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#### Abstract

The scale of the persistent, concentrated immigration from contiguous Mexico is a source of concern to many in the United States. The perception is that Mexicans are not assimilating into mainstream America as previous generations of immigrants did. In this paper we look at the emigration of approximately 1 million French-Canadians who moved to the United States, with the bulk of the migration occurring between the end of the Civil War and 1930 and with most settling in neighboring New England. What makes this episode particularly interesting is the fact that the French-Canadian immigrants exerted considerable efforts to maintain their language and to replicate their home country institutions, most notably the schooling system, in their new country. This explicit resistance to assimilation generated considerable attention and concern in the U.S. over many years. The concerns are strikingly similar to those often invoked today in discussions of policy options regarding immigration from hispanic countries, notably Mexico. We then look at a variety of outcomes for French Canadian immigrants and at their convergence across generations with respect to native English-speaking New Englanders and to other immigrants. The educational attainment of Franco-Americans lagged that of their fellow citizens over a long period of time. Yet, by the time of the 2000 Census, they eventually, if belatedly, appeared to have achieved parity. In addition, when we compare Franco-Americans to French-speaking Canadians of the same generations, it is clear that Franco-Americans substantially upgraded their educational attainment relative to what it would have been if they had not emigrated. This suggests that the "pull" factor eventually exerted a dominating influence.


## 1 Introduction

Throughout their history, Americans have both welcomed and feared immigrants, with the balance of attitudes shifting depending on the characteristics of the group in question and economic conditions in the United States at the time. A subject of continuing concern is the issue of whether migrants coming from other parts of the Americas are more or less desirable than overseas migrants. In 1885 (23 Sept. p. 4), the New York Times editorialist stated

In such towns as Fall River and Holyoke the French Canadians have nearly shouldered out the native American operatives [...] They have crowded the Irish very hard, and they form a much more intractable element in the social problem [...] Their dwellings are the despair of the sanitarians and themselves the despair of social philosophers [...] They are the Chinese of New-England inasmuch as they seem rarely to strike root in our soil. Whatever may be the fate of the Irish immigrant there is always the hope that his children and grandchildren may be assimilated with the native population. [...] His interest in the land of his birth is chiefly sentimental and is expressed in occasional contributions to the emergency fund. But even if the French Canadian leaves his bones here his thoughts all lie beyond the Canadian border [...] Add to this feeling of alienism that he is absolutely unenterprising, and it becomes evident that he must be a troublesome element in the population.

In the late 1870s and 1880s, both newspaper editorialists and government officials routinely denounced the arrival of illiterate Roman Catholics from the poor farms of Quebec and the Maritimes. A more sympathetic view is found in the lead article of the April 1898 issue of the Quarterly Journal of Economics (MacDonald (1898)) which documents the quantitative importance of, and the problems generated by, the substantial influx of French-Canadians into New England. He noted that "Nowhere do [French Canadians] seem to be looked upon, as a class, with entire favor, and in private are often spoken of with contempt; but their work is necessary, their trade is important, and their political support not to be despised." (p. 278) However, MacDonald’s conclusion was fairly optimistic. He predicted that despite their unfavourable group characteristics, the French Canadians would eventually succumb to the pressures to assimilate experienced by all immigrants.

MacDonald's assessment was made under the belief that the inflow was in decline. "There can
be no doubt that the current has ceased to flow strongly from the Province of Quebec to any part of the New England [States]." (p. 257) As we will see below, the flow persisted for another thirty years, but we find strong evidence supporting the prediction of eventual assimilation.

A little over one hundred years later, the Mexican immigration of the last few decades has attracted similar attention in public debate, the popular press, and in the academic world. Concerns over the impact of large inflows of people range from labor market repercussions in terms of wages and jobs (Borjas (2003)), social program usage (Borjas and Trejo (1993)), educational outcomes of native Americans (Betts and Lofstrom (1998)), to overall "social" impacts (Huntington (2004)). Indeed, in a controversial article, Huntington (2004) goes so far as to say that the current episode of Mexican immigration is a unique event in United States history. ${ }^{1}$ Much has been said about the contemporary situation, but it is still too early to determine to what extent Mexican-Americans will eventually assimilate, socially and economically, into mainstream society. ${ }^{2}$

This paper looks at the movement of approximately 1 million French-Canadians from Canada to the United States. The bulk of the migration occurred between the end of the Civil War and 1930, with most settling in neighboring New England or northern New York. In 1930, approximately twothirds of first and second generation French Canadians lived in New England (Truesdell (1943)). What makes this episode particularly relevant for the current debate is the fact that the French-Canadian immigrants exerted considerable efforts to maintain their language and to replicate their home country institutions in their new country. Probably most notable among those institutions is the school system. They established many "national" parishes where both church and school were bilingual or French and the priest was usually from French Canada. The Irish-Americans who ran the U.S. Roman Catholic

[^1]Church were assimilationist. They often opposed the creation of French-Canadian parishes and when possible assigned European francophone (or even Irish) priests who would discourage the maintenance of Canadian customs by their immigrant parishioners. French Canada's Roman Catholic Church played an active role in helping Franco-Americans achieve their goal of "ethnic survival" by sending large numbers of priests, nuns, and teaching brothers.

The prolonged concern in the U.S. about French Canadian immigrants is strikingly similar to modern discussions of policy options regarding immigration from Latin America. Several of the factors Huntington sees as unique to Mexican immigration (contiguity, regional concentration, persistence, and historical presence) bear a strong resemblance to the characteristics of French Canadian migrants. ${ }^{3}$ We are not the first researchers to draw parallels between the French Canadians and the Hispanics. Theriault (1980, p. 2) notes: "From the point of view of resistance to assimilation the Franco-Americans appear to be most nearly comparable to the Spanish-Americans of the Southwest, with whom they also share the unique distinction among American immigrant groups of proximity to their country of origin."

We are not suggesting that an understanding of the assimilation path of Franco-Americans will be a sure guide as to what can be expected over the next several decades regarding the integration of Mexican immigrants. If Mexico experiences little economic growth while the U.S. economy prospers greatly, the pressures to move may persist for much more than sixty years. Around 1900, the proportion of all Canadian born francophones living in the US (19\%) was virtually the same as the proportion of Mexicans in the US in the late 1990s. However, after 1900, the proportion of francophones in the US dropped (to 11\% by 1930) (Huntington (2004), p.44, Truesdell (1943) p. 47,

[^2]Urquhart and Buckley (eds) (1965) p. 18). ${ }^{4}$
Franco-Americans were demographically important especially in New England towns. Nearly 5\% of the 1900 population of New England was French Canadian born, and 9\% were first or second generation French Canadian. In 1930, 3\% of New England's population was Canadian born, 9\% first or second generation immigrants (including those with only one parent born in Canada (Truesdell (1943), p. 77, and US Census)). As we can see from Map 1, in 1910 a good many counties had at least $20 \%$ first or second generation French Canadians in their population. ${ }^{5}$ However, the total francophone population of Canada in 1900 was only 29\% of the total population of New England and 2\% of the entire U.S. population. In 1930, the French origin population in Canada was $36 \%$ of the total population of New England, still 2\% of the entire US population (Urquhart and Buckley (eds) (1965), p. 18 and US census of 1930, p. 35). In July 2004, the population of Mexico was $35.8 \%$ of the total population of the United States (Central Intelligence Agency's World Factbook). Thus, supply limitations were certainly a factor for French Canadian much more than Mexican migration.

While virtually any French Canadian could cross the border up to 1917, and any minimally literate French Canadian could do so until 1930, officially the current flow from the south is tightly regulated. French Canadians showed marked reluctance to take out American citizenship, even though virtually all were legally free to do so. We cannot in any way assess the impact of having a large number of illegal, but long-resident, immigrants who cannot apply for citizenship.

The first goal of the paper is to look, for a variety of characteristics, at French Canadians' convergence across generations towards the patterns seen for native white English-speaking New Englanders and to compare the French Canadian trends to those found for European Roman Catholic

[^3]immigrants. We focus on educational attainment, the number of children born by females, the incidence of marriages outside of the ethnic group, and the incidence of military service. We find that the educational attainment of Franco-Americans lagged that of their fellow citizens over a long period. Yet by the time of the 2000 census, they eventually, if belatedly, appear to have achieved parity, at least in the case of young females. Somewhat more tentatively, we argue that the eventual convergence did not occur linearly with each successive generation gaining ground in a proportional fashion. We provide some evidence that the process accelerated and hypothesize that acceleration stemmed from three related sources. The first is the gradual dearth of French-speaking teachers in parochial schools. The second is the declining fraction of Franco-Americans attending those parochial schools, and the third is the declining degree of attachment to the Franco-American identity. Changes in the nature of schooling could have caused the declining sense of attachment to the inherited identity.

Our second objective is to examine the extent to which French Canadian immigrants replicated both the institutional settings and the outcomes of the society they left. We compare FrancoAmericans to French-speaking Canadians of the same generations in what arguably amounts to an experiment in "identity choice" (see Akerlof and Kranton (2000) and the related paper by AustenSmith and Fryer (2003)). What we argue gives credibility to the exercise is the fact that although Quebec (francophone) society became much more urban over this time period, in many ways it was relatively stable over the years that saw successive generations of Franco Americans adapt within U.S. society. The "Quiet Revolution" in Quebec, which saw the rapid decline in the Roman Catholic church's power within the province and a marked improvement in the economic position of francophones relative to anglophones did not occur until the 1960s.

Franco-Americans substantially upgraded their educational attainment across generations

[^4]relative to the achievement of the same age cohorts in Quebec. Quebec did not introduce compulsory schooling legislation until 1943, and until the late 1960s the structure of the Roman Catholic school system ensured that few children continued past primary school. The contrasts between French Canadians and Franco-Americans are particularly strong for post-secondary educational attainment, especially for females. Finally, we also find that all but one age cohort of Franco American females had fewer children than their French Canadian counterparts in 1970. The exception was for women aged 25 to 34. This exception provides further support for the notion that Franco-Americans were by the 1960s largely unaffected by developments in Quebec. Fertility rates had dropped precipitously in Quebec during the sixties and by 1970 were lower than fertility in the United States. Overall, these results strongly suggest that the "pull" factor eventually exerted a dominating influence.

