

The Economic Status of Americans of Southern and Eastern European Ancestry

United States Commission
on Civil Rights
Clearinghouse Publication 89
October 1986



U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights is an independent, bipartisan agency first established by Congress in 1957 and reestablished in 1983. It is directed to:

- Investigate complaints alleging that citizens are being deprived of their right to vote by reason of their race, color, religion, sex, age, handicap, or national origin, or by reason of fraudulent practices;
- Study and collect information concerning legal developments constituting discrimination or a denial of equal protection of the laws under the Constitution because of race, color, religion, sex, age, handicap, or national origin, or in the administration of justice;
- Appraise Federal laws and policies with respect to discrimination or denial of equal protection of the laws because of race, color, religion, sex, age, handicap, or national origin, or in the administration of justice;
- Serve as a national clearinghouse for information in respect to discrimination or denial of equal protection of the laws because of race, color, religion, sex, age, handicap, or national origin;
- Submit reports, findings, and recommendations to the President and the Congress.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

Clarence M. Pendleton, Jr., *Chairman*

Morris B. Abram, *Vice Chairman*

Mary Frances Berry

Esther Gonzalez-Arroyo Buckley

John H. Bunzel

Robert A. Destro

Francis S. Guess

Blandina Cardenas Ramirez

J. Al Latham, Jr., *Staff Director*

The Economic Status of Americans of Southern and Eastern European Ancestry

*United States Commission
on Civil Rights
Clearinghouse Publication 89
October 1986*

PREFACE

In 1978, during hearings on the Commission's reauthorization convened by the Senate Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on the Constitution, individuals representing the views of some Americans of Eastern and Southern European descent ("Euroethnics") delivered testimony suggesting that the Commission had neglected to observe its mandate to investigate alleged denials of equal protection of the law based on national origin.¹ These witnesses charged that the Commission had not attended to discrimination encountered by, for example, Poles, Italians, Greeks, and Lithuanians. They were concerned primarily with what they perceived to be stereotyping in the media, inadequate data collection by the Executive Branch (especially the Bureau of the Census), discrimination in employment, and "the potential disproportional impact of affirmative action programs and numerical remedies."²

In response to the criticism, the Congress adopted an amendment to the Commission's authorizing statute proposed by Senator Jesse Helms, directing the agency:

to continue to appraise the laws and policies of the Federal government with respect to denials of equal protection of the laws under the Constitution involving Americans who are members of Eastern- and Southern-European ethnic groups and . . . report its findings to the Congress. Such report shall include an analysis of the adverse consequences of affirmative action programs encouraged by the Federal Government upon the equal opportunity rights of these Americans.³

Background research to develop a study responsive to the Congress's request revealed that data necessary to conduct a statistical analysis of the impact of affirmative action were not readily available. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) and other Federal monitoring agencies do not routinely collect information on Euroethnic identification. As of this writing, no study has been able to measure the effect of affirmative action on whites generally or on

¹ See, e.g., *Civil Rights Commission Authorization Act of 1978: Hearings on S. 2300 before the Subcomm. on the Constitution of the Senate Comm. on the Judiciary*, 95th Cong., 1st and 2d Sess. 199 *et seq.* (1978) (statement of Leonard I. Walentynowicz, executive director, National Polish American Congress), 208 *et seq.* (statement of Jan. B. Sklenar, president, Masaryk Chapter, Detroit, Czechoslovak National Council of America), 252 *et seq.* (statement of Robert A. Destro, general counsel, Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights).

² Walentynowicz Testimony, *Commission Authorization Act of 1978: Hearings*, 203.

³ 42 U.S.C. §1975c.

Euroethnic groups individually. Bearing in mind what the Congress had desired to learn, Commission staff took what they judged to be the most appropriate way to approach the subject: to discover where Euroethnics stood, according to key social and economic indicators, in relation to Americans of other national and ethnic origins, particularly whites whose ancestors first immigrated to the United States. The answer to this question is an important first step in assessing whether members of Euroethnic groups encounter problems in the labor market—one of which might be legally proscribed discrimination.

