important respects. Among the domestic migrants from the South we distinguish between whites and African Americans, which allows us to consider simultaneously the influence of migrant status and race on children's roles. But, our primary interest is in how *black* southern migrants and European immigrants were similar to, or different from each other. Among immigrants we distinguish between Jews and non-Jews, in light of previous research that has inferred significant differences, by religion, in the adjustment experiences of immigrants during this time period (Bodnar 1985; Olneck and Lazerson 1974; Perlmann 1988). We propose a conceptual framework for understanding group differences in educational persistence that includes a variety of individual-level, family-level, and community-level factors.

BACKGROUND AND LITERATURE

The Context

By the early 20th Century, the northern U.S. had a long history of absorbing large numbers of foreign-born newcomers, with a wide variety of national origins. However, the convergence of two very different migration streams after 1910 exaggerated both the *number* and *diversity* of the new arrivals. In the years preceding World War I, record numbers of European immigrants entered the U.S.: During the peak years, more than one million immigrants arrived annually (Martin and Midgley 1999). Although these absolute levels have been surpassed by recent immigration during the late 20th and early 21st Centuries, they represented a considerably larger proportionate impact on the existing population. And, the large majority of the immigrants in 1920 were concentrated in the northern U.S., especially within the larger cities of the Northeast and Midwest.

The foreign-born population in the northern U.S. in 1920 was also notable for its European origins. The era of “new immigration” that began during the last quarter of the 19th Century, and continued into the second decade of the 20th Century, consisted largely of migrants from southern, central, and eastern Europe. This profile contrasted sharply with the earlier era of immigration during which most migrants hailed from northern or western Europe (Lieberson 1980; Martin and Midgley 1999), and it introduced considerably more ethnic and religious variety into the foreign-born population. The growing size and increasing ethnic diversity of the European immigrant population during the opening decades of the 20th Century were important reasons for the legislative restrictions that were imposed on the number and national origins of new immigrants by the Quota Laws of 1921 and 1924. While partially effective at reducing the flow of new migrants from southern, central, and eastern Europe during ensuing decades (Massey 2002), these laws had little impact on the composition of the immigrant population in the northern U.S. in the short-run.

The northern U.S. also had a long history of absorbing African American migrants from the South, especially following the Civil War when the former slave population gained its freedom. For a variety of reasons related to post-bellum conditions that held blacks in the South, as well as the lack of opportunities available to them in the North, the northward migration of African Americans remained

quite modest until the second decade of the 20th Century (Mandle 1978; Ransom and Sutch 1977; Tolnay 2003b), and consequently the number of blacks in the North remained small. However those conditions changed quickly when northern employers were no longer able to import inexpensive workers from southern, central, and eastern Europe, at the same time that the nation's entry into World War I increased sharply the need for industrial production (Collins 1997). With their labor suddenly in demand in the North, southern blacks were able to act upon their long-held grievances against the social subordination, economic discrimination, and physical violence that had plagued them in the South (e.g., Drake and Cayton 1962; Grossman 1989; Henri 1975; Tolnay and Beck 1992). Their massive exodus from 1910 through 1970 is often referred to as "The Great Migration."

The Great Migration, which was still in its initial stage in 1920, produced a dramatic geographic redistribution of the African American population. Millions of southern blacks, many with rural and agricultural backgrounds, made their way to the major urban centers of the Northeast and Midwest. During the 1920s, places like Chicago, Detroit, Philadelphia, New York, and Boston experienced significant growth in their black populations. Some southern migrants also made the longer trek to the West, although that migration stream was quite limited at first, and only grew more intense during World War II, when the expansion of the defense industry on the West Coast increased the demand for workers in that region.

The early participants in the Great Migration arrived in the North when there was still a very large and dominant presence of European immigrants. In fact, many of the large northern cities that were the most popular destinations for foreign-born migrants also drew the most domestic migrants from the South. This is not surprising, given that both groups were seeking the economic opportunities that those urban areas offered, and that the transportation routes serving those cities made travel to them cheaper and more convenient. As recent arrivals in these areas, both groups of newcomers faced the challenge of adapting to their new surroundings – locating places to live, finding jobs, and making decisions about their children's activities. While all were "newcomers," these foreign-born and domestic migrants brought different socioeconomic characteristics and cultural backgrounds to this adjustment process. And, they faced different social and institutional constraints in their quests for

assimilation and social mobility. As a result, it is reasonable to expect that their experiences in the North were not uniform. Our focus, here, is on the decisions that the groups made about the extended schooling of their children. Specifically, how, if at all, did those decisions differ? And, secondly, were they affected similarly or differently by the same social forces?

Schooling for Newcomers: Comparing Blacks and Immigrants

An extensive social science literature documents the many, and diverse, individual and societal benefits associated with extended education. Status attainment research has shown that one's own education, as well as that of one's parents, is positively related to occupational status and earnings (e.g., Featherman and Hauser 1978). Demographers have concluded that higher levels of education are associated with lower rates of morbidity and mortality (e.g., Rogers, Hummer, and Nam 2000). Family sociologists have linked educational persistence to a reduced probability of non-marital parenthood and more stable marital unions (e.g., Bumpass and Lu 2000; Lillard and Waite 1993). Criminologists note that educational attainment is negatively related to crime and delinquency (e.g., Hirschi 2002; Liska 1987). Significantly, for our purposes, education has also been found to play an important role in the adaptation and assimilation of immigrants into their host societies (e.g., Alba and Nee 2003).

Education for newcomers builds the human capital of individuals which can later be translated into better jobs and higher earnings. Furthermore, schooling serves as a conduit for the flow of information about the host society and culture. It is generally impractical for adults among the first-generation of immigrants to take advantage of formal schooling opportunities because of their age, and because their earnings are required to support the household. As a result, it is typically the children of the first-generation immigrant population who negotiate the educational system, and serve as an important bridge between the older generation and their new surroundings. In the modern era, because of relatively strict compulsory attendance laws, immigrant children are virtually required to attend school until they are sixteen years of age. Also in the modern era, child labor laws restrict (but do not necessarily eliminate) the potential earnings of young children, and thereby limit their financial contributions to the household economy.

Within the historical setting of the northern U.S. in 1920, however, immigrant parents had more

latitude in choosing the roles for their children and, therefore, it was possible for a greater variety of socio-demographic and cultural factors to influence such choices. Compulsory schooling and child labor laws varied from jurisdiction to jurisdiction, but were typically weaker in nature, and more poorly enforced, than in the modern era (Jacobs and Greene 1994). Thus, especially when children reached the older teenage years, work became a viable, and sometimes very attractive, alternative to extended schooling. Gaining a better understanding of which parents chose to have their teenage children continue their educations, and why, is the primary objective of the analyses to follow.

Prior research has documented significant historical differentials in the educational behavior between immigrants and the native-born population (both black and white), and within the immigrant population itself. Jacobs and Greene (1994) conducted one of the most thorough examinations of historical school enrollment patterns for first- and second-generation immigrant children, including comparisons with native-born whites and blacks. Their evidence revealed substantially lower levels of school attendance for native-born African American children than for first-generation immigrant children from ages 5 through 15 (1994:227). At ages 16 through 18 the two groups exhibited virtually identical attendance rates, with those for black children being slightly lower. Within the immigrant population, most national origin groups reported higher attendance rates than blacks, with the notable exceptions being Irish, Polish, French Canadians, and Hispanics. The analysis by Jacobs and Greene was based on the nationally representative 1910 public use sample, so the attendance patterns reported for blacks include those living in southern states, where the educational opportunities for African American children – especially at the higher grade levels – were severely restricted. Furthermore, they did not describe the schooling patterns of black domestic migrants.