The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 documents the immigration patterns of FrenchCanadians and Section 3 describes immigrants' adjustment process. We provide further evidence that the settlers' attempts to isolate themselves from their fellow citizens stirred widespread reprobation. We describe the education system set up by the Franco-Americans and show how it differed from the Quebec system. Section 4 explains the data used and Section 5 sets out results to date. We focus on the cross-generation convergence of various outcomes within the U.S., as well as the extent to which outcomes gradually diverged from those of French Canadians in Quebec.

## 2 The Immigration Phase

As in the New York Times editorial quoted above, in the late nineteenth century, the French Canadians of New England were occasionally derided as the "Chinese of Eastern North America." ${ }^{6}$ Unlike most Chinese immigrants to the western US, it was common for French Canadian families, as well as single men, to emigrate. The rate of natural increase among the francophone population was high, and the

[^5]possibilities to obtain good farmland were low. While urban centres in Canada absorbed some of those eager to leave the agricultural sector, the U.S. offered a much greater number of manufacturing jobs. Textile mill owners recruited some of the earliest groups of migrants. Travel costs, in both time and money, were minimal for French Canadians moving to New England. One day and (around 1900) at most five dollars (about a week's wages for a low skilled man in Quebec) was sufficient to get to the mill towns of southern New England (Green, MacKinnon, and Minns (2005)). While many participants in streams of immigration come with the intention of returning home, it was far easier for French Canadians than for European immigrants to actually go back home whenever they saw fit. The cost of an Atlantic voyage was more like $\$ 25$ and travel time around two weeks. ${ }^{7}$

Indeed, whenever there was a downturn in the New England mill towns, Canadian authorities predicted both the end of the outflow, and a massive return by the unemployed. There were repeated attempts to convince the emigrants either to move to the Canadian west or to return to Quebec to take up farms in areas north of the St. Lawrence valley. If going "home" is an easy option, then the willingness to make both symbolic and practical breaks with the past is likely to be lessened. French Canadian migrants in New England were less likely to take out American citizenship than most other immigrants. ${ }^{8}$ It is extremely doubtful that it was ties to Queen Victoria or her descendants that they were unwilling to renounce. For the Roman Catholic church in Quebec (and New England), faith and language were inextricably linked. It was easy to encourage convents to set up schools in the "Petits Canadas". The need was understood to be great, and the cost of sending Canadian-born nuns to New England was minimal.

From 1917, migrants from Canada were subject to the U.S.-imposed literacy test, and some

[^6]French Canadians failed it (Ramirez, 2001?). There had been very considerable improvements in levels of literacy among the French Canadian population since the 1870s, so that the new literacy test did not have a major negative impact on the possibility of getting into the States. The slower growth of the New England textile industry was probably more important.

To get an idea of the yearly flows into the U.S. from French Canada, we use the 1920 census to plot the distribution of arrival years (see Figure 1). Admittedly, this fails to capture the actual yearly flows as many of the early immigrants eventually returned to Canada or had died by 1920. It does highlight the fact that the immigration phase was far from over by the late 1890's, as MacDonald (1898) thought. Fairly high rates of immigration continued until the border was closed in 1930. Emigration rates remained very low throughout the Second World War. Wartime service and economic opportunities tended to break up some of the francophone enclaves in New England. After the war, low rates of immigration coupled with suburbanization of the population made it much harder to maintain viable French-language institutions (newspapers, schools, churches) (Roby, 2000, pp 353475.)

As time passed, discussion developed within the Franco-American community about the desirability of taking out American citizenship. The same reports that noted the number of children at (bilingual) parochial schools also listed the number of voters and boasted of the city councillors and state legislators of French background. To remain distinct, it helped to have a voice in the American political process. In 1930, over half of the French Canadian born adult men in the US were citizens. However, proportions naturalized were generally lower in the New England states than in the rest of the U.S. (Truesdell, 1943, pp. 111, 117).

## 3 Franco-American and French-Canadian Educational Institutions

Many of the early immigrants were illiterate, as was common in Quebec at that time. Only about half of working-age francophone men in Canada could read and write in 1871. In the early days,
such instruction as was provided in New England for immigrant children was fairly rudimentary, with some mills instituting schools to teach Franco-American children basic skills and some English. The teachers were often Franco-American women who had attended convent schools in Canada. As the number of immigrants grew and many French Canadians located in a fairly small set of towns, religious orders took over or established parochial schools, the first of which was founded in Rutland, Vermont in 1870. Brault (1986) gives a very detailed account of the parochial schooling system, including the creation of high schools and colleges in the early 20th Century. As he remarks, "the cornerstone on which the Franco-American school was built was the profound conviction that abandoning the French language was tantamount to abandoning the Catholic faith."

Key components of the parochial schools were their focus on the French language and the French Canadian culture, in addition to the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church. It is the language components, which are more central to the key issue of resistance to cultural assimilation into mainstream America, that raised the greatest concerns among native Americans. English-language parochial schools were suspect; French-language parochial schools were clearly dangerous. Recognition of parochial schools was an issue early on precisely because instruction was not provided in English (Hamon (1891) cited in Brault (1986)). Bilingual parochial schooling was seen as acceptable by the authorities requiring school attendance. By the early 1900s, parochial schools settled into the format they maintained until the 1950s: half a day was taught in French, half a day in English. French was used to teach catechism, Bible study, Canadian history, art, and music, while reading, writing, arithmetic, American history, geography, civics, and hygiene were taught in English. Usually French-language topics were taught by the Canadian religious while English subjects were taught by Americans.

Although it was not customary for early Franco-Americans to attend high school or college, a few did. Until at least the early 20th Century, those who did not attend U.S. public schools returned to

Canada to attend the church-run "Classical Colleges". The curriculum led roughly to a B.A. degree, with the first four years corresponding to high school education and the last four to college-level instruction. This system was a remnant of the pre-revolutionary education system in France and accessing it was more or less the privilege of the elite, as it was not publicly funded. With increased demand for post-elementary but not secular schooling in New England on the part of FrancoAmericans, the first U.S. based Classical College, Assumption College, was established in Worcester, MA, in 1904. Brault (1986) reports that contrary to its sister schools in Quebec, instruction at Assumption became increasingly bilingual over the years. The institution, founded by the French and Belgian Assumptionist Fathers, suffered a steady decline of its French-speaking faculty. By the late 1930s, roughly half the courses were taught in English and even the students generally spoke English among themselves when not in class.

In summary, Franco-Americans tried hard to re-create the educational institutions of French Canada. Yet, three main differences in the educational environment made the New England "flavor" different and no doubt played a role in the eventual absorption of Franco-Americans into mainstream society. First, the U.S. schools had an added component relative to their sister schools in Quebec, which is that except in the very early years a substantial part of the instruction was in English. The second very important difference in the environment was, of course, that all children were eligible to enroll in the regular public school system. There is ample evidence that Franco-Americans were subject to pressures from native Americans to enrol their children in the public schools at the same time that their priests preached the importance of sending the children to the parochial school. In contrast, although parents in urban Quebec could in principle enrol their children in English-speaking Catholic schools, in practice few did so. The third difference was that there were no compulsory schooling laws in Quebec until the 1940s. While it may have been fairly easy for children just below the school-leaving age to evade the compulsory schooling laws in U.S. manufacturing towns, there was
external pressure to ensure that all children attended school for at least six or seven years. ${ }^{9}$

## 4 Data

We use the IPUMS of the United States Census for the years 1910, 1940, 1970, and 2000 to create our samples of New England residents. We focus on New England because the concentration of French Canadians was highest there and it was in these states that the institutions necessary to permit the maintenance of a separate community flourished. In Michigan or California, living in French was really not an option. Those who chose to move to or remain in Fall River or Woonsocket could more plausibly act as if living in the US was either a temporary event, or that New England was a southern extension to Quebec and Acadia.

Particular emphasis is put on the 1970 U.S. Census for the following reasons. First, we are interested in the long-term effect on immigrants of French-Canadian heritage. The Form 2 samples of the 1970 Census contain the most detailed information of all post-war US census about the respondent's birthplace and mother tongue, as well as for both parents of the respondent. ${ }^{10}$ Another factor which makes us rely heavily on 1970 rather than 1960 is that a micro-data sample of the 1961 Canadian census is not available. Thus for 1970/71 but not 1960/61 we can construct a sample of French-speaking Americans and Canadians. As mentioned earlier, the Catholic schooling system in place in Quebec until the mid-60s served as the model for the parochial schools that Franco-Americans established in New England. We can be confident that the educational institutions experienced by (many to most) Franco-American and (virtually all) French-Canadian adults in 1970/71 were quite similar. As noted above, there were two (for older adults, three) very important features which only affected Franco-Americans: instruction was carried out in English for roughly half the day, the public

[^7]school system was an option, and there were compulsory schooling laws.
The 2000 U.S. Census is less appropriate for our purposes because it contains only the selfreported first and second ancestry of the respondent. While this is useful, the absence of information about parental birthplace precludes looking at convergence across generations. By 2000, there were few Franco-Americans under 70 who had been born in French Canada. While we may be picking up some third (or higher) generation descendants of immigrants with the "ancestry" response, we cannot separate out each generation. In addition, because respondents can always answer "American" to the ancestry question, some individuals are assigned to the comparison group when they should be included in the sample of individuals of French-Canadian ancestry.

The 1940 Census includes most of the relevant variables also in the 1970 Census. This allows us to study the "mid-term" education-related outcomes of Franco-Americans. The sample size is somewhat smaller, though, because only so-called "sample-line" members (one per household) were asked questions on mother tongue and parents' birthplace. ${ }^{11}$ Nevertheless we do manage to add quite a few observations to the sample-line member sample by looking at each household member's relationship to the head of the household and to the sample-line individual. For example, if a non sample line member is the son of the head of household and the head's wife is the sample-line individual, and her mother tongue is French, then the son is considered to be a Franco-American. ${ }^{12}$ Finally, the 1910 Census does not have educational attainment but it does have school attendance.