The approach decided upon was to examine the data collected in the 1970 and 1980 Censuses of Population to determine the relative employment and income profile of specific Euroethnic groups compared to other white Americans, controlling for factors that might account for disparities—whether individuals were born in the U.S., English-speaking ability, age, region of residence, and educational level. Microdata samples from the 1980 census have been used to examine the relationship of Euroethnic ancestry to income and employment. These data are supplemented with information from the 1970 census, which included certain relevant questions not used in the 1980 census.

Given data limitations that preclude the drawing of sound, supportable conclusions about the connection between Euroethnic employment and income and affirmative action, it seems unlikely that a statistical economic analysis can fully meet the statutory requirement established by Congress. Nevertheless, we believe that the information presented in this report will prove useful to Members of Congress as well as to others concerned about the economic status of these groups. A second report of this project will examine other noneconomic dimensions of the issue, including an assessment of the legal and policy aspects of affirmative action as it relates to Euroethnics.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report was prepared by Harriet Orcutt Duleep and Hal Sider, a former employee, with contributions from James S. Cunningham, Martha Jones, and Lauren Weiner. Helpful comments on drafts of the report were also received from Caroline Davis Gleiter and Sally Knack Harriston. Appreciation also is extended to Audrey H. Wright, Ana Dew, and Cathy H. Somers who typed and helped prepare the manuscript.

The report was prepared under the overall supervision of June O'Neill, Assistant Staff Director, Office of Programs and Policy.

The following outside experts have provided valuable comments and advice on the report: Prof. Barry R. Chiswick, Department of Economics, University of Illinois at Chicago; Prof. Nathan Glazer, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University; Prof. Paul S. Kochanowski, Department of Economics, Indiana University—South Bend; Dr. John A. Kromkowski, president, National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs; Irving M. Levine, director, National Affairs, American Jewish Committee; Prof. William C. McCready, School for Social Service Administration, and senior research associate, Center for Urban Research and Policy Studies, University of Chicago; Jacob Mincer, Bottenwieser Professor of Economics and Human Relations, Columbia University; Prof. Donald E. Pienkos, Department of Political Science, University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee; Prof. Thad Radzilowski, director, Immigration History Research Center, University of Minnesota; and Stephan Thernstrom, Winthrop Professor of History, Harvard University. The assistance given by these experts is gratefully acknowledged.

CONTENTS

Executive Summary	1
Introduction	6
1. Historical Background	10
2. Euroethnics: Their Identification, Numbers, and Immigrant Population	18
3. Region of Residence, Age, and Education	24
4. The Employment and Earnings of Americans of Eastern and Southern European Ancestry	30
5. The Melting Pot Revisited	43
6. Conclusion	47
7. Recommendations	49
Statement of Commissioner Robert A. Destro	50
 Appendix A: Data Development	 55
Appendix B: Further Results from Regression Analysis	65

Executive Summary

This is the first of two reports responding to a congressional request concerning possible denial of equal protection under the law to Americans who are descendants of Eastern and Southern European immigrants and the potentially adverse consequences of affirmative action programs on these groups.¹ The congressional request was in part generated by the interest of Robert Destro, a member of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

This report presents an analysis of the current economic status of Eastern and Southern European ethnic groups to help provide some insight into the extent to which discrimination may have adversely affected this status. The second part of this project will examine the legal premises underlying affirmative action as it relates to these groups, as well as other policy-related aspects of the issue.

Definitions and Premises

Throughout this report the term "Euroethnics" is used to refer to Americans of Eastern and Southern European ancestry. It should be understood, however, that this term is extremely broad and covers many diverse ethnic groups. Where possible, the analysis looks at individual ethnic groups more narrowly defined.