Other scholars have also examined the schooling of immigrant children during the late 19th and early 20th Centuries, and compared their behavior to that of native-born blacks and/or whites. Perlmann (1988) focused his attention on Providence, Rhode Island, using a rich data source that would be virtually impossible to compile for a nationally representative sample. Comparing native-born black children to the children of Irish, Italian, and Russian Jewish immigrants, he found that the high school entrance rates of Providence's black children in 1915 and 1925 surpassed only that of

Italian children. He further linked ethnic variation in schooling to structural factors such as class standing, occupational specialties, and discrimination as well as to cultural influences, including the emphasis that different ethnic groups placed on the value of educational attainment. Perlmann (1988:108) also acknowledged the potential impact of the social environment within which families were located, "The behavior of individuals was influenced not merely by the characteristics of their own families, but by the characteristics of their social context as well. And the characteristics of social context may have differed across ethnic lines, just as the characteristics of families did." Although Perlmann discussed the possible impact of southern migrants on the characteristics of the general black population in Providence, he did not compare the schooling patterns of southern-born and northern-born blacks.

Olnick and Lazerson (1974) paint a somewhat different picture of the contrast between the schooling of African American and immigrant children than that presented by Jacobs and Greene (1994) or by Perlmann (1988). According to their evidence for 1908, the percentage of native-born black children in Boston, Chicago, and New York progressing from the 8th grade to the 9th grade was somewhat lower than the percentage of native-born white children (49% versus 58%, respectively), but higher than that of the following immigrant groups: English (47%), Swedish (33%), German (33%), and southern Italians (23%). Olnick and Lazerson do not focus primarily on the schooling of black children, but devote considerable attention to comparing the educational patterns of Russian Jews and southern Italians, and conclude that cultural differences played an important role in the superior educational attainment of Russian Jews. They (1974:472) conclude that, "Evidence drawn from anthropological sources, immigrant novels, and sociological studies makes clear that Russian Jewish culture prepared that group to fare very well in terms of educational success, and that Southern Italian culture was at odds with the demands of formal schooling in America."

In his general history of immigration in America, Bodnar (1985) emphasizes quite strongly that immigrants were reluctant to invest in the schooling of their children. He argues that immigrants found much of the typical school curriculum to be irrelevant, and that the classroom experience was often unpleasant for their children. As a result, he concludes (1985:193), broadly, that, "The claims of the

family economy were so strong and economic need sufficiently high that immigrant children in nearly every group and in every city throughout the United States chose work when it was available over extended schooling prior to the 1930s.” Goldin expresses general agreement with Bodnar, based on her study of children’s roles in Philadelphia in the 19th Century. She (1981:298) claims that “Black children in Philadelphia remained in school more years than did the children of immigrant families. Immigrants, in contrast, appear to have foregone their children’s education rather than send their married women to work in the labor market.”

Others have also described historical schooling patterns for blacks and immigrants for different locales and different time periods (e.g., Lieberman 1980). However, the work by Jacobs and Greene, Perlmann, Olneck and Lazerson, Bodnar, and Goldin illustrates adequately that there is not complete consensus on this topic. What, exactly, can we conclude about the relative propensity for African American and immigrant parents to send their children to school? The different educational measures, samples, and methodologies used by the various studies make the disparate findings somewhat difficult to evaluate. Furthermore, it is possible that the literature offers conflicting evidence regarding this question because it has overlooked possible sources of variation in educational persistence between, and within, these two diverse social groups. In the following section, we offer a conceptual framework for understanding group differences in schooling that is built upon individual-, family-, and community-level factors.

Schooling for Newcomers: A Conceptual Framework for Group Differences

Decisions that families make about the preferred, primary role for children – for example, whether they should attend school or work for wages – are best viewed from a kind of rational choice perspective. That is, parents are seeking arrangements that optimize the benefits and minimize the costs associated with their children’s primary activity. These benefits and costs may be financial or emotional, and they may be short-term or long-term. The parent’s decision-making process is influenced by a wide variety of factors from different “domains.” It is the recognition and consideration of these domains that characterizes the conceptual framework that we use to better understand group variation in schooling in 1920. Specifically, we adopt a multi-level approach in which the “best”

decision for parents about their children's activity is determined by: (1) the attributes of the children themselves; (2) the characteristics of the family; and (3) the nature of the local context within which the children and their families are situated. If racial or ethnic groups vary in the decisions that they make about schooling for their children, then the explanations for that variation may be sought among factors within these three different domains. In this section, we briefly discuss how this multi-level framework can be applied to the study of children's schooling within the historical context of the American North in 1920.

Individual-Level Factors

Within the historical context that concerns us, two individual-level characteristics of children likely had important influences on the roles of adolescent children – age and gender.¹ In 1920 there was a steep age gradient in the proportion of children attending school, which existed for virtually all racial and ethnic groups. A very high percentage of younger children were enrolled in school, with attrition from school accelerating sharply among older teens (Jacobs and Greene 1994; Olneck and Lazerson 1974; Perlmann 1988). The best explanation for this pattern was the increasing opportunity costs associated with keeping older children in school. For many families in 1920, prolonged schooling was a luxury that they simply could not afford. And, unskilled, older adolescents could often find employment in the local labor market and contribute their earnings to the household economy. Some of the older teens also left school to establish their economic independence as a prelude to forming their own families – a transition that occurred earlier in 1920 than it does today. In most cases we would not anticipate significant differences across racial or ethnic groups in the distribution of children across the teenage years, unless those groups had considerably different fertility histories. However, among migrant families (international or domestic), one might expect greater group variation in the ages of children, given the possibility of selective migration. If the racial and ethnic groups *did* differ in age composition, then it could have contributed to concomitant group variation in levels of school enrollment.

¹ Children may also have differed in the levels of intelligence, or academic ability, which could have influenced parental decision making about their schooling. We do not include those individual-level differences in this discussion because they cannot be operationalized in the historical context. Because we do not expect these factors to vary among groups, this should not bias our results.

Gender has also played an important role in shaping the educational behavior and attainment of children in the U.S., especially in the past. In general, there were greater opportunities and pressures for male children to become gainfully employed during the teenage years. Traditional gender roles typically downplayed the potential economic contributions of female children, in favor of contributions on the domestic front. Also, economic benefits derived from female employment were not as good due to depressed female wages, so less was to be gained from girls' leaving school. As a result, in most settings it was common for girls to extend their schooling further than boys into adolescence and young adulthood, simply because they were less likely to be diverted by the local labor market (Goldin 1981). To be sure, there were also forces exerting pressure in the opposite direction. Since the primary identities of adult women revolved around their roles as wives and mothers, the economic returns to extended schooling for females generally were not as great as they were for males. Also, there were certain settings, for example near textile mills, in which the labor of young, single, women was especially welcomed, and where they were able to make significant contributions to the family economy (e.g., Tilly and Scott 1978). Weighed against such alternatives, the educational attainment of young women was more likely to be cut short. Finally, previous research has documented ethnic or cultural variation in the emphasis that was placed on female schooling, or resistance to women, particularly married women, working (Bodnar 1985; Perlmann 1988).