We use the 1971 Canadian Census to compare Franco-Americans and French-Canadians in Quebec. Responses to questions about mother tongue, birthplace, and parents' birthplaces allow us to select French-speaking residents of the Province of Quebec who were born in that province. We

[^8]exclude the small number of individuals who report speaking French and who were born in the U.S. Although the overall percentage is very small ( $0.9 \%$ of the sample if they were included), it is interesting to note that the fraction of U.S. born respondents is approximately $3.5 \%$ of those aged over 60 , while it is about $0.5 \%$ for those below 60 . Given that those over 60 in 1971 would have been born in the late 19th and early 20th Century, at which time much effort was being exerted to repatriate people back to Quebec (Vicero (1968)), it would appear that those efforts were not very successful. After acknowledging that many of the first arrivals eventually returned home, MacDonald (1898) remarks that "very few of the French now return to" Canada (p. 268). The numbers above seem to support his assertion.

## 5 Analysis

Tables 1 and 2 show the fraction of the 1970 New England population reporting French or Italian as their mother tongue. ${ }^{13}$ The main reason we choose the Italians as a comparison group of immigrants is simply pragmatism: since ethnic background in the 1970 Census is identified by the respondent's country of birth, his or her parents' country of birth, and the respondent's mother tongue, and there were many Italians in New England, it is possible to compare how the characteristics of these two mainly Roman Catholic sets of residents evolved across generations. In some ways, the Irish also provide for an interesting comparison, given that they were generally Roman Catholic and provided a large factory workforce. However, one obvious problem is that they cannot be identified in the 1970 Census past the second generation.

Using mother tongue as an identifier of ethnic background is in some ways too restrictive, as no doubt many individuals of French Canadian ancestry never spoke French and thus are included among native white English speaking New Englanders. Besides the fact that data limitations in the 1970

[^9]Census prevent us from using any other criterion for those beyond the second generation, we think that language background may be the most relevant definition for our purpose. We want to assess the impact on successive generations of holding onto the mother country institutions, and language is a critical part of those institutions. The very fact that in 1970 a sizeable fraction New Englanders still reported that their mother tongue is French is in itself a measure of success in achieving the goal of ethnic survival. Looking at the outcomes of a group of individuals with strong ethnic identification to a community where post-secondary, if not post-elementary, education was a low priority for many decades provides us with a "most adverse case" perspective on the long term degree of assimilation.

Probably the most striking feature about Tables 1 and 2 is that while the fractions of New England residents reporting French or Italian as mother tongue are not that different (Tables 1A and 2A), clear differences emerge once the samples are broken down by nativity status and age. This is especially true in the case of those whose parents were U.S. born. While the fractions of Frenchspeakers who had both parents born in the United States remains relatively high, in contrast there are few Italian-speaking individuals aged 35 and over whose parents were both born in the U.S. It appears that language assimilation is more prevalent among Italians than among French Canadians. (The timing of immigration was rather different, with many fewer Italians in the U.S. before 1890. Therefore among older adults of Italian descent fewer could have had US born parents. ${ }^{14}$ ) Tables 1B and 2B show the distribution of nativity status by age. Within the population of French speakers it is not unusual to have someone reporting that both her/his parents were U.S. born. Such is not the case for Italian speakers. Save for the youngest age group, very few of those reporting Italian as their mother tongue come from the third generation.

Table 3 and Figure 2 show one of the main results in the paper, one that continues to hold in the regression results presented below where we control for measurable characteristics. In 1970, even

[^10]among those whose parents were both born in the U.S., the educational attainment of FrancoAmericans still lagged that of their fellow white English-speaking citizens by over one full year of schooling. Not surprisingly, the largest deficit in educational attainment is observed among first generation immigrants, many of whom attended school in Canada. The fact that average years of schooling seemed "capped" at around 9 in Figure 2 for even those in the youngest age group of immigrants is not a surprise; as discussed earlier, the schooling system in French Canada long imposed a hard ceiling except for those from prosperous family backgrounds.

The next set of figures and table describes the characteristics of the Franco-American throughout the 20th century in terms of literacy, school enrolment, and the type of school that they attended relative to the English speakers. We try to look at where they started and follow their evolution through time. Data permitting, we also compare them to the home country population's outcomes to get an idea of the relative progress made by Franco-Americans.

Figures 3a-d show the school attendance rate as well as a measure of literacy for both males and females in 1910. School attendance patterns strongly imply that as soon as boys were considered able to work, they quit school and entered the labor force. Although a similar age pattern is also present for females, and many young women worked in the manufacturing sector, the attendance rates for French-speaking girls are more irregular, with a perceptible drop at around the age of 10 but somewhat more girls than boys continuing at school into their mid-teens. ${ }^{15}$ For some (as yet unknown) reason, Franco-American females’ school starting age is very similar to that of other New Englanders. French speaking boys started school later than their sisters or other New England boys. An additional important factor behind the rapid drop in attendance rates past the age of 13 or 14 can probably be traced to the parochial schooling environment. The "next step" of attending a classical college, either in New England or in Quebec was available to only a few individuals. Switching to a public high

[^11]school would have rarely been encouraged, and in any case the educational preparation in most parochial schools may not have provided an adequate academic background. The evidence shown in these figures is consistent with the finding that at the time when the American secondary education system started its considerable expansion (1910 to the late 1920s), New England lost its national lead in terms of the fraction of individuals graduating from high school (Goldin and Katz (1999)). With a significant fraction of children quitting school at 14 or 15 , and with a continuing flow of minimally educated immigrants from Quebec, overall state averages were bound to decrease relative to those of some western states.

As previously noted, literacy rates in French Canada in the late 19th century were very low. This is still clearly evident when we look at the 1910 literacy rate of males in Figure 3b. Even among young males, close to $20 \%$ are illiterate. Also, older men are progressively less literate. In comparison, the literacy rate hardly changes with the age cohort for non French speakers in New England.

Table 4 reports the proportion of children at school attending parochial schools in December, 1908. For each of the surveyed cities in New England with a French-Canadian presence, we show results for children whose father's race was French Canadian, and also for another major non-English mother tongue mainly Roman Catholic group. Except in Boston, where few Roman Catholic children of any ethnic background attended parochial schools, and there were relatively few French Canadians, French-Canadian children were strikingly likely to be attending a parochial school if they were at school at all. Perlmann (1988) stresses that Italians were very unlikely to send their children to parochial school, and this is what we see throughout New England. Only Polish children (who are not found in large numbers in the cities where the French Canadians lived in 1908) were as likely to attend parochial schools.

Figures 4a and 4b exploit the availability of school attendance data in both New England and in French Canada to get an idea of the progress made by second generation Franco-Americans relative to

English speaking white Americans and, perhaps more strikingly, relative to French Canadians in Trois-Rivieres, an almost entirely francophone town of similar size to Woonsocket, R.I., or in rural Quebec. The latter group is particularly relevant as many of those who migrated to the U.S. came from rural Quebec. ${ }^{16}$ The first thing to note is that by 1940 school attendance rates are virtually the same for Franco and English-speaking Americans until the age of 16, at which time the Franco attendance rate drops precipitously. This pattern suggests that compulsory school attendance was much more of a constraint for them than for the average American. Much progress had occurred between 1910 and 1940 in the attendance of Franco-Americans relative to US Anglos. Second generation FrancoAmericans are doing much better than their French-Canadian counterparts, especially those in rural areas. In fact, the attendance rate of Franco-American males in 1910 is remarkably similar to that of rural Quebecers thirty one years later, more so than is the case for females, although the broad patterns are similar. ${ }^{17}$

Clearly the combination of compulsory schooling laws and possibly also access to the public school system raised Franco-Americans’ educational participation rates. When French Canadians moved from rural to urban Quebec, they also raised their investment in formal education. However, we should be cautious about interpreting the rising educational attainment of Franco-Americans relative to US anglos as simply assimilation to a common urban pattern. In 1940/41, school attendance rates of $2^{\text {nd }}$ generation Franco-Americans in New England, most of whom were living in urban areas, were substantially higher than for youngsters in Trois-Rivières. Children in New England started

[^12]school at younger ages, and, more clearly for girls than boys, much more frequently stayed in school past age 14.

Moving to 1970, we can see in Figures 5a and 5b that, again, relative enrolment rates drop after age 16, although the drop is not as evident as in the previous figures, particularly for males born of U.S. born parents. Franco-Americans still display a stronger tendency to attend parochial elementary and secondary schools compared to non Francos, except for those who attend college (Figure 5c). By the year 2000, while there is still some visual evidence in Figure 6a suggesting that Franco-American males' college enrollment rates is lower than for other non Francos, the catch up is virtually complete for females (Figure 6b). Finally, Figure 6c and 6d show the enrollment rates in public or private schools across groups, conditional on being enrolled. Figure 6d is particularly interesting in that it seems to illustrate quite clearly the abrupt drop in private school enrollment in elementary and secondary schools over the 30 year period between the 1970 and 2000 Censuses. However, an important caveat associated with Figure 6d is that the definition of a Franco-American is not the same: while it is defined by mother tongue in 1970, the definition is broader in 2000 and almost certainly includes a large fraction of unilingual English speakers, people who, by the 1970 definition, would have been classified as US Anglos. Consequently, it could well be that private school enrollment rates are higher in 2000 for those whose mother tongue is French. Equivalently, using the same definition in 1970 as in 2000 would very likely have lowered the private school enrollment rates.