There is no accepted rule defining the makeup of an ethnic group. In many cases, a recognizable ethnic group corresponds to a specific country. Other clearly recognizable groups do not readily conform to current national boundaries. The populations of some recognizable groups in the U.S. are so

small that analyzing them separately precludes statistical reliability. These groups have been aggregated on the basis of geographic proximity of the areas of origin. Based on these considerations, the following detailed groups were selected as the focus of this report: Italians, Greeks, Estonians/Latvians/Lithuanians, Czechs, Slovaks, Poles, Russians, Ukrainians, Romanians, Hungarians, Serbs/Croats/Slovenes, and a catch-all "other Eastern European" category.

The 1980 census contains information on individuals' ancestral background, thus permitting identification of all Euroethnics, including those with parents who were born in America. Although ethnic groups may be defined by religion as well as by national origin, religion is not reported to the U.S. census. However, certain questions in the 1970 census permit the identification of Jews and, where possible, the study presents statistics separately for those so identified.

Microdata samples from the 1980 census have made it possible to examine the relationship of Euroethnic ancestry to income and employment. In addition, the 1970 census includes certain relevant questions not used in the 1980 census that permit ethnic identification of first-generation immigrants and their second-generation descendants by country of origin. This has made it possible to examine intergenerational change in education and occupational distribution.

To establish a statistical basis for examining the issue of discrimination, this study used census data to

¹ U.S.C. §1975c.

assess how well Euroethnics do in the labor market compared to non-Euroethnic white Americans. Of course, intergroup differences in earnings may occur for many reasons other than discrimination. Thus the approach adopted in this study was to examine the relative employment and income profile of specific Euroethnic groups compared to other white Americans, controlling for factors that might account for disparities. These factors included English-speaking ability, age, region of residence, and educational level.

A finding that substantial economic differences exist between Euroethnics and other whites with similar characteristics would suggest the possible presence of current labor market discrimination against these groups, unless there was evidence of skill differentials that could not be measured by the available variables. This approach, however, cannot identify the presence of all aspects of economic discrimination. For instance, the census data do not easily lend themselves to an analysis of discrimination against Euroethnic groups in executive positions of America's major corporations. To the extent that such discrimination exists, these groups would be excluded from spheres of power and influence. Certain firms may restrict their hiring or promotion of members of ethnic or religious groups, and individuals who are turned away from or denied promotions by these firms would experience real discrimination. Such acts, which are violations of antidiscrimination laws, would reduce real well-being, although their overall effects on money earnings could be negligible. Since discriminatory treatment is no longer likely to be overt, but would take more subtle forms, it is all the more difficult to detect with the tools of social science.

Historical Background

Most of the Euroethnics who emigrated to the United States during the 19th and early 20th centuries were without wealth or property and had little or no knowledge of English. The new immigrants were, by and large, employed as unskilled labor in America's northeastern and north central cities. Moreover, the progress of the new immigrants was made difficult by discrimination, whether based on religion—most were Catholic or Jewish—on cultural differences, or because they represented a new source of competition for jobs.

Prejudice against Euroethnics was evident in numerous ways. Many prejudices were legalized and codified at Federal, State, and local levels. For example, noncitizens were barred in various places from certain types of employment. Although these laws were not always directed against Euroethnic groups per se, the pattern and timing of immigration was such that these groups were disproportionately noncitizens, and the laws fell most heavily upon them. Studies were done to "prove" that the new immigrant stocks were inherently inferior to the "old" immigrants from Great Britain and Northern and Western Europe. Some American educators were doubtful that the new immigrants could be efficiently incorporated into the public education system. Many native Americans felt threatened by the surge of immigration at the close of the 19th century. During a recession in the 1880s, for example, organized groups, including certain unions, churches, and political parties, worked for the imposition of a Federal immigrant head tax and other measures to reduce the flow of immigrants into the American labor market.

The history of immigration policy indeed provides general evidence of the prejudicial attitudes toward the Euroethnics. The Immigration Acts of 1921 and 1924 imposed outright quotas on immigration that linked the number of newcomers allowed to the number of that nationality already in the country. As a result, the brunt of these restrictions fell on immigration from Southern and Eastern Europe.