Family-Level Factors

In addition to their own, personal, attributes, the educational behavior of adolescents can be strongly influenced by the characteristics of the families to which they belong. A substantial literature has linked the educational behavior of children to the *socioeconomic status* (SES) of their families, in both modern and historical settings (e.g., Alexander, Entwistle, and Kabbani 2001; Ekstrom, Goertz, and Pollack 1986; Haveman, Wolfe, and Spaulding 1991; Jacobs and Greene 1994; Perlmann 1988; Rumberger 1983; Rumberger 1987). In general, children in higher SES families attend school more regularly (where school attendance is optional), and are more likely to extend their educations into the older teenage years, and beyond. These relationships can reflect class variation in the need to receive financial assistance from children for the support of the family, as well as variation in the value or

emphasis placed on education within families. To the extent that immigrant and African American families residing in the urban North in 1920 occupied different positions in the SES hierarchy, we should expect the educational behavior of their children to vary accordingly.

There are many dimensions of *family structure or composition* that can also have significant effects on schooling, even net of their association with family socioeconomic status. For example, children who are raised in families with only one biological parent – whether a single-parent or step-parent household – are significantly less likely to enjoy academic success than are children raised by both biological parents. They are, on average, more likely to move and less likely to persist in school than are youth being raised by two biological parents (Astone and McLanahan 1991, 1994). Some researchers have suggested that this effect is the result of the trauma of family disruption itself, rather than solely the consequence of lost income or reduced parental supervision (see e.g., Sandefur, et al. 1992).

A negative relationship has also been inferred between the number of siblings (or family size) and educational attainment (e.g., Blake 1981, 1985). However, the mechanisms through which large sibling sets have a detrimental impact on educational behavior remains the subject of debate. Some researchers have argued that a larger number of siblings dilutes parental resources – both economic and interpersonal (e.g., Downey 1995). Still others subscribe to the belief that the effect of family size stems from the influence of larger numbers of children on the family's intellectual environment or milieu. If a household's intellectual milieu is determined by the unweighted average of the intellectual ages of all household members, then, as the proportion of children in the household increases, the intellectual environment in which those children develop is depressed (Powell and Steelman 1990). In addition to the *number* of co-resident siblings, the presence of older or younger siblings may also influence schooling, and the relationship might be expected to vary by gender. For example, in some cases older daughters are withdrawn from school in order to help care for younger siblings, especially when the children's mother works outside of the home. The educations of older sons might also be truncated in order for them to earn income that supports the schooling of younger siblings, or to allow their mothers to avoid labor force participation and thereby care for younger children who are not yet in school.

For immigrant children, schooling also can be influenced by the level of acculturation of their parents. The children of parents who have more completely adapted to the host society should be more likely to attend school during adolescence than those whose parents have made less progress in assimilating. For example, the acquisition of English language skills by parents can increase the likelihood of children's schooling for two reasons. First, parents who are functional in the language of the host society will be less likely to depend on their children to be "ambassadors" to the outside world, a role which might distract them from attending school, especially during adolescence (Zhou, 1997). Second, more assimilated parents are also more likely to share the educational values of the host society, making the schooling behavior of their children more similar to that of the dominant native-born population (e.g. Bean and Stevens 2003).

Contextual Factors

Individual children and their families are embedded within local contexts that can vary substantially in the extent to which they encourage, or discourage, prolonged educational persistence. These contextual effects might best be viewed as operating through the imposition of various educational *constraints* and *opportunities*. Especially in the historical context, local jurisdictions varied in the stringency of laws regarding compulsory schooling and child labor that had the potential to shape the educational behavior of adolescents – depending on how strictly such regulations were enforced. Jacobs and Greene (1994) suggest that such laws, though widespread, were not consistently enforced, thus had relatively little impact on schooling, before 1916. Beyond legal statutes, local areas differed on other important dimensions that may have affected the educational decision-making of individual families. For example, the nature of the local economy could depress school attendance by attracting children into the labor force, if it included abundant employment opportunities for unskilled workers (Bodnar 1985; Goldin 1981; Walters and James, 1992).

Characteristics of a minority group's residential patterns within an urban area might also be linked to the educational behavior of children, as well as a variety of other social and economic outcomes. For example, the absolute or relative size of a racial or ethnic group could determine the strength of ethnically defined networks, or the emergence of collective adaptation strategies, that

increase the likelihood of adolescent employment and thereby decrease schooling (e.g., Morawska 1990). In addition, a group's residential isolation within the metropolis may reduce interaction with the majority group, inhibiting the process of acculturation. As Hershberg et al. note (1981:466), "An ethnically enclosed residential experience insulates a group from important mechanisms of assimilation, limits cross-cultural contacts that affect the socialization of the young, and has serious implications for subsequent experiences such as intermarriage, upward job mobility, and the formation of social ties. Thus, the lower the degree of segregation the greater the likelihood that a group is experiencing assimilation."

On the one hand, if a group's traditional values de-emphasize educational attainment, then residential segregation could depress educational persistence. On the other hand, if residential isolation creates a barrier between a minority group's adolescents and employment potential in the larger community, then it could have a positive impact of schooling, simply by reducing competing economic opportunities.

DATA, VARIABLES, AND METHOD

Data

Our investigation of group differences in schooling is based primarily on the 1920 Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) prepared by the Integrated Public Use Microdata Series Project at the Minnesota Population Center (see Ruggles and Sobek 2001). This is a one-percent sample of all households in the United States in 1920, and includes information that is shared by all members of a household (e.g., region, size of place, ownership of dwelling, etc.) as well as information specific to all persons residing in the household (e.g., age, sex, literacy, occupation, etc.). Because we are interested in educational persistence, we have selected from the larger 1920 PUMS unmarried adolescents between the ages of 14 and 18 who resided with at least one biological parent (N = 54,178). Because of the small numbers of adolescents in racial/ethnic categories other than black or white, and because of our interest in the influence of race and migration status on schooling, we exclude all native-born

adolescents who were are not either black or white, and all nonwhite foreign-born youth.² We also restrict our sample geographically to residents of non-southern states, reflecting our interest in comparing the educational behavior of foreign-born immigrants and domestic migrants to the North.³ For some analyses, we impose an additional geographic restriction by limiting the sample to adolescents residing in cities with a total population of 25,000 or more (N = 17,628).

Variables

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable used in all of our analyses is a dichotomy that distinguishes those adolescents who did not report an occupation and who had attended school anytime since September 1, 1919 (coded “1”) from those who were either not enrolled in school or were both working *and* attending school (coded “0”). This measurement strategy is adopted in order to identify those adolescents who were pursuing their educations more intensively. The 1920 Census considered attendance at any school, university or educational institution as a positive response to this question. Unfortunately, we are not able to discern the duration of school attendance during the referenced time period, nor do we know in which grade students were enrolled. Therefore, our investigation is unable to determine whether enrolled students were in a grade that was appropriate for their age. However, given that our primary goal is not focused on actual educational achievement, but is rather to determine how the primary role of adolescents varied between groups based on race and nativity, this limitation should not impact our overall findings.