The final set of figures shows how average schooling levels for evolved across generations for a variety of ethnic groups. The "fathers-sons" comparison shown in Figure 7a to 7d defines "fathers" and "sons" as members of the same ethnic group separated by thirty years. Figures 7b, c, and d show the results for pairs with the putative sons aged 25-34, 35-44 and 45-54. To avoid crowding the graphs, some "ethnic groups" are rather loosely defined (e.g. "White Anglos" or "Central Europeans"). If we
first look at the overall United States in Figure 7a, we see that the only apparent outlier in the graph, relative to the (dotted) regression line, is for Asians, for whom intergenerational improvement in educational attainment is striking. While the Mexicans are at the bottom corner of the graph, they are more or less on the regression line. Turning to New England in Figure 7b, and using the same definition of "fathers" and "sons", there seems to be nothing really special about either FrancoAmericans or Italians. Italian fathers have slightly higher educational attainment than FrancoAmerican fathers but both groups are close to the regression line. However, if we change the age of the son-father pairings and look at older groups, then we see (in Figure 7c) that while Franco-American fathers have higher education than Italian fathers, the intergenerational progress for the francophones lags that of all the other groups, except blacks. This is even more evident in Figure 7d comparing "sons" aged 45-54 and "fathers" aged 75-84. This interpretation of these figures must ignore possible differential attrition across groups, as well as shifting cohort qualities. What we infer from Figures 7b to 7d is that as we "age" the members of the groups, we start seeing for Franco-Americans, but not Italians, the impact of maintaining the old tradition of low schooling. Reluctance to move beyond the parochial school environment, which would have been much more prevalent for the older generations of Franco-Americans, likely played a considerable role. Going instead from Figure 7d to Figure 7b shows the impact in terms of educational attainment of gradually abandoning the traditional French Canadian identity.

Figures 2 to 7 showed the main points we think are important in comparing schooling levels over time of French Canadians in Quebec and New England. In Tables 5 to 8, we control as well as we can for other factors that could interact with ethnic origin in explaining educational attainment. The evidence of Tables 5 to 8 suggests that in terms of educational attainment French Canadians assimilated towards "US Anglo" standards fairly slowly, but that by the year 2000, educational
attainment for young adults of French Canadian descent was almost the same as that of US anglos. The rate of change for Franco-Americans, relative to Italian-Americans, was probably somewhat lower. Italian immigrants were typically exceptionally poorly educated, so that quite a lot of the jump between the first and second generation seen in Table 8 is due to the disappearance of working-age adults with less than Grade 3 education.

According to Table 9, which reports estimates of the gap in years of schooling for francophones in New England relative to those in Quebec, differences between movers and stayers are modest. The second generation clearly gained in terms of years of education from having been born in the U.S. [Is there a control for living in an urban vs. rural area in 1970/71? If not, should there be?] The third (or higher) generation who were still identified as of French Canadian descent (with mother tongue French) did even better. Having only one rather than both parents born in the U.S. ("Other FrancoAmericans") seems to have been fairly unimportant. ${ }^{18}$

While few Franco-Americans completed secondary school, and even fewer attended university, it is interesting to consider the gaps in attendance rates across the Canada-US border. Table 10 shows that there was a very substantial gap for second and higher generation Franco-Americans, especially women. These Franco-Americans were about twice as likely to have had some post-secondary education as were French Canadians in Quebec in 1971.

Patterns of inter-ethnic marriage are more the province of sociologists and demographers than of economists. However, Table 11 is our attempt to compare the marriage patterns of FrancoAmericans, Italian-Americans, and Irish-Americans. It is not surprising that Franco-Americans were less likely to inter-marry than Irish Americans. Some Irish Americans were Protestant, so would have

[^13]found it easy to find a non-Irish Protestant spouse. Whatever their religious affiliation, we would expect second generation Irish to be more like "ordinary Americans" and thus more likely to have inter-married.

Franco-American women of each generation were more likely to have married men of other ethnic backgrounds than were Italian-American women. In the first generation, we would expect the surplus of Italian men to Italian women and the relative balance of francophone men and women to produce this result. It is not so clear why the pattern would persist across generations, even if there was some tendency for Italian-born men to marry the U.S. born daughters of other Italian immigrants. Another interpretation of the first column of Table 11 suggests an intriguing contrast with the results of Tables 5, 7 and 8. In terms of schooling, it looks like the Italian-American women assimilated to U.S. patterns faster than did Franco-Americans. Did Italian-American women nonetheless lead more restricted lives than Franco-American women and therefore meet fewer potential partners from other ethnic groups or face greater family pressure to marry an Italian?

Table 12 is a first attempt to look at child-bearing, another characteristic that we expect to change with immigrant assimilation. Given that there may have been differences in age at marriage across groups, attention is focused on the women in the three oldest categories, who would be reporting lifetime total births. The Franco-American women in the top panel do not show the kind of assimilation pattern we think we see at least for the oldest Italian-American women. We expected immigrant women to have had more children than US anglos. We expected US born women of immigrant parents to have had more children than US anglos, but fewer children than immigrant women. We did NOT expect US born francophone daughters of US born parents to have clearly higher fertility levels than US anglos. This, however, is the case for the older francophone women. ${ }^{19}$ Learning more about the interplay between women's employment histories and their total family size
is clearly important: it may be that the U.S. born children of U.S. born parents had less need to spend as many years in the labour force.

While we are quite puzzled by the results in the top two panels of Table 12, the third panel clearly establishes that Franco-American women not only had much more schooling than French Canadian women, they also had much smaller families. As with the top panel, we see that there doesn't seem to have been much of a gradient across generations in the U.S. The older FrancoAmericans had fewer children than the older French-Canadians. By contrast, the youngest FrancoAmericans had more children than the French-Canadians. The social changes in 1960s Quebec seem not to have had an impact in New England.

One form of assimilation is to take the nationality of the country you live in. A more active form of participating in the new country is to join its armed forces. As the U.S. armed forces have relied heavily on compulsory military service, it is not clear to what extent veteran status can be interpreted as a sign of voluntary acceptance of the new country as "your" country. However, young men have had some control over whether they served or not. We expected lower proportions of veterans to be found among the Canadian born: a good many of these men would not have entered the US until they were past the prime military ages. We are also not sure how likely non-citizens were to be drafted. However, the US born of Canadian born parents (so citizens by birth), were generally less likely to serve than US anglos. We think that the contrast between the two oldest age categories (born in 1905 or earlier, and born 1906-1915) and the 1916-1925 age group is an effect of the Second World War. Presumably most men born in between 1916 and 1925 were liable to be called up. Somewhat older men were likely eligible to volunteer but either would not have been drafted or would have been more able to get an exemption if called up. [Reference on military service in US in WWII??] If our assumptions are correct, then it looks like second generation Franco-Americans were less willing to

[^14]volunteer for military service. The behaviour of Franco-American US born men with US born parents seems to have been virtually the same as that of US anglos.

We are still trying to figure out if we can compare military service patterns of FrancoAmericans and French Canadians.

## 6 Conclusions

There was considerable clerical and political opposition to the emigration of French Canadians to New England. There was much more concern about the assimilation of those who moved to Protestant or totally secular patterns of living. Using census evidence, we are able to trace how people lived, not just what they or their social superiors thought and wrote about changing lifestyles. At the same time that the New York Times editorialists inveighed against the un-assimilable French Canadians, individuals were changing their habits in many ways. Some of the changes may have been made reluctantly and with a sense of guilt. A fictional emigrant (who had only two children), upon confessing to his cousins in rural Quebec that he had changed his surname from Larivière to Rivers reflected (Ringuet, 1940, p. 141):

But if you changed your family name, the one you inherited from a long line of ancestors, it was a bit like repudiating your descent and stripping the name of its honourable reputation for hard work and persistence in the face of every obstacle, which generations of the family had built up. And if going off to the United States was a kind of desertion in any case ... this final surrender was in some ways a denial as bad as St. Peter's, an act of treason like the treason of Judas.

Despite the proximity of Quebec and the network of institutions designed to extend the reach of French Quebec into New England, even those Franco-Americans who stayed in New England and identified themselves as having French as a mother tongue or French Canada as their ancestral origin did eventually assimilate. This was a slow process, but it appears to now be effectively complete. The "American Way" had a powerful influence on even this group of immigrants. We see no reason to conclude that migrants from within North America do not assimilate.
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Figure 1. Distribution of Year of Arrival in the U.S.


Figure 2. Educational Attainment
Source: 1970 U.S. Census


Figure 3a. School Attendance Rates by Age: Males Source: 1910 U.S. Census


Figure 3b. Literacy Rates by Age: Males


Figure 3c. School Attendance Rates by Age: Females


Figure 3d. Literacy Rates by Age: Females
Source: 1910 U.S. Census


Figure 4a. School Attendance Rates by Age: Males
Source: 1940 U.S. Census and 1941 CDN Census


2nd generation defined as: head of family born in the US for US Anglos or French Canada for French Canadians (with child born in the U.S.)

Figure 4b. School Attendance Rates by Age: Females
Source: 1940 U.S. Census and 1941 CDN Census

___ English-Speaking White American
----- 2nd Generation Franco American
........... Females-Trois Rivieres
2nd generation defined as: head of family born in the US for US Anglos
or French Canada for French Canadians (with child born in the U.S.)