The immigration laws, along with social and economic changes in the U.S. and in the sending countries, brought about a major reduction of immigration from Eastern and Southern Europe. Since Euroethnic immigration dropped so dramatically in the early 20th century, the Americans who form the focus of this report are, for the most part, the second- and third-generation descendants of immigrants who arrived between 1880 and 1920.

Population Characteristics

Based on the 1980 census, today's Euroethnics are slightly over 11 percent of the U.S. population. Americans of Eastern European ancestry make up 6.5 percent of Americans. Poles are the largest subgroup (2.8 percent) and Russians the next largest (1.0 percent). Americans of Southern European ancestry are 4.7 percent of the U.S. population.²

are represented as a proportion of each listed ancestry. That is, a

² In this report, persons of multiple ancestry in the 1980 census

More than 90 percent of this group is made up of persons of Italian descent.

Euroethnics have remained a highly urban population. Nearly 60 percent of persons reporting Southern European ancestry reside in the Northeast; more than 93 percent live in metropolitan areas. Nearly 75 percent of persons of Eastern European descent live in the northeastern or north central regions; approximately 91 percent live in metropolitan areas. In contrast, about 46 percent of non-Euroethnic whites live in the northeastern or north central regions, and 78 percent live in metropolitan areas.

Intergenerational Change in Educational and Occupational Attainment

One of the most intriguing and inspiring aspects to emerge from the study of Euroethnics is the extent of change in social and economic indicators between first-generation persons and their children. Data from the 1970 census on a respondent's and his parents' place of birth permitted an examination of this intergenerational change. These data reveal a dramatic increase in educational attainment between first- and second-generation Euroethnics. The educational attainment of second-generation Euroethnics exceeded the first generation by 4 or more years, compared to an intergenerational gain of about 2 years for non-Euroethnic whites. In one generation, persons of Eastern and Southern European birth went from an educational deficit relative to native-born non-Euroethnic whites to one of relative advantage. As for college attendance, all of the Euroethnic groups have higher rates of college attendance among persons aged 25 to 34 years than do non-Euroethnic whites in that age group. Those of Eastern European descent exceed the college-going rate of non-Euroethnic whites by 55 percent; those of Southern European descent exceed that rate by 12 percent.

Intergenerational data from the 1970 census also reveal a dramatic growth in professional and managerial employment for men of Eastern and Southern European descent. Among first-generation Southern Europeans, 14 percent held professional, technical, or managerial occupations; the second generation

increased their representation in these occupations to 34 percent. Corresponding figures for first- and second-generation Eastern Europeans were 22 percent and 45 percent. By comparison, the percentage of other whites born in the same time periods and employed in professional, technical, or managerial jobs went from 24 percent to 32 percent. Combining the data across all generations, 30 percent of men of Eastern European ancestry and 24 percent of men of Southern European ancestry are concentrated in managerial and professional occupations, versus 22 percent of non-Euroethnic white men. The occupational distribution for Euroethnic women is similar to that of non-Euroethnic white women.

Current Labor Market Status

Data from the 1980 census were used to compare various aspects of the labor market experience of Euroethnics and other whites. Analysis of these data revealed that the employment patterns and earnings of Euroethnics are similar to those of white Americans who are not of Euroethnic descent.

The unemployment rates of Euroethnic men tend to be lower than those of non-Euroethnic white men; the former's comparative advantage would be even larger if their residence was not concentrated in the Northeastern United States where unemployment rates tend to be higher than the national average. Patterns of employment and unemployment among Euroethnic women are virtually indistinguishable from those of non-Euroethnic white women.

Whether measured on an annual, weekly, or hourly basis, Southern European men earn from 4 to 6 percent more than non-Euroethnic white men, and Eastern European men earn 18 percent more. Eastern European women earn 10 to 15 percent more than non-Euroethnic white women and Southern European women earn from zero to 7 percent more.