Individual-level Independent Variables

The independent variable of primary interest is represented by a series of dummy variables that identify the group membership of the adolescents, as defined by race, ethnicity, and migration status. The following six groups are considered: (1) Northern-born, Native-born Whites, (2) Southern-born, Native-Born Whites, (3) Northern-born, Native-born Blacks, (4) Southern-born, Native-born Blacks,

² Our sample includes 3,753 foreign-born white adolescents. The countries of origin for immigrant children are as follows: Russia, 782; Italy, 631, Poland, 354, Canada, 307; England, 220; Austria, 197; Hungary, 154; Mexico, 133; Germany, 126; Scotland, 117; other countries, 732. The native-born sample includes 48,580 northern-born whites, 1,068 southern-born whites, 492 northern-born blacks, and 285 southern-born blacks.

³ We have used the census-defined regions in making this selection.

(5) Jewish White Immigrants, (6) Non-Jewish White Immigrants. Most of the individual-level attributes required to assign adolescents to one of these six groups are quite straightforward. “Native-born” adolescents are those who were born in the United States; “Immigrants” were born outside of the U.S.. Racial identification was based on the reported race of the adolescent on his or her person record. In 1920 the Census Bureau included a racial category for “mulatto,” which we combine with the category “Black/Negro.” The region of birth recorded for each native-born adolescent was used to distinguish southern migrants to the North from indigenous northerners. Distinguishing between “Jewish” and “non-Jewish” immigrant children is somewhat more complicated. The 1920 PUMS data do not directly record religion. They do, however, include three languages that we believe would be highly correlated with Jewish religious affiliation, “Yiddish,” “Jewish,” and “Hebrew.” If the adolescent or either of his/her parents reported one of these languages as their “native tongue” then the adolescent was assigned to the “Jewish White Immigrant” group. We include this distinction in light of previous research that has inferred significant educational differences between Jewish and non-Jewish immigrant children.

Gender and *age* are additional individual-level characteristics considered in our models. Gender is incorporated by conducting all analyses separately for males and females. This strategy allows not only for the possibility that attendance levels differed between male and female adolescents, but also for the possibility of gender differences in the social forces that influenced schooling. Age at last birthday before the census (integer values between 14 and 18) is included as a covariate in all models. The likelihood of school enrollment for adolescents in 1920 declined quite quickly with age. Controlling for age allows us to avoid drawing spurious conclusions about group variation in school attendance that are really due to differences in age composition across groups.

Family-Level Independent Variables

The 1920 census did not include a great variety of questions that can be used to describe the socioeconomic status of individuals or families. We have included two measures in our models that we believe provide an adequate representation of the SES of each adolescent’s family. *Parental literacy* is coded “1” if an adolescent resides with at least one parent who can read and write, and “0” if

otherwise.⁴ *Home ownership* is coded “1” for adolescents living in a dwelling that is owned or being purchased and “0” for those living in a rented dwelling.⁵ We expect both indicators of family SES to be positively related to school attendance.

A variety of measures of family structure and composition are included in our analyses and are based on the presence of parents and siblings in an adolescent’s family. *Family structure* is based on the co-residence of an adolescent with his/her mother and father. The following three categories are included: (1) only the mother is present, (2) only the father is present, (3) both the mother and father are present (serves as the reference category). Other things being equal, school attendance should be more likely for adolescents residing in two-parent families. The need for teenage children to supplement the family income, or to care for younger siblings, was greater within single-parent families.⁶ Family composition is represented by the number of co-resident siblings, and a proxy measure for the birth order of the target adolescent. *Number of siblings* is a simple count of the number of brothers and sisters residing in the same household as the adolescent. Our measure of *birth order* distinguishes oldest and youngest coresident children from others (the reference category).⁷ We expect school attendance to have been more likely for adolescents with fewer siblings, and for those who were the youngest child within their family.

A final family-level independent variable is included for immigrant children only. *Parental English* is coded “1” for those adolescents who lived with at least one parent who was able to speak English and “0” for those with no co-resident parent able to speak English. Since this variable is relevant only for immigrant children, it is included as a multiplicative interaction term with the group membership dummy variables for the foreign-born. Preliminary investigation indicated that English

⁴ In 1920 individuals were recorded as “literate” if they were able to read and write in any language, not just English. This means that literacy is probably a better indicator of human capital for the native-born population, for whom the language of literacy is most likely English, than for the foreign-born. This disadvantage is partially overcome by the inclusion of a variable measuring the English language ability of the parents of the foreign-born adolescents in our sample.

⁵ Because the adolescents in our sample were not necessarily the children of household heads, it is possible that this variable does not necessarily indicate that their family owned (or rented) the dwelling within which they lived.

⁶ It should be recalled that all adolescents included in our analysis reside with *at least one* parent.

⁷ Note that we are unable to determine whether the target adolescent is the oldest or the youngest living child in the family. Rather, Census data provide only information on family members who are coresident.

ability made a significant difference in school attendance only for Non-Jewish Immigrants. Therefore the interaction between English ability and Jewish Immigrants is not included in our analyses. The correct interpretation for the coefficient associated with this interaction term is that it represents the difference in school attendance between Non-Jewish Immigrant children who have at least one parent able to speak English and Non-Jewish Immigrant children with no co-resident parent with English language skills. Because parental English skills are a reasonable indicator of cultural adaptation, we expect the interaction to have a positive effect on adolescent schooling.

Contextual-Level Independent Variables

The local context within which adolescents and their families were embedded is represented in a variety of ways in our analyses. For those analyses that include adolescents in urban and rural areas of the non-South we include a set of dummy variables that distinguish among the following types of residences: (1) within the central city of a metropolitan area, (2) within a metropolitan area, but outside of the central city, (3) in a non-metropolitan area. Previous research has documented residential variation in schooling within the northern U.S. during the early 20th Century, with higher levels of attendance for older adolescents living in rural areas (e.g. Guest and Tolnay 1985; Jacobs and Greene 1994). Controlling for type of residence helps us to avoid drawing conclusions about group variation in schooling which was really due to the differential concentration of the groups in areas that differed in their patterns of educational persistence. In these analyses we also control for the adolescent's state of residence in order to account for the impact of interstate variation in compulsory school attendance or child labor laws on our results. If group populations were distributed unevenly across non-southern states, then differential exposure to these such laws could create spurious group variation in school attendance.

When we shift to the analysis of adolescents living in large urban areas, we take a somewhat different approach to considering variation in contextual conditions. In order to account for all possible differences across cities that might affect group variation in schooling, we include a set of $m-1$ dummy variables representing each of the m non-southern cities with populations of 25,000 or more (New York City is used as the reference).

Method

Our analysis is conducted in two stages. We first examine the educational persistence of adolescents in the entire non-southern region, urban and rural. Northern-born, native-born whites are used as the reference category in order to compare the schooling of blacks and immigrants with the dominant ethnic majority group in the North and West. We estimate a sequence of models in order to first describe “crude” inter-group differences in schooling, and then to observe the effects of family-level covariates and place of residence on those differences. State of residence is included in the final model, which also includes type of residence (i.e., central city, suburb, or non-metropolitan area), in order to control for geographic variation in compulsory schooling or child labor laws. Hypothesis tests are conducted using robust standard errors that correct for the clustering of adolescents within states.