Figure 5a. School Attendance Rates by Age: Males

___ English-Speaking White Americans
----- French-Speakers Born in CAN or with CDN Born Parents
............ French-Speakers with US Born Parents

Figure 5b. School Attendance Rates by Age: Females
Source: 1970 U.S. Census


Figure 5c. Public School Attendance Rates by Age
Source: 1970 U.S. Census- Conditional on Attending Any School

—_ English-Speaking White Americans
----- French-Speakers Born in CAN or with CDN Born Parents
............ French-Speakers with US Born Parents

Figure 5d. Parochial School Attendance Rates by Age

__ English-Speaking White Americans
----- French-Speakers Born in CAN or with CDN Born Parents
........... French-Speakers with US Born Parents

Figure 6a. School Attendance Rates by Age: Males


Figure 6b. School Attendance Rates by Age: Females
Source: 2000 U.S. Census


Figure 6c. Public School Attendance Rates by Age
Source: 2000 U.S. Census- Conditional on Attending Any School

__ US Born Not of French Canadian Origin
----- 1st/2nd Ancestry Reported: Fr. Canadian

Figure 6d. Private School Attendance Rates
Source: 1970 \& 2000 U.S. Census- Conditional on Attending Any School

-_ 1970, non-Franco
----- 1970, Franco/U.S. Born Parents
........... 2000, non-Franco

-     -         - 2000, Fr. Can. Ancestry

Figure 7a. Educational Attainment of Fathers and Sons-All of U.S.
Source: 1970 U.S. Census


Sons: Sample members aged 25-34 Fathers: Sample members aged 55-64
Ethnic groups are defined by language/race/ birthplace/father's birthplace

Figure 7b. Educational Attainment of Fathers and Sons-New England Source: 1970 U.S. Census


Sons: Sample members aged 25-34 Fathers: Sample members aged 55-64
Ethnic groups are defined by language/race/ birthplace/father's birthplace

Figure 7c. Educational Attainment of Fathers and Sons-New England Source: 1970 U.S. Census


Sons: Sample members aged 35-44 Fathers: Sample members aged 65-74
Ethnic groups are defined by language/race/ birthplace/father's birthplace

Figure 7d. Educational Attainment of Fathers and Sons-New England Source: 1970 U.S. Census


Sons: Sample members aged 45-54 Fathers: Sample members aged 75-84
Ethnic groups are defined by language/race/ birthplace/father's birthplace

Table 1A. Fraction of New England States Residents Reporting French as Mother Tongue by Age.
Source. 1970 U.S. Census

| Age Group | All Fr. Speakers | Canadian Born | U.S. Born w. Both <br> Parents Cdn-Born | U.S. Born w. Both <br> Parents U.S. Born | Other <br> Fr.-Americans |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $25-34$ | 0.0861 | 0.0106 | 0.0085 | 0.0484 | 0.0186 |
| $35-44$ | 0.1006 | 0.0091 | 0.0181 | 0.0461 | 0.0273 |
| $45-54$ | 0.1033 | 0.0149 | 0.0249 | 0.0358 | 0.0276 |
| $55-64$ | 0.1052 | 0.0217 | 0.0338 | 0.0232 | 0.0265 |
| $65+$ | 0.1018 | 0.0345 | 0.0331 | 0.0161 | 0.0181 |
| Total | 0.0991 | 0.0178 | 0.0231 | 0.0346 | 0.0236 |

Notes. All French-Speakers who do not originate from Canada or whose parents were not born in Canada or the U.S. were deleted (fraction goes from $9.91 \%$ to $9.84 \%$ if coded as non franco.)

Table 1B. Frequency Distribution of Franco-American Residents by Age and Nativity Status.

| Age Group | Canadian Born | U.S. Born with Both <br> Parents Canadian-Born | U.S. Born with Both <br> Parents U.S. Born | Other <br> Franco-Americans |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $25-34$ | 0.1234 | 0.0987 | 0.5624 | 0.2154 |
| $35-44$ | 0.0904 | 0.1801 | 0.4579 | 0.2715 |
| $45-54$ | 0.1446 | 0.2409 | 0.3470 | 0.2675 |
| $55-64$ | 0.2066 | 0.3210 | 0.2201 | 0.2522 |
| $65+$ | 0.3386 | 0.3253 | 0.1581 | 0.1779 |
| Total | 0.1796 | 0.2333 | 0.3492 | 0.2379 |

Table 2A. Fraction of New England States Residents Reporting Italian as Mother Tongue by Age.
Source. 1970 U.S. Census

| Age Group | All Ital. Speakers | Ital. Born | U.S. Born w. Both <br> Parents Ital.-Born | U.S. Born w. Both <br> Parents U.S. Born | Other <br> Ital.-Americans. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $25-34$ | 0.0535 | 0.0089 | 0.0102 | 0.0210 | 0.0134 |
| $35-44$ | 0.0763 | 0.0089 | 0.0413 | 0.0071 | 0.0191 |
| $45-54$ | 0.1005 | 0.0101 | 0.0764 | 0.0020 | 0.0120 |
| $55-64$ | 0.0941 | 0.0210 | 0.0652 | 0.0009 | 0.0070 |
| $65+$ | 0.0719 | 0.0511 | 0.0159 | 0.0002 | 0.0039 |
| Total | 0.0787 | 0.0195 | 0.0413 | 0.0065 | 0.0113 |

Table 2B. Frequency Distribution of Italian Residents by Age and Nativity Status.
Source. 1970 U.S. Census

| Age Group | Italian Born | U.S. Born with <br> Italian-Born Parents | U.S. Born with <br> U.S. Born Parents | Other <br> Italian-Americans |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $25-34$ | 0.1659 | 0.1915 | 0.3921 | 0.2504 |
| $35-44$ | 0.1164 | 0.5409 | 0.0926 | 0.2501 |
| $45-54$ | 0.1005 | 0.7602 | 0.0196 | 0.1198 |
| $55-64$ | 0.2231 | 0.6928 | 0.0092 | 0.0749 |
| $65+$ | 0.7185 | 0.2233 | 0.0030 | 0.0552 |
| Total | 0.2476 | 0.5253 | 0.0832 | 0.1440 |

Table 3. Years of Schooling of French-Speaking Residents vs. Native English-Speaking White Americans. Source. 1970 U.S. Census: New England Residents

Panel A: Men

| Age Group | All French Speakers | Canadian Born | U.S. Born with <br> Can.-Born Parents | U.S. Born with <br> U.S. Born Parents | Eng.-Speaking <br> White Americans |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $25-34$ | 11.22 | 8.94 | 11.21 | 11.50 | 12.55 |
| $35-44$ | 10.34 | 8.60 | 10.17 | 10.51 | 12.12 |
| $45-54$ | 9.72 | 8.43 | 9.38 | 10.12 | 11.50 |
| $55-64$ | 8.75 | 7.90 | 8.57 | 9.14 | 10.62 |
| $65+$ | 7.47 | 6.65 | 7.61 | 7.85 | 9.13 |

Panel B: Women

| Age Group | All French Speakers | Canadian Born | U.S. Born with <br> Can.-Born Parents | U.S. Born with <br> U.S. Born Parents | Eng.-Speaking <br> White Americans |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $25-34$ | 11.14 | 9.78 | 10.89 | 11.38 | 12.33 |
| $35-44$ | 10.39 | 9.06 | 10.23 | 10.70 | 11.82 |
| $45-54$ | 9.83 | 9.04 | 9.57 | 10.20 | 11.38 |
| $55-64$ | 8.80 | 8.08 | 8.70 | 9.25 | 10.69 |
| $65+$ | 7.62 | 7.03 | 7.86 | 8.09 | 9.31 |

Table 4. Proportion of Schoolchildren Attending Parochial Schools, 1908

| Father's Race | Boston | Fall River | Lowell | Manchester | Providence |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| French-Canadian <br> $[\mathrm{N}]$ | 19 | 66 | 68 | 61 | 42 |
| $[912]$ | $[5,016]$ | $[3,412]$ | $[1,525]$ | $[1,072]$ |  |
| Polish |  |  | 40 | 93 |  |
| $[\mathrm{~N}]$ |  |  | $[222]$ | $[193]$ |  |
| South Italian | 12 |  |  |  | 2 |
| $[\mathrm{~N}]$ | $[6,013]$ |  |  |  | $[1,033]$ |
| Portuguese |  | 2 |  |  |  |
| $[\mathrm{~N}]$ |  | $[1,850]$ |  |  |  |

Notes. Source: The Children of Immigrants in Schools, Vols. 30-32 of the Immigration Commission reports. The Immigration Commission collected information on school attendance for a day in December, 1908, for several cities, for children aged 3 to 20 at public or parochial schools. We show proportions of schoolchildren attending parochial schools. As many parochial schools offered only grades $1-8$, this measure understates the proportion of children with French Canadian fathers who were attending parochial schools. The total number of children attending either public or parochial schools is shown in brackets. It is not possible to separate out which children were attending bilingual schools from those attending English language parochial schools.

Table 5. Educational Attainment of Franco-Americans vs English-Speaking White Americans

Panel A: Men

|  | Dep. Var.: Years of Schooling |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All | All | $25-34$ | $35-44$ | $45-54$ | $55-64$ | $65+$ |
| First-Generation | -3.55 | -3.55 | -3.80 | -3.96 | -3.54 | -3.25 | -3.56 |
| Immigrants | $(0.11)$ | $(0.16)$ | $(0.27)$ | $(0.34)$ | $(0.23)$ | $(0.24)$ | $(0.21)$ |
| U.S. Born with | -2.42 | -2.23 | -1.62 | -1.89 | -2.70 | -2.66 | -2.68 |
| Canadian-Born Parents | $(0.09)$ | $(0.14)$ | $(0.31)$ | $(0.22)$ | $(0.18)$ | $(0.18)$ | $(0.20)$ |
| U.S. Born with | -1.77 | -1.56 | -1.17 | -1.92 | -1.91 | -2.28 | -2.39 |
| U.S. Born Parents | $(0.07)$ | $(0.11)$ | $(0.13)$ | $(0.14)$ | $(0.16)$ | $(0.21)$ | $(0.30)$ |
| Other Franco-Americans | -1.72 | -1.49 | -1.01 | -1.76 | -1.86 | -2.01 | -1.87 |
|  | $(0.09)$ | $(0.14)$ | $(0.21)$ | $(0.18)$ | $(0.17)$ | $(0.20)$ | $(0.26)$ |
| Age Dummies | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| State Dummies | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| County Group Dummies | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No |
| Labor Force Status Dummies | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Adjusted $R^{2}$ | 0.160 | 0.179 | 0.050 | 0.096 | 0.120 | 0.109 | 0.123 |
| N | 35,822 | 16,176 | 9,134 | 8,161 | 7,591 | 5,763 | 5,173 |