Since Euroethnics tend to be better educated and somewhat older than non-Euroethnic whites, and since they live in high-income areas of the country, it may be the case that Euroethnics earn less than non-Euroethnic whites of the same age, educational level, and geographic region. The data analysis revealed, however, that on average, Euroethnics

Greek-Italian person is counted as 0.5 of a Greek person and 0.5 of an Italian person. This procedure results in a lower percentage distribution of a particular ethnic group than published census figures in which persons of multiple ancestries are weighted

equally with persons of single ancestry (refer to table 172 and appendix B-8 of *1980 Census of Population, General Social and Economic Characteristics, United States Summary*, PC80-1-C1, Bureau of the Census, 1983).

earn at least as much as non-Euroethnic whites even after controlling for the effects of schooling and other factors. These results held whether the comparison group was all non-Euroethnic whites (excluding Hispanics) or was confined to Americans of British descent. The economic success of Euroethnic groups was maintained regardless of whether these groups included persons who reported single as well as multiple ancestry, or whether the comparison was limited to persons who reported only a single Euroethnic ancestry. The data also show that poverty rates among Euroethnic groups tend to be lower than among non-Euroethnic whites.

Ethnic Identity

Throughout this report, Euroethnics are treated as a distinct group. But to what extent do persons of Southern and Eastern European ancestry perceive themselves as members of distinct ethnic groups and how is this identification changing? The strength of ethnic cohesion cannot be measured with data from the U.S. census. However, some information about aspects of assimilation can be gleaned by comparing the responses of young and old persons to certain questions on the 1980 census.

One possible measure of ethnic cohesion is the extent to which persons who report a particular ancestry report a single ancestry as opposed to multiple ancestries. Multiple ancestries probably reflect patterns of intermarriage that in turn affect the degree of separateness of an ethnic group. The census data report that older individuals are much more likely to report a single ancestry than younger individuals, suggesting that intermarriage has increased over time.

Another possible indicator of change is whether persons speak their ancestral language. Census data can be used to estimate the proportion of persons in a given ancestry group who speak a language other than English at home. Analysis of these data reveal substantial differences between young and old with respect to the use of non-English languages. In each ancestry group, young persons speak English exclusively much more frequently than do older persons.

The language and single ancestry measures suggest that in certain respects isolation has weakened among Euroethnic groups as they have become more assimilated. However, these measures cannot capture the true extent of cultural identification; persons with a multiple ancestry or who speak only English may in fact maintain strong ethnic bonds.

Such attachments are beyond the purview of census data.

Further Research and Data Needs

In the course of doing this study, several important research questions arose that could not be answered with available data. Key among these questions is how these groups overcame their initial handicaps and the discrimination they faced. A more complete understanding of the economic success of these groups would come from an examination of their mobility strategies, including an analysis of factors such as settlement patterns, investment in education and other forms of human capital, land acquisition, entrepreneurial activities, community structures, the establishment of unions, and the use of political power.

The study found that the economic success of Euroethnic groups persisted regardless of whether single or multiple ancestry was used to delineate these groups. This finding suggests that Euroethnic progress cannot be attributed to a dilution of their ethnic attachments. Nevertheless, a fuller study of discrimination would include more information about possible discrimination against individuals on the basis of ethnic names or other purported ethnic characteristics. In addition, it would be useful to contrast the experiences of the foreign born with those of second and later generations.

The study presented here is limited in its ability to evaluate the existence or extent of employment discrimination in particular situations such as high corporate positions. A study of this subject would require unique data collection, for example, tracking the job experiences of graduating classes from top-ranking business schools.

It is important to bear in mind that data limitations inevitably restrict the questions that can be addressed. The addition to the 1980 census of information on ancestry made possible a more complete assessment of the economic achievement of detailed Euroethnic groups than has heretofore been possible. Data quality and analytical considerations strongly argue for continuation of the question on self-identification of ethnicity in the 1990 census. It is equally important, however, to restore to the 1990 census a question on the place of birth of the parents (and grandparents) of the individual respondents. Such information is indispensable for identifying generations and for determining the length of time the family has been in the United States.