In the second analytic stage we shift our attention to schooling in the large urban areas of the North and West. Again, we use a strategy of sequential model estimation to first describe inter-group differences in school attendance and then to observe the impact on those differences of adding a set of 98 dummy variables representing the 99 cities over 25,000 population in which the adolescents in our sample lived. This “fixed effects” model yields two important results: (1) it indicates the total potential for variation in city-level characteristics to explain variation in individual-level schooling, and (2) it describes the total effect of city-level characteristics on inter-group variation in schooling. Again, hypothesis tests are conducted using robust standard errors that take into consideration the clustering of adolescents within cities.⁸

FINDINGS

Educational Persistence Among Adolescents: Patterns in the Entire Non-South

Boys

Table 1 reports the results obtained for analyses of school attendance for all children 14-18 years of age residing in the Non-South. Looking first at the results for boys, Model 1 shows a significant schooling disadvantage for non-Jewish immigrants and both northern and southern born-blacks. When converted to odds ratios ($e^{-.669} = .51$ and $e^{-.647} = .52$, respectively) the findings imply

⁸ We do not include *state* of residence in the urban analysis because we believe that the set of dummy variables representing city of residence will control adequately for geographic variation in laws related to children’s schooling and work.

that these two groups were roughly one-half as likely to attend school as were Northern-born whites. In contrast, the likelihood of attendance for Jewish immigrants and southern-born whites was statistically indistinguishable from the likelihood for the reference group.

[Table 1 About Here]

When the set of individual- and family-level controls are introduced (Model 2) the same general group differences are observed. However, the schooling advantage for Jewish immigrants, which was small and non-significant in Model 1, attains statistical significance. Net of the other covariates, we find that the odds of Jewish immigrant boys attending school were nearly fifty-percent greater than those for the reference group ($e^{.386} = 1.47$). The emergence of a significant schooling advantage for Jewish immigrant boys in Model 2 suggests that they were more likely than the reference group to have a profile of individual-level and family-level characteristics that *discouraged* school attendance. When those differences are not controlled, as in Model 1, the greater propensity for Jewish immigrants to attend school is suppressed. The other notable effect of controlling for the additional covariates in Model 2 is the modest attenuation in the schooling disadvantage for both northern- and southern-born blacks. For southern-born blacks, the odds of attending school, relative to those for the reference group, increase from .52 to .61 ($e^{-.497} = .608$). For northern-born blacks, controlling for family characteristics eliminates statistical difference from the reference group. Like the finding for Jewish immigrants, this change suggests that black boys exhibited individual and family characteristics that predisposed them to lower levels of schooling. Once those characteristics are controlled, their *net* level of school attendance increases relative to the reference group.

Model 3 in Table 1 adds controls for the boys' type of residence – central city within a metropolitan area, suburb within a metropolitan area, or non-metropolitan area – as well as for his state of residence. It appears that group variation in schooling was affected very little by concomitant group differences in the distribution of boys by type of location or by differences across states. Although the coefficients change slightly, the same general differentials described in Model 2 persist in Model 3.

A cursory consideration of the effects of other covariates on boys' school attendance reveals generally predictable relationships. The coefficients from Model 3 suggest that educational persistence

for adolescent males was significantly *more likely* for those who: were younger; resided with both parents, at least one of whom was literate; had fewer siblings; lived in an owned rather than rented dwelling, and were located outside of a metropolitan area. In addition we find that non-Jewish immigrant boys were more likely to attend school if their parents were able to speak English. Some of these effects are substantial. For example, having a literate parent increased the odds of school attendance by two-thirds ($e^{.508} = 1.66$), while living in a single-parent household reduced the odds of schooling by about forty-percent ($e^{-.572} = .56$ and $e^{-.501} = .61$, for mother-only and father-only families, respectively).

Girls

Turning to the findings for girls, we observe substantial differences from the group variation described for boys. Model 1 shows that, when only age is controlled, girls from *both* immigrant groups, Jews and non-Jews, are significant *less* likely than the reference group to attend school. And, the contrasts are impressive. The odds that Jewish immigrant girls attended school were roughly forty-percent less than those for the reference group ($e^{-.544} = .58$), while the corresponding odds for non-Jewish immigrant girls were nearly two-thirds less ($e^{-1.024} = .36$). Further differences from the findings for boys are observed for southern-born girls. While southern-born black boys were significantly less likely to attend school, the likelihood of attendance for southern-born black girls is not significantly different from the reference group. In contrast, attendance for southern-born white *boys* was similar to that of northern-born whites, but southern-born white *girls* are significantly more likely to attend. Gender differences also emerge for northern-born blacks. While northern-born black boys had educational profiles roughly equivalent to the reference group, we find that northern-born black girls were significantly more likely than northern-born white girls to attend school.

The addition of individual-level and family-level covariates in Model 2 has relatively little impact on the general group differences for girls that were observed in Model 1. Perhaps the most notable difference between the two models is the substantial attenuation in the schooling disadvantage for Jewish immigrants. The original odds ratio from Model 1 (OR = .58) increases to .77 in Model 2 ($e^{-.265} = .77$) when the controls are included. Like the case for boys, this change suggests that Jewish

immigrant girls were disproportionately more likely to have a profile of individual and family characteristics that discouraged school attendance, vis-a-vis the reference group. Once the controls were added, the original disadvantage described in Model 1 was substantially reduced. A similar explanation accounts for the modest increase in the educational advantage for northern-born black girls.

Controlling for residential location in Model 3 has two interesting consequences for inter-group variation in schooling for girls. First, it further reduces the schooling *deficit* for Jewish immigrants, which now fails to attain statistical significance, and increases both the coefficient and level of statistical significance for the educational advantage enjoyed by northern-born black girls. This implies that, compared with the reference group, Jewish immigrant and northern-born black girls were more concentrated in locations that depressed the likelihood of schooling, specifically, the central cities of metropolitan areas. Second, controlling for residential location increases the schooling *advantage* for southern-born black girls enough that it attains statistical significance. As with the evidence for Jewish immigrants, this change suggests that southern-born black girls were more likely to live in areas (e.g., central cities of metropolitan areas) where opportunities for schooling were depressed. Conversely, the relatively higher rates of educational persistence for southern-born white girls falls below the level of statistical significance when residential characteristics are added to the model, indicating that southern-born white migrants were more likely to locate in areas that encouraged educational attachment (e.g., non-metropolitan areas) than were other migrant groups. One interesting differential survives the inclusion of all covariates in Model 3 – the strong educational *disadvantage* for non-Jewish immigrants.

The effects of the remaining covariates in Model 3 are very similar to those observed for boys. School attendance was more likely for girls who: were younger; resided with both parents, at least one of whom was literate; had fewer siblings; lived in an owned rather than rented dwelling, and were located in a suburb or outside of a metropolitan area. As was observed for boys, the likelihood of attendance for non-Jewish immigrant girls was higher if their parents were able to speak English. For the most part, the magnitude of impact for these variables on the schooling of girls is roughly comparable to that observed for boys.

Summary

The evidence regarding educational persistence among adolescents in the non-southern region reveals substantial variation by race/ethnicity/migration status, as well as by gender. Clearly, the schooling experience of immigrant adolescents depended upon their cultural background, as defined by our distinction between Jewish and non-Jewish children. Non-Jewish immigrants were uniformly disadvantaged when compared with the reference group, though the extent of their schooling deficit depended upon their access to an English speaking parent. Jewish immigrants, in contrast, suffered no schooling disadvantage; indeed Jewish boys were actually more likely to attend school than were Northern-born, Native Whites. Further, differences by gender showed that both northern-born and southern-born black girls were significantly more likely to attend school than the reference group. Northern-born black boys were equally as likely as northern-born white boys to attend school, while southern born black boys were less likely.