Panel B: Women

|  | Dep. Var.: Years of Schooling |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All | All | $25-34$ | $35-44$ | $45-54$ | $55-64$ | $65+$ |
| First-Generation | -3.13 | -2.98 | -2.70 | -2.86 | -2.75 | -3.51 | -3.40 |
| Immigrants | $(0.08)$ | $(0.12)$ | $(0.21)$ | $(0.24)$ | $(0.18)$ | $(0.19)$ | $(0.14)$ |
| U.S. Born with | -2.53 | -2.54 | -1.92 | -1.82 | -2.51 | -2.74 | -2.94 |
| Canadian-Born Parents | $(0.07)$ | $(0.10)$ | $(0.24)$ | $(0.17)$ | $(0.14)$ | $(0.15)$ | $(0.15)$ |
| U.S. Born with | -1.70 | -1.55 | -1.21 | -1.51 | -1.74 | -2.25 | -2.73 |
| U.S. Born Parents | $(0.06)$ | $(0.09)$ | $(0.10)$ | $(0.11)$ | $(0.12)$ | $(0.18)$ | $(0.22)$ |
| Other Franco-Americans | -1.97 | -1.71 | -1.14 | -1.54 | -1.97 | -2.31 | -2.83 |
|  | $(0.07)$ | $(0.11)$ | $(0.17)$ | $(0.14)$ | $(0.13)$ | $(0.17)$ | $(0.19)$ |
| Age Dummies | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| State Dummies | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| County Group Dummies | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No |
| Labor Force Status Dummies | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Adjusted $R^{2}$ | 0.181 | 0.194 | 0.071 | 0.077 | 0.115 | 0.140 | 0.150 |
| N | 41,365 | 18,592 | 9,450 | 8,511 | 8,284 | 6,704 | 8,416 |

Notes. Standard errors in parenthesis. Data source: 1970 U.S. Census ( $15 \%$ form, State and Metro samples). County group identifiers are available only in "Metro" sample. Sample includes New England residents only.

Table 6. Educational Attainment of Franco-Americans vs English-Speaking White Americans by Age: 2000 Census

| Panel A: Men |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All | All | $25-34$ | $35-44$ | $45-54$ | $55-64$ | $65+$ |
| First Reported Ancestry: | -0.56 |  | -0.21 | -0.42 | -0.50 | -0.71 | -1.04 |
| French Canadian | $(0.02)$ |  | $(0.05)$ | $(0.04)$ | $(0.05)$ | $(0.07)$ | $(0.07)$ |
| 2nd Reported Ancestry: |  | 0.16 | 0.34 | 0.07 | 0.01 | 0.08 | 0.43 |
| French-Canadian |  | $(0.06)$ | $(0.11)$ | $(0.10)$ | $(0.13)$ | $(0.20)$ | $(0.26)$ |
| N | 217,415 | 217,415 | 40,757 | 55,228 | 49,577 | 30,777 | 41,076 |

Panel B: Women

|  | Dep. Var.: Years of Schooling |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All | All | $25-34$ | $35-44$ | $45-54$ | $55-64$ | $65+$ |
| First Reported Ancestry: | -0.46 |  | 0.02 | -0.23 | -0.46 | -0.51 | -1.03 |
| French Canadian | $(0.02)$ |  | $(0.04)$ | $(0.04)$ | $(0.05)$ | $(0.06)$ | $(0.05)$ |
| 1st or 2nd Reported Ancestry: |  | 0.20 | 0.21 | 0.14 | 0.06 | 0.17 | 0.67 |
| French-Canadian |  | $(0.05)$ | $(0.10)$ | $(0.08)$ | $(0.11)$ | $(0.15)$ | $(0.19)$ |
| N | 244,914 | 244,914 | 43,242 | 58,378 | 51,576 | 32,492 | 59,226 |

Controls include age, state, metropolitan area, and labor force status dummies. Sample includes new England residents only.

Table 7. Educational Attainment of Italian-Americans vs English-Speaking White Americans

Panel A: Men

|  | Dep. Var.: Years of Schooling |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All | All | $25-34$ | $35-44$ | $45-54$ | $55-64$ | $65+$ |
| First-Generation | -4.55 | -4.71 | -4.14 | -5.04 | -3.52 | -4.12 | -4.96 |
| Immigrants | $(0.09)$ | $(0.13)$ | $(0.26)$ | $(0.34)$ | $(0.26)$ | $(0.22)$ | $(0.15)$ |
| U.S. Born with | -1.56 | -1.67 | -0.56 | -1.89 | -1.55 | -1.87 | -2.41 |
| Italian-Born Parents | $(0.07)$ | $(0.10)$ | $(0.26)$ | $(0.22)$ | $(0.10)$ | $(0.13)$ | $(0.27)$ |
| U.S. Born with | -0.13 | -0.33 | -0.09 | -1.92 | -0.19 | 0.26 | -0.27 |
| U.S. Born Parents | $(0.15)$ | $(0.21)$ | $(0.18)$ | $(0.14)$ | $(0.60)$ | $(1.12)$ | $(1.99)$ |
| Other Italian-Americans | -0.87 | -0.82 | -0.20 | -1.76 | -1.19 | -0.84 | -3.27 |
|  | $(0.12)$ | $(0.17)$ | $(0.24)$ | $(0.18)$ | $(0.24)$ | $(0.44)$ | $(0.52)$ |
| Age Dummies | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| State Dummies | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| County Group Dummies | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No |
| Labor Force Status Dummies | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Adjusted $R^{2}$ | 0.179 | 0.204 | 0.043 | 0.082 | 0.086 | 0.104 | 0.223 |
| N | 35,501 | 16,307 | 8,846 | 7,964 | 7,808 | 5,752 | 5,131 |

Panel B: Women

|  | Dep. Var.: Years of Schooling |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All | All | $25-34$ | $35-44$ | $45-54$ | $55-64$ | $65+$ |
| First-Generation | -5.62 | -5.68 | -5.32 | -5.14 | -4.61 | -5.01 | -6.10 |
| Immigrants | $(0.08)$ | $(0.11)$ | $(0.24)$ | $(0.24)$ | $(0.22)$ | $(0.20)$ | $(0.13)$ |
| U.S. Born with | -1.75 | -1.88 | -0.66 | -1.13 | -1.51 | -2.42 | -2.83 |
| Italian-Born Parents | $(0.14)$ | $(0.08)$ | $(0.21)$ | $(0.11)$ | $(0.08)$ | $(0.11)$ | $(0.21)$ |
| U.S. Born with | -0.41 | -0.38 | -0.27 | -0.51 | -1.25 | -0.75 | -2.37 |
| U.S. Born Parents | $(0.14)$ | $(0.20)$ | $(0.15)$ | $(0.29)$ | $(0.46)$ | $(1.14)$ | $(2.19)$ |
| Other Italian-Americans | -1.34 | -1.50 | -0.65 | -0.86 | -1.24 | -2.91 | -3.62 |
|  | $(0.10)$ | $(0.14)$ | $(0.18)$ | $(0.16)$ | $(0.20)$ | $(0.30)$ | $(0.41)$ |
| Age Dummies | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| State Dummies | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| County Group Dummies | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No |
| Labor Force Status Dummies | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Adjusted $R^{2}$ | 0.221 | 0.235 | 0.082 | 0.077 | 0.096 | 0.168 | 0.264 |
| N | 40,206 | 18,592 | 9,057 | 8,337 | 8,243 | 6,634 | 7,935 |

Notes. Standard errors in parenthesis. Data source: 1970 U.S. Census ( $15 \%$ form, State and Metro samples). County group identifiers are available only in "Metro"
sample. Sample includes New England residents only.

Table 8. Educational Attainment of Franco-Americans and Italian-Americans in 1940

Panel A: Men

|  | Dependent Var: Years of Schooling |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age | $25-34$ |  |  | 35-44 |  | 45-54 |
| Base Group | U.S. Born | N. England | U.S. Born | N. England | U.S. Born | N. England |
|  | Anglo | Born Anglo | Anglo | Born Anglo | Anglo | Born Anglo |
| First-Generation | -2.75 | -2.65 | -3.14 | -3.45 | -3.45 | -3.35 |
| Franco-Americans | $(0.26)$ | $(0.26)$ | $(0.22)$ | $(0.22)$ | $(0.23)$ | $(0.23)$ |
| First-Generation | -3.27 | -3.14 | -4.75 | -4.57 | -5.40 | -5.28 |
| Italian-Americans | $(0.27)$ | $(0.26)$ | $(0.19)$ | $(0.18)$ | $(0.16)$ | $(0.16)$ |
| Second Generation | -2.28 | -2.18 | -2.11 | -1.96 | -2.32 | -2.20 |
| Franco-Americans | $(0.15)$ | $(0.15)$ | $(0.18)$ | $(0.18)$ | $(0.24)$ | $(0.23)$ |
| Second-Generation | -1.78 | -1.63 | -1.45 | -1.26 | -1.04 | -0.92 |
| Italian-Americans | $(0.16)$ | $(0.24)$ | $(0.31)$ | $(0.30)$ | $(0.75)$ | $(0.73)$ |
| Age Dummies | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| State Dummies | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Labor Force Status Dummies | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Adjusted $R^{2}$ | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.30 | 0.31 |
| N | 4,586 | 4,264 | 4,144 | 3,782 | 3,463 | 3,167 |

Panel B: Women

| $\begin{gathered} \text { Age } \\ \text { Base Group } \end{gathered}$ | Dependent Var: Years of Schooling |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 25-34 |  | 35-44 |  | 45-54 |  |
|  | U.S. Born Anglo | N. England Born Anglo | U.S. Born Anglo | N. England Born Anglo | U.S. Born Anglo | N. England Born Anglo |
| First-Generation | -3.26 | -3.17 | -2.73 | -2.64 | -3.47 | -3.44 |
| Franco-Americans | (0.22) | (0.21) | (0.21) | (0.20) | (0.21) | (0.21) |
| First-Generation | -4.28 | -4.17 | -5.36 | -5.21 | -6.09 | -6.03 |
| Italian-Americans | (0.25) | (0.24) | (0.17) | (0.17) | (0.16) | (0.16) |
| Second Generation | -2.38 | -2.31 | -2.53 | -2.44 | -2.71 | -2.67 |
| Franco-Americans | (0.14) | (0.14) | (0.16) | (0.15) | (0.20) | (0.20) |
| Second-Generation | -2.16 | -2.06 | -2.26 | -2.11 | -1.53 | -1.43 |
| Italian-Americans | (0.14) | (0.13) | (0.26) | (0.26 | (0.62) | (0.61) |
| Age Dummies | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| State Dummies | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Labor Force Status Dummies | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Adjusted $R^{2}$ | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.25 | 0.26 | 0.35 | 0.37 |
| N | 4,980 | 4,616 | 4,472 | 4,109 | 3,559 | 3,247 |

Source: 1940 U.S. Census. Other controls include dummies for living on a farm, and living in a metropolitan area. "Second Generation" Italian/Franco-American defined as follows: sample line in household has Italian/French as mother tongue, and is a relative of the head of the household. If sample line individual is not related to head (is a servant, lodger, etc.), then only sample line individual is recorded as having Italian/French mother tongue. All others in household have mother tongue listed as unknown. To be classed as second generation Italian/Franco-American, sample line individual must be born in U.S., and have implied family mother tongue Italian/French. Thus some 3rd generation immigrants could be included, if family is still Italian/French. Some 2nd generation immigrants will be omitted: if a child with English as mother tongue is sample line individual, then family not classified as Italian/French speaking. "US Anglo" defined as US born person, living in household where English is the mother tongue of the sample line individual, and the sample line individual is related to the head of the household. Thus US born children of Canadian or British parents will generally be counted as US Anglos. Approximately $75 \%$ of the sample line individuals defined as "US Anglos" had parents born in the US.

Table 9. Educational Attainment of Franco-Americans vs French-Canadians in Quebec

| Panel A: Men |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Dep. Var.: Years of Schooling |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | All | $25-34$ | $35-44$ | $45-54$ | $55-64$ | $65+$ |  |
| First-Generation | 0.03 | -1.14 | -0.47 | 0.30 | 0.42 | 0.40 |  |
| Immigrants | $(0.09)$ | $(0.22)$ | $(0.26)$ | $(0.20)$ | $(0.21)$ | $(0.18)$ |  |
| U.S. Born with | 1.06 | 1.29 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 0.95 | 1.18 |  |
| Canaian-Born Parents | $(0.08)$ | $(0.24)$ | $(0.18)$ | $(0.16)$ | $(0.17)$ | $(0.18)$ |  |
| U.S. Born with | 1.55 | 1.47 | 1.46 | 1.87 | 1.47 | 1.30 |  |
| U.S. Born Parents | $(0.07)$ | $(0.11)$ | $(0.12)$ | $(0.14)$ | $(0.20)$ | $(0.24)$ |  |
| Other Franco-Americans | 1.78 | 1.86 | 1.68 | 1.99 | 1.62 | 1.75 |  |
|  | $(0.08)$ | $(0.17)$ | $(0.15)$ | $(0.16)$ | $(0.19)$ | $(0.22)$ |  |
| Adjusted $R^{2}$ | 0.186 | 0.097 | 0.094 | 0.110 | 0.069 | 0.073 |  |
| N | 17,722 | 5,032 | 4,544 | 4,227 | 3,137 | 2,782 |  |

Panel B: Women

|  | Dep. Var.: Years of Schooling |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All | $25-34$ | $35-44$ | $45-54$ | $55-64$ | $65+$ |
| First-Generation | 0.38 | 0.08 | 0.28 | 0.87 | 0.38 | 0.07 |
| Immigrants | $(0.07)$ | $(0.19)$ | $(0.21)$ | $(0.17)$ | $(0.16)$ | $(0.13)$ |
| U.S. Born with | 1.12 | 1.37 | 1.42 | 1.36 | 0.86 | 0.79 |
| Canadian-Born Parents | $(0.07)$ | $(0.21)$ | $(0.16)$ | $(0.14)$ | $(0.14)$ | $(0.13)$ |
| U.S. Born with | 1.73 | 1.87 | 1.88 | 2.08 | 1.48 | 0.87 |
| U.S. Born Parents | $(0.06)$ | $(0.10)$ | $(0.11)$ | $(0.12)$ | $(0.17)$ | $(0.17)$ |
| Other Franco-Americans | 1.55 | 1.89 | 1.61 | 1.90 | 1.43 | 0.80 |
|  | $(0.06)$ | $(0.15)$ | $(0.13)$ | $(0.13)$ | $(0.16)$ | $(0.17)$ |
| Adjusted $R^{2}$ | 0.204 | 0.147 | 0.130 | 0.145 | 0.085 | 0.057 |
| N | 21,891 | 5,116 | 4,656 | 4,613 | 3,571 | 3,935 |

Notes. Sources: 1970 U.S. Census and 1971 Canadian Census.
Dummies for age and labor force status are included.

Table 10. Having at Least Some College/Univ.: FrancoAmericans in New England vs French-Canadians in Quebec

Panel A: Men

|  | Dep. Var.: Some College+ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All | $25-34$ | $35-44$ | $45-54$ | $55-64$ | $65+$ |
| First-Generation | -0.029 | -0.100 | -0.055 | -0.017 | -0.008 | 0.001 |
| Immigrants | $(0.008)$ | $(0.019)$ | $(0.020)$ | $(0.016)$ | $(0.015)$ | $(0.012)$ |
| U.S. Born with | 0.004 | 0.023 | 0.021 | 0.001 | -0.0143 | 0.008 |
| Canadian-Born Parents | $(0.008)$ | $(0.031)$ | $(0.020)$ | $(0.014)$ | $(0.012)$ | $(0.012)$ |
| U.S. Born with | 0.040 | 0.049 | 0.056 | 0.035 | 0.022 | 0.031 |
| U.S. Born Parents | $(0.007)$ | $(0.015)$ | $(0.014)$ | $(0.014)$ | $(0.016)$ | $(0.019)$ |
| Other Franco-Americans | 0.057 | 0.099 | 0.067 | 0.066 | 0.018 | 0.018 |
|  | $(0.009)$ | $(0.024)$ | $(0.018)$ | $(0.017)$ | $(0.015)$ | $(0.016)$ |
| N | 19,610 | 5,032 | 4,544 | 4,227 | 3,137 | 2,670 |

Panel B: Women

|  | Dep. Var.: Some College+ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All | $25-34$ | $35-44$ | $45-54$ | $55-64$ | $65+$ |
| First-Generation | 0.009 | 0.036 | 0.013 | 0.026 | 0.010 | -0.000 |
| Immigrants | $(0.007)$ | $(0.024)$ | $(0.020)$ | $(0.016)$ | $(0.012)$ | $(0.007)$ |
| U.S. Born with | 0.018 | 0.001 | -0.007 | 0.019 | 0.019 | 0.031 |
| Canadian-Born Parents | $(0.006)$ | $(0.065)$ | $(0.013)$ | $(0.013)$ | $(0.012)$ | $(0.010)$ |
| U.S. Born with | 0.044 | 0.065 | 0.038 | 0.049 | 0.053 | 0.020 |
| U.S. Born Parents | $(0.005)$ | $(0.012)$ | $(0.011)$ | $(0.012)$ | $(0.017)$ | $(0.013)$ |
| Other Franco-Americans | 0.049 | 0.064 | 0.045 | 0.043 | 0.060 | 0.042 |
|  | $(0.006)$ | $(0.019)$ | $(0.011)$ | $(0.013)$ | $(0.016)$ | $(0.015)$ |
| N | 21,648 | 5,116 | 4,656 | 4,613 | 3,571 | 3,692 |

Notes. Sources: 1970 U.S. Census and 1971 Canadian Census. Dummies for age and labor force status are included.

Table 11. Incidence of Marriage Outside of the Ethnic Group Source: 1970 U.S. Census

|  | Dep. Var.: Spouse is from different ethnic group |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | vs. Italian-Americans |  |  | vs. Irish-Americans |
|  | Females | Males | Females | Males |
| First-Generation | 0.185 | -0.006 | -0.166 | -0.067 |
| Immigrants | $(0.028)$ | $(0.032)$ | $(0.048)$ | $(0.055)$ |
| N | 793 | 1,010 | 627 | 510 |
| U.S. Born with | 0.062 | -0.091 | -0.356 | -0.329 |
| Canadian-Born Parents | $(0.029)$ | $(0.028)$ | $(0.031)$ | $(0.030)$ |
| N | 1,873 | 2,097 | 1,141 | 1,198 |
| U.S. Born with | 0.082 | -0.091 |  |  |
| U.S. Born Parents | $(0.043)$ | $(0.041)$ |  |  |
| N | 1,224 | 1,208 |  |  |
| Other | -0.021 | -0.082 |  |  |
| Franco-Americans | $(0.037)$ | $(0.038)$ |  |  |
| N | 1,014 | 1,042 |  |  |

Note. Each line represents a separate probit which includes controls for age, state, and labour force status dummies. Ethnic group is defined by language for Italian-Americans and Franco-Americans and by being Irish-born or having both parents born in Ireland for the Irish-Americans.