Shifting attention to comparisons specifically between immigrants and African Americans, we observe equally interesting variation. Among boys, the sharpest contrasts existed between Jewish immigrants and southern-born blacks, with the latter exhibiting substantially lower levels of school enrollment. While southern-born black boys were more likely than non-Jewish immigrants to attend school, that advantage disappeared if the immigrant child resided with a parent who spoke English. Among girls, the greatest difference existed between blacks and non-Jewish immigrants, with the latter being much less likely to attend school – even if they had a parent who spoke English. The schooling advantage for both northern-born and southern-born black girls – with levels of attendance even greater than those of the reference group – is an interesting and somewhat surprising finding to which we will return in the conclusion.

Educational Persistence Among Adolescents: Patterns in the Urban Non-South

Our preliminary effort to assess more fully the role of residential context in shaping group variation in educational persistence is based on the schooling experiences of adolescents in the larger urban areas of the non-South – cities with populations of 25,000 or more. In every other respect, the sample used in the analysis of urban children is identical to the sample of all non-southern adolescents.

The threshold population of 25,000 was chosen to restrict the analysis to clearly “urban environments” that might have offered different social, cultural, or economic environments that influenced the schooling behavior of adolescent residents. Our primary interest is in assessing the extent to which those varying environments might have affected: (1) the absolute level of educational persistence, and (2) variation in educational persistence by the race/ethnicity/migrant status characteristics that we considered in the earlier analysis. We, again, conduct separate analyses for boys and girls. For each gender, we first estimate a model that is identical to Model 3 in Table 1, except that residential location is dropped as a predictor because we are considering only urban settings. Next, we add a set of 98 dummy variables that represent the 99 different cities included in the sample. This type of “fixed effects” model controls for all possible sources of variation across cities that might affect school attendance. By comparing the results from the two models we can assess the additional explanatory power that is added by accounting for inter-city variation, and we can observe any changes in the pattern of group differences in schooling. For all analyses the standard errors for coefficients have been corrected for clustering of cases within cities.

[Table 2 About Here]

Boys

Looking first at the results for boys, the basic group differences in schooling, net of all covariates, is described in Model 1. As in Table 1 (Model 3) we find that school attendance was higher among Jewish immigrants, and lower among non-Jewish immigrants. In contrast, two findings in Model 1 differ from the earlier results, specifically: southern-born white boys living in large urban areas are significantly more likely than the reference group to attend school; and southern-born black boys do not exhibit the significant educational disadvantage relative to the reference group that was observed for the entire adolescent population of the non-South. It should be noted that it is reasonable to expect discrepancies between the findings reported in Table 1 and Table 2, given the substantial differences in the composition of the samples.

When the set of dummy variables representing each boy’s city of residence is added to the right-hand-side of the equation, we obtain the results shown in Model 2. It appears that the city-level

context does have a significant impact on the level of school attendance for adolescents. The addition of the city-dummies significantly improves the goodness-of-fit of the explanatory model, with the log-likelihood changing from -4528.9 in Model 1 to -4409.39 in Model 2 ($\chi^2 = 239.01, p < .001$). In addition, controlling for city-level context reduces the educational advantage for southern-born white boys to non-significance. This finding suggests that white migrants from the South settled in cities that offered their children greater educational opportunities, relative to those for northern-born white children. However, the specific city-level characteristic(s) that might be responsible for this effects cannot be identified from the fixed-effects model.

Girls

Turning to the findings for girls we also observe some similarities and some differences from the group variation described in Table 1. Consistent with those findings, the results for girls residing in large cities also reveal a significant educational advantage for northern-born blacks and a significant educational disadvantage for non-Jewish immigrants. Also consistent with the earlier evidence is the larger disadvantage for non-Jewish immigrant girls who did not reside with an English speaking parent. Interestingly, the findings for girls living in large cities also show higher levels of school attendance for southern-born whites, echoing the results for urban boys.

City-level context also matters for the schooling behavior of urban girls, as it did for boys. When the set of dummy variables identifying city of residence is added in Model 2 the log likelihood value increases to -4362.04 from -4547.64 in Model 1 ($\chi^2 = 371.19, p < .001$). Also paralleling the findings for boys, the southern-born white girls are no longer more likely than the reference group to attend school, once city-of-residence is controlled. This represents further support for the conclusion that white migrants from the South settled in cities that facilitated the school attendance of their children. Again, however, the specific nature of those cities cannot be deduced from this fixed-effects model. Although not as striking in its magnitude, the educational advantage for northern-born black girls is enhanced when variation in city contexts is accounted for.

Summary

The estimation of fixed-effects models for boys and girls in large cities in the non-South provides important evidence that the contexts within which adolescents were embedded did, in fact, influence their likelihood of attending school. Although accounting for city-of-residence left intact most inter-group differences in schooling, it was able to account for the apparent educational advantage of southern-born white boys and girls. This is intriguing evidence of a destination selection process by white southern migrants. Apparently, they gave their children an educational advantage by settling in urban environments where schooling was more common or more valued. In future research we hope to identify, more specifically, the characteristics of cities that affected the schooling behavior of children in 1920.

Finally, it is worth noting that the remaining covariates in the models for boys and girls in Table 2 behave much as they did in Table 1. That is, school enrollment was more common among adolescents who: were younger; resided with both parents, at least one of whom was literate; had fewer siblings; and lived in an owned rather than a rented dwelling.

CONCLUSION

Our findings reinforce those from many previous studies by documenting substantial variation in schooling behavior by children's race and ethnicity during the early 20th Century. By considering the role of internal migration for native-born whites and blacks, we have also been able to extend our appreciation of the mix of factors that influenced educational persistence. The story is not a simple one. Race, gender, religion, national or regional origin, and local context, all played some role in determining whether children extended their schooling into the teenage years. Since the primary motivation for this investigation was to compare the educational behavior of immigrants and African Americans, we will concentrate our concluding remarks largely on that issue.

African American adolescents did not necessarily exhibit the most disadvantaged pattern of school attendance in the northern U.S., nor did immigrants. Among boys, the implications of being an immigrant depended heavily upon their religious heritage, while the implications of being African American depended upon their region of origin. For example, the schooling of southern-born black boys trailed Jewish immigrants even more than it did the northern-born native white reference group.

However, southern black migrants were quite similar to non-Jewish immigrants in their levels of attendance. In contrast, northern-born black boys were more similar to northern-born native whites than they were to either group of immigrants – or to their counterparts from the South.

The most interesting, and somewhat surprising, findings regarding the school attendance of immigrants and African Americans are observed for girls. Black girls, both southern-born and northern-born, were the *most* likely of all groups to attend school. The contrast between black and non-Jewish immigrant girls is especially dramatic. While residing with an English speaking parent attenuated the attendance gap between the two groups, the difference remained substantial. We can suggest two possible explanations for the educational advantage of African American girls in the North. On the one hand, it is possible that the *demand* for extended schooling of girls was higher among African American families. Certainly, there is evidence that a powerful desire for education blossomed in the South during the post-bellum period (e.g., Anderson 1988; Margo 1990). This may help to account for the higher levels of school attendance among the southern-born black girls and, perhaps, even among the northern-born black girls, since many of them would have had southern-born parents. But, this potential explanation raises two puzzling questions. First, would the demand for female education have been stronger among African Americans than among Jewish immigrants? Second, why were southern-born black boys seemingly immune from this cultural phenomenon?

On the other hand, African American girls may have had fewer alternatives to schooling, especially for gainful employment. The northern workplace was not an especially hospitable environment for black girls during the early part of the 20th Century. Even the domestic service jobs that were so common among African American women in the South were more likely to be held by immigrant females, especially those from Ireland and Scandinavian countries. Outside of the domestic service sector, African American women faced intense competition from the large pool of immigrant males who had flooded into northern states prior to World War I. With no special occupational niche to exploit, adolescent black girls may have opted to stay in school longer. In contrast, young African American males were viewed as an inexpensive source of unskilled labor, filling positions at the bottom of the occupational hierarchy for relatively little remuneration (e.g., Lieberman 1980). Indeed, it was

this role for African American men that fueled the Great Migration of workers from the South to the North.

Most likely, the higher levels of school attendance for African American girls was the product of multiple factors, including the demand for schooling and the limited supply of non-educational alternatives. Additional research will be required to tease out the underlying reasons for this finding. Reasonable avenues to explore will include the direct examination of parallel group differences in gainful employment, as well as group differences in adolescent “idleness,” that is those teens who neither worked nor attended school.

Finally, our results suggest that the local context played a significant role in shaping the educational persistence of adolescents. Although the contrasts involving immigrants and blacks were not strongly influenced by accounting for context, there are at least two potentially fruitful directions for future research on this issue. First, it is possible that the importance of the local context for school attendance was not uniform across groups. Future research should consider whether context mattered more for some groups than for others. Second, to the extent that data allow, it would be useful to move beyond the “sledgehammer” approach of fixed-effects modeling used in our analyses. That is, specific city-level characteristics could be designed and their impact on individual-level schooling estimated. Again, the possibility that such specific contextual variables operated differently across groups also should be explored.

REFERENCES

- Alba, Richard, and Victor Nee. 2003. *Remaking the American Mainstream. Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Alexander, Karl L., Doris Entwistle, and Nader Kabbani. 2001. "The Dropout Process in Life Course Perspective: Early Risk Ractors at Home and School." *Teachers College Record* 105(5): 760-822.
- Anderson, James D. 1988. *The Education of Blacks in the South, 1860-1935*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Astone, Nan Marie, and Sara S. McLanahan. 1991. "Family Structure, Parental Practices and High School Completion." *American Sociological Review* 56: 309 – 320.
- _____. 1994. "Family Structure, Residential Mobility, and School Dropout: A Research Note." *Demography* 31:575-584.
- Bean, Frank D., and Gillian Stevens 2003. *America's Newcomers and the Dynamics of Diversity*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Blake, Judith. 1981. "Family Size and the Quality of Children." *Demography* 18: 421 - 442.
- _____. 1985. "Number of Siblings and Educational Mobility." *American Sociological Review* 50: 84 - 94.
- Bodnar, John. 1985. *The Transplanted. A History of Immigrants in Urban America*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Bumpass, Larry and H.H. Lu. 2000. "Trends in Cohabitation and Implications for Children's Family Contexts in the United States." *Population Studies* 54:29-41.
- Collins, W.J. 1997. "When the Tide Turned: Immigration and the Delay of the Great Black Migration." *Journal of Economic History* 56:607-632.
- Denton, Nancy A., and Stewart E. Tolnay. 2002. *American Diversity: A Demographic Challenge for the Twenty-First Century*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Downey, Douglas B. 1995. "When Bigger Is Not Better: Family Size, Parental Resources, and Children's Educational Performance." *American Sociological Review* 60: 746 – 761.

- Drake, St. Clair, and Horace R. Cayton. 1962. *Black Metropolis: A Study of Negro Life in a Northern City*. Harcourt, Brace, and Company.
- Ekstrom, Ruth B., Margaret E. Goertz, Judith M. Pollack and Donald A. Rock. 1986. "Who Drops Out and Why? Findings From a National Study." *College Teachers Record* 87(3):356-373.
- Featherman, David L., and Robert M. Hauser. 1978. *Opportunity and Change*. New York: Academic Press.
- Goldin, Claudia. 1981. "Family Strategies and the Family Economy in the Late Nineteenth Century: The Role of Secondary Workers." Pp. 277-310 in *Philadelphia. Work, Space, Family, and Group Experience in the Nineteenth Century*. Theodore Hershberg (ed.), New York: Oxford University Press.
- Grossman, James R. 1989. *Land of Hope: Chicago, Black Southerners, and the Great Migration*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Guest, Avery M., and Stewart E. Tolnay. 1985. "Agricultural Organization and U.S. Educational Consumption in 1900." *Sociology of Education*, 58:201-212.
- Haveman, Robert, Barbara Wolfe, and James Spaulding. 1991. "Childhood Events and Circumstances Influencing High School Completion." *Demography* (28)1:133-157.
- Henri, Florette. 1975. *Black Migration: Movement North, 1900-1920*. Anchor Press/Doubleday.
- Hershberg, Theodore, Alan N. Burstein, Eugene P. Ericksen, Stephanie W. Greenberg, and William L. Yancey. 1981. "A Table of Three Cities: Blacks, Immigrants, and Opportunity in Philadelphia, 1850-1880, 1930, 1970." Pp. 461-491 in *Philadelphia. Work, Space, Family, and Group Experience in the Nineteenth Century*. Theodore Hershberg (ed.), New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hirschi, Travis. 2002. *Causes of Delinquency*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Jacobs, Jerry A., and Margaret E. Greene. 1994. "Race and Ethnicity, Social Class, and Schooling." Pp. 209-256 in *After Ellis Island. Newcomers and Natives in the 1910 Census*. Susan Cotts Watkins (ed.), New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Lieberson, Stanley. 1963. *Ethnic Patterns in American Cities*. The Free Press.