Table 12. Number of Children Ever Born Among Females
Panel A: Franco-Americans vs White English Speaking Americans

|  | Dep. Var.: Number of Children Born Alive |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All | $25-34$ | $35-44$ | $45-54$ | $55-64$ | $65+$ |
| First-Generation | 0.66 | -0.11 | 0.26 | 0.34 | 0.81 | 1.08 |
| Immigrants | $(0.06)$ | $(0.12)$ | $(0.19)$ | $(0.14)$ | $(0.14)$ | $(0.10)$ |
| U.S. Born with | 0.41 | 0.42 | 0.29 | 0.17 | 0.35 | 0.79 |
| Canadian-Born Parents | $(0.05)$ | $(0.14)$ | $(0.14)$ | $(0.11)$ | $(0.11)$ | $(0.11)$ |
| U.S. Born with | 0.46 | 0.26 | 0.32 | 0.28 | 0.82 | 1.31 |
| U.S. Born Parents | $(0.04)$ | $(0.06)$ | $(0.009)$ | $(0.09)$ | $(0.13)$ | $(0.16)$ |
| Other | 0.27 | 0.27 | 0.01 | 0.09 | 0.24 | 0.92 |
| Franco-Americans | $(0.05)$ | $(0.10)$ | $(0.11)$ | $(0.10)$ | $(0.12)$ | $(0.14)$ |
| N | 41,365 | 9,450 | 8,511 | 8,284 | 6,704 | 8,416 |

Panel B: Italian-Americans vs. White English Speaking Americans

|  | Dep. Var.: Number of Children Born Alive |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All | $24-34$ | $35-44$ | $45-54$ | $55-64$ | $65+$ |
| First-Generation | 1.29 | 0.10 | -0.14 | 0.04 | 1.01 | 2.21 |
| Immigrants | $(0.06)$ | $(0.14)$ | $(0.19)$ | $(0.17)$ | $(0.14)$ | $(0.090)$ |
| U.S. Born with | -0.11 | -0.02 | -0.54 | -0.33 | 0.12 | 0.88 |
| Canadian-Born Parents | $(0.04)$ | $(0.12)$ | $(0.09)$ | $(0.06)$ | $(0.08)$ | $(0.15)$ |
| U.S. Born with | -0.00 | 0.01 | -0.32 | -0.14 | 0.94 | -0.72 |
| U.S. Born Parents | $(0.100)$ | $(0.09)$ | $(0.23)$ | $(0.35)$ | $(0.79)$ | $(1.52)$ |
| Other | -0.06 | -0.18 | -0.32 | -0.11 | 0.09 | 1.14 |
| Franco-Americans | $(0.07)$ | $(0.10)$ | $(0.12)$ | $(0.15)$ | $(0.21)$ | $(0.29)$ |
| N | 40,206 | 9,057 | 8,337 | 8,243 | 6,634 | 7,935 |

Notes to Panels A and B. Source: 1970 U.S. Census. Controls include age, state, and labor force status dummies.

Panel C: Franco-Americans vs French-Canadians

|  | Dep. Var.: Number of Children Born Alive |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All | $25-34$ | $35-44$ | $45-54$ | $55-64$ | $65+$ |
| First-Generation | -0.90 | 0.27 | -0.02 | -1.06 | -1.36 | -2.05 |
| Immigrants | $(0.07)$ | $(0.10)$ | $(0.17)$ | $(0.16)$ | $(0.16)$ | $(0.15)$ |
| U.S. Born with | -1.07 | 0.52 | -0.05 | -1.24 | -1.61 | -2.45 |
| Canadian-Born Parents | $(0.06)$ | $(0.11)$ | $(0.13)$ | $(0.14)$ | $(0.14)$ | $(0.16)$ |
| U.S. Born with | -0.44 | 0.58 | -0.07 | -1.10 | -1.10 | -1.81 |
| U.S. Born Parents | $(0.05)$ | $(0.05)$ | $(0.09)$ | $(0.12)$ | $(0.17)$ | $(0.20)$ |
| Other | -0.88 | 0.51 | -0.24 | -1.29 | -1.67 | -2.32 |
| Franco-Americans | $(0.06)$ | $(0.08)$ | $(0.11)$ | $(0.13)$ | $(0.16)$ | $(0.20)$ |
| N | 20,222 | 4,570 | 4,368 | 4,340 | 3,297 | 3,647 |

Notes. Sources: 1970 U.S. Census and 1971 Canadian Census.
Dummies for age and labor force status are included.

Table 13. Veteran Status Across Generations of Men
Franco-Americans vs White English-Speaking New Englanders

|  | Dep. Var.: Respondent Served in Armed Forces |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All | $24-34$ | $35-44$ | $45-54$ | $55-64$ | $65+$ |
| First-Generation | -0.269 | -0.366 | -0.477 | -0.237 | -0.137 | -0.144 |
| Immigrants | $(0.018)$ | $(0.035)$ | $(0.049)$ | $(0.039)$ | $(0.032)$ | $(0.025)$ |
| U.S. Born with | -0.075 | -0.105 | 0.009 | -0.038 | -0.113 | -0.085 |
| Canadian-Born Parents | $(0.016)$ | $(0.051)$ | $(0.028)$ | $(0.027)$ | $(0.025)$ | $(0.026)$ |
| U.S. Born with | 0.046 | 0.039 | -0.006 | -0.024 | 0.016 | -0.055 |
| U.S. Born Parents | $(0.012)$ | $(0.021)$ | $(0.019)$ | $(0.022)$ | $(0.033)$ | $(0.041)$ |
| Other | -0.033 | 0.018 | -0.040 | -0.013 | -0.063 | -0.043 |
| Franco-Americans | $(0.012)$ | $(0.034)$ | $(0.025)$ | $(0.024)$ | $(0.029)$ | $(0.036)$ |
| N | 35,790 | 9,134 | 8,161 | 7,591 | 5,763 | 5,141 |

Other controls include dummies for age, state, and labour force status.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ The authors wish to thank workshop participants at UBC and UC-Berkeley for valuable comments. Special thanks to David Card, David Lee, and Kevin Milligan for particularly insightful suggestions.

[^1]:    ${ }^{1 \text { ""Contemporary Mexican ... immigration is without precedent in U.S. history. The experience and lessons of past }}$ immigration have little relevance to understanding its dynamics and consequences. Mexican immigration differs from past immigration and most other contemporary immigration due to a combination of six factors: contiguity, scale, illegality, regional concentration, persistence, and historical presence" (p. 33).

[^2]:    ${ }^{2}$ Although see Trejo (2001) for a look at the intergenerational progress made by Mexicans of recent cohorts. We abstract from the experience of immigrants such as the Amish, who never intended to participate in the mainstream society in the way that most groups of immigrants did.

[^3]:    ${ }^{3}$ Concerns about the French Canadians remaining separate persisted for many years. In 1942, F.D. Roosevelt told Canadian Prime Minister Mackenzie King that he saw a need for greater assimilation of French Canadians in New England, although he felt there had been much progress in recent years (Bothwell (1992), p. 4).
    4 For Canada, we use racial origin French, not mother tongue, to define the French Canadian population.

[^4]:    ${ }^{5}$ Computations using the 1910 Census for the cities of Lowell, MA and Woonsocket, RI with population counts (using the person weights) of 121,158 and 31,733 respectively show that French Canadians accounted for $30.6 \%$ and $57.9 \%$, respectively, of those towns' population.

[^5]:    ${ }^{6}$ French Canadians were not only compared with Chinese. Another New York Times editorial (June 6, 1892) noted that "No other people, except the Indians, are so persistent at repeating themselves. Where they halt they stay, and where they stay they multiply and cover the earth."

[^6]:    ${ }^{7}$ According to the Immigration Commission, in 1908, almost $60 \%$ of the sampled French Canadian male employees living in the U.S. for ten years or more had made at least one trip home. Only $10 \%$ of Polish, $16 \%$ of Irish, and $32 \%$ of English men in the survey reported a visit to their native land (Immigration Commission, Vol. 20, pp. 983, 987, 993,1000).
    ${ }^{8}$ In 1908, of foreign born adult men in the U.S. for 10 years or more, $28 \%$ of the French Canadians were fully naturalized, while $40 \%$ of the Poles and $50 \%$ of the Other Canadians were U.S. citizens (Immigration Commission, Vol. 19, p. 189).

[^7]:    ${ }^{9}$ In 1941, over $40 \%$ of the men 25-34 in rural Quebec reported having attended school for at most six years.
    ${ }^{10}$ We exclude from the sample respondents who report having French as their mother tongue but who were born in any French-speaking country other than Canada. We also exclude those whose parents were born in a French-speaking country other than Canada. These sample limitations result in very few deleted observations - to be francophone in New England virtually always was to be of French Canadian descent.

[^8]:    ${ }^{11}$ Where mother tongue and birthplace are reported, the correlations between "French Canada" and mother tongue "French", and "Other Canada" as birthplace and mother tongue "English" are both high, but the correspondence is not exact. We think that some census takers considered "French Canada" as the equivalent of Quebec. Therefore Acadians and Franco-Ontarians were likely to appear as coming from "Other Canada", while Quebec Anglophones may appear as "French Canadians".

[^9]:    ${ }^{12}$ When the sample line individual in the household is a servant, lodger, or other non-relative, we cannot infer anything about ethnic origins, unless someone in the family group was born in French Canada.
    ${ }^{13}$ In Tables 1A and 2A, the omitted category is the U.S. born with one parent born in the U.S.

[^10]:    ${ }^{14}$ Need to compare \% of US born children of Italian or French Canadian parents who have English as mother tongue.

[^11]:    ${ }^{15}$ By age 10, girls were old enough to help their mothers and should have learned the basics of Roman Catholic doctrine.

[^12]:    ${ }^{16}$ We lack a micro sample of the Canadian census of 1941, and the published data do not separate school attendance by language group, so we use school participation rates in Trois-Rivières as representative of attendance patterns among the urban francophone population. Rates for Quebec City were almost identical to those found for Trois Rivières.
    ${ }^{17}$ We can estimate school participation rates in Quebec by area and mother tongue for 1901, thanks to the Canadian Families Project sample. We await the release of the new 1\% IPUMS sample of the 1900 US Census, which should provide a large enough sample of francophones in both countries to make comparisons of school participation rates across the border. In 1901, urban Quebec francophones were far more likely to attend school, especially at ages 13 to 16, than their rural peers. However, urban francophone attendance rates in 1901 were also well below the attendance rates for New England based francophones in 1910 shown in Figures 3a and b. There was progress within rural Quebec between 1901

[^13]:    ${ }^{18}$ In 1970/71, older people on both sides of the border may have felt the desire to inflate their stated number of years of education, given the rising educational standards around them (ref to Goldin). However, the estimates of years of education for the corresponding age groups in 1940/41 and 1970/71 match up quite closely. If people inflated their estimates of years at school, this seems to have happened by 1940/41.

[^14]:    ${ }^{19}$ In 1970, the number of Italian-American women over aged 65 with US born parents must have been tiny, as few Italians