- _____. 1980. *A Piece of the Pie. Blacks and Immigrants Since 1880*. University of California Press.
- Lieberson, Stanley, and Mary C. Waters. 1988. *From Many Strands: Ethnic and Racial Groups in Contemporary America*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Lillard, L.A., and L.J. Waite. 1993. "A Joint Model of Marital Childbearing and Marital Disruption." *Demography* 30:563-682.
- Liska, Allen E. 1987. *Perspectives on Deviance*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Mandle, Jay. 1978. *The Roots of Black Poverty: The Southern Plantation Economy After the Civil War*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Margo, Robert. 1990. *Race and Schooling in the South, 1880-1950*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Massey, Douglas S. 2002. "The New Immigration and Ethnicity in the United States." Pp. 75-98 in *American Diversity: A Demographic Challenge for the Twenty-First Century*. Nancy A. Denton and Stewart E. Tolnay (eds.) Albany: SUNY Press.
- Massey, Douglas S., and Nancy A. Denton. 1993. *American Apartheid*. Harvard University Press.
- Morawska, Ewa. 1990. "The Sociology and Historiography of Immigration." Pp. 187-240 in *Immigration Reconsidered: History, Sociology, and Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Olnick, Michael R., and Marvin Lazerson. 1974. "The School Achievement of Immigrant Children: 1900-1930." *History of Education Quarterly* 14:354-482.
- Perlmann, Joel. 1988. *Ethnic Differences. Schooling and Social Structure Among the Irish, Italians, Jews, and Blacks in an American City, 1880-1935*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Powell, Brian, and Lala Carr Steelman. 1990. "Beyond Sibship Size: Sibling Density, Sex Composition, and Educational Outcomes." *Social Forces* 69: 181 – 206.
- Ransom, Roger, and Richard Sutch. 1977. *One Kind of Freedom: The Economic Consequences of Emancipation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Rogers, Richard G., Robert A. Hummer, and Charles B. Nam. 2000. *Living and Dying in the USA : Behavioral, Health, and Social Differentials of Adult Mortality*. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Ruggles, Steven, and Matthew Sobek. 2001. *User's Guide: Integrated Public Use Microdata Series: Millennial Edition*. Minneapolis: Department of History, University of Minnesota.
- Rumberger, Russell W. 1983. "Dropping Out of High School: The Influence of Race, Class and Family Background." *American Educational Research Journal* 20: 199-200.
- _____. 1987. "High School Dropouts: A Review of Issues and Evidence." *Review of Educational Research* 57(2):101-121.
- Sandefur, Gary D., Sara McLanahan and Roger A. Wojtkiewicz. 1992. "The Effects of Parental Marital Status during Adolescence on High School Graduation." *Social Forces* 71: 103 – 121
- Thernstrom, Stephan, and Abigail Thernstrom. 1997. *America in Black and White: One Nation, Indivisible*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Tilly, Louise, and Joan Scott. 1978. *Women, Work, and Family*. New York: Hold, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Tolnay, Stewart E. 2003a. "Trends in the Relative Occupational Status of African Americans and European Immigrants in Northern Cities, 1880-1970." *Social Science Research* 32:603-632.
- _____. 2003b. "The African American 'Great Migration' and Beyond." *Annual Review of Sociology* 29:209-232.
- Tolnay, Stewart E., and E.M. Beck. 1992. "Racial Violence and Black Migration in the South, 1910 to 1930." *American Sociological Review* 57:103-16.
- Walters, Pamela Barnhouse, and David R. James. 1992. "Schooling for Some: Child Labor and School Enrollment in the Early Twentieth-Century South." *American Sociological Review* 57:635-650.
- Zhou, Min. 1997. "Growing Up American: The Challenge Confronting Immigrant Children and Children of Immigrants." *Annual Review of Sociology* 23: 63-95.

Table 1. Results of Logistic Regression Analysis of School Attendance by Children Age 14 - 18 Who Were Living in the Non-South in 1920

	BOYS (N = 27,818)			GIRLS (N = 26,360)		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3 ^a	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3 ^a
Jewish Immigrant	.139 (.119)	.386** (.122)	.442*** (.125)	-.544*** (.121)	-.265* (.124)	-.011 (.126)
Non-Jewish Immigrant	-.669*** (.063)	-.789*** (.157)	-.839*** (.159)	-1.024*** (.063)	-1.149*** (.155)	-1.214*** (.160)
Northern-Born Black	-.249† (.146)	-.118 (.149)	-.047 (.151)	.373* (.153)	.456** (.156)	.539*** (.159)
Southern-Born Black	-.647*** (.195)	-.497* (.200)	-.423* (.201)	.074 (.199)	.308 (.205)	.390 † (.209)
Southern-Born White	.078 (.095)	.123 (.096)	-.009 (.098)	.317** (.112)	.364** (.114)	.095 (.117)
Age at Last Birthday	-.859*** (.011)	-.895*** (.012)	-.906*** (.012)	-.780*** (.011)	-.822*** (.012)	-.840*** (.012)
Has a Literate Parent		.557*** (.077)	.508*** (.078)		.929*** (.078)	.829*** (.079)
Non-Jewish Immigrant x English-Speaking Parent		.358* (.170)	.409* (.171)		.390* (.168)	.527** (.173)
Mother-Only Household		-.558*** (.049)	-.572*** (.050)		-.439*** (.047)	-.438*** (.048)
Father-Only Household		-.473*** (.066)	-.501*** (.066)		-.462*** (.065)	-.468*** (.066)
Oldest Coresident Sibling		.019 (.033)	.014 (.033)		.029 (.033)	.014 (.034)
Youngest Coresident Sibling		-.003 (.042)	.010 (.043)		.023 (.043)	.060 (.043)
Number of Coresident Siblings		-.142*** (.007)	-.142*** (.007)		-.130*** (.007)	-.134*** (.007)
Home Ownership		.414*** (.029)	.367*** (.031)		.491*** (.030)	.361*** (.031)
Not Urban Resident			.100** (.037)			.412*** (.038)
Urban Resident, Outside of City Center			-.013 (.047)			.186*** (.047)
Intercept	13.623*** (.178)	13.934*** (.201)	14.159*** (.206)	12.755*** (.180)	12.723*** (.200)	12.919*** (.207)
Log Likelihood	30646.337	29736.223	29411.426	29662.896	28663.667	27931.167
Pseudo R-Square	0.205	0.228	0.237	0.178	0.206	0.226

Note: † $p \leq 0.10$; * $p \leq 0.05$; ** $p \leq 0.01$; *** $p \leq 0.001$ (Two-Tailed Tests).

Northern-born native whites are referent group.

Standard errors in parentheses.

a: Residential characteristics control for state of residence, though coefficients are not reported.

Table 2. Results of Logistic Regression Analysis of School Attendance for Urban Youth, Age 14 - 18, Who Were Living in the Non-South in 1920

	BOYS (N= 8,906)		GIRLS (N = 8,722)	
	Model 1	Model 2 ^a	Model 1	Model 2 ^a
Jewish Immigrants	.540*** (.099)	.547*** (.097)	.100 (.192)	.171 (.217)
Non-Jewish Immigrants	-.414† (.215)	-.480* (.231)	-.866*** (.150)	-.856*** (.142)
Northern-Born Blacks	.140 (.168)	.182 (.200)	.662** (.241)	.771** (.295)
Southern-Born Blacks	-.343 (.227)	-.364 (.238)	.320 (.323)	.280 (.409)
Southern-Born Whites	.452* (.225)	.278 (.247)	.491* (.220)	.286 (.240)
Age at Last Birthday	-.975*** (.054)	-1.001*** (.052)	-.954*** (.055)	-.998*** (.051)
At Least One Literate Parent	.418*** (.096)	.366*** (.094)	.638** (.226)	.551** (.208)
Non-Jewish Immigrant x Parent Speaks English	.037 (.246)	.076 (.247)	.461* (.188)	.370* (.181)
Mother-Only Household	-.585*** (.064)	-.614*** (.068)	-.420*** (.085)	-.461*** (.086)
Father-Only Household	-.490*** (.103)	-.519*** (.108)	-.312* (.124)	-.269* (.120)
Oldest Coresident Sibling	.089 (.069)	.078 (.072)	-.016 (.046)	-.027 (.048)
Youngest Coresident Sibling	-.004 (.063)	-.007 (.065)	.064 (.074)	.074 (.076)
Number of Coresident Siblings	-.162*** (.012)	-.158*** (.012)	-.168*** (.014)	-.166*** (.013)
Home Ownership	.576*** (.091)	.528*** (.091)	.500*** (.084)	.470*** (.084)
Intercept	15.195*** (.864)	15.620*** (.821)	14.881*** (1.066)	15.630*** (.988)
Log-Likelihood:	-4528.9	-4409.39	-4547.639	-4361.791
Pseudo R-Square:	0.260	0.280	0.247	0.278

Note: †p ≤ 0.10; * p ≤ 0.05; ** p ≤ 0.01; *** p ≤ 0.001 (Two-Tailed Tests).

Northern-born native whites are referent group.

Standard errors in parentheses

a: Model includes city of residence though coefficients are not reported.