Finally, religion is an important missing variable in this analysis because of its evident importance in defining groups of common heritage who have been subjected to discrimination. Efforts such as the General Social Survey of the National Opinion Research Center to combine information on religious background with ethnic identification should be encouraged.

Conclusion

According to this study's results, successive generations of Euroethnic groups have made impressive gains in educational achievement and income and, in fact, are now on a par with, or surpass, the economic status of other white Americans, or even of white Americans of British descent. The finding of no earnings differential, however, does not necessarily mean that members of Euroethnic groups no longer experience any discrimination. Rather it may mean that whatever discrimination exists has not, on

average, reduced the money earnings of these groups, though it may have restricted their choices and, therefore, their economic well-being. Members of Euroethnic groups have experienced prejudice and discrimination that was widespread in the past; and although the more overt forms have undoubtedly diminished, discrimination may yet linger in certain social and economic aspects of life.

The available data do not permit a full assessment of the effect of Federal antidiscrimination legislation on the economic status of Euroethnics. This report, however, provides considerable basic information on the factors that have contributed to the present economic status of these groups. Such information has not been previously available. The more specific legal and policy questions concerning the place of Euroethnics in government antidiscrimination policies designed to implement the Civil Rights Act of 1964 will be discussed in the second part of the Commission's response to its congressional mandate.

Introduction

This report was prepared at the request of Congress to address concerns about denials of equal protection under the law to Americans who are members of Eastern and Southern European ethnic groups.¹ A key question is whether discrimination has had a negative impact on the economic status of Eastern and Southern European ethnic groups. This report attempts to shed light on this issue by examining how members of these groups fare along the major dimensions of economic life compared to other whites in the United States. The analysis reviews patterns of employment and unemployment, education, occupational attainment, and income.

Defining Ethnic Groups

The first challenge in responding to the congressional mandate is to define the study group. Who are Eastern and Southern European ethnics? For the purposes of this study, Eastern and Southern European ethnics are Americans whose origins can be traced to geographic areas encompassed in today's countries of Eastern and Southern Europe. Americans whose origins can be traced to countries of Western Europe, such as Great Britain, Germany, France, Spain, and Portugal, are not studied individually in this report, although they form most of the comparison group of non-Euroethnic whites.

Throughout this report the term "Euroethnics" is used to refer to Americans of Eastern and Southern European ancestry. It should be understood, however, that this term is extremely broad and covers

many diverse ethnic groups. Failure to distinguish among these various groups could hide differential patterns of economic performance. This, in turn, would limit the study's utility in responding to the congressional mandate.

There is no simple rule for defining an ethnic group. In their discussion of which groups to include in the *Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups*, the editors wrote:

All the groups treated here are characterized by some of the following features, although in combinations that vary considerably:

1. common geographic origin;
2. migratory status;
3. race;
4. language or dialect;
5. religious faith or faiths;
6. ties that transcend kinship, neighborhood, and community boundaries;
7. shared traditions, values, and symbols;
8. literature, folklore, and music;
9. food preferences;
10. settlement and employment patterns;
11. special interests in regard to politics in the homeland and in the United States;

¹ 42 U.S.C. §1975c.

12. institutions that specifically serve and maintain the group;

13. an internal sense of distinctiveness;

14. an external perception of distinctiveness.²

The degree to which this constellation of features characterizes any group varies over time. Thus, at the beginning of their migration to the United States, Italians could have been separated into ethnic groups associated with particular provinces of Italy, such as Abruzzi, Campania, and Calabria. These distinctions, however, likely changed with time in the new country.

Pragmatic considerations guided the choice of groups to examine in this study. In many cases, a recognizable ethnic group corresponds to a specific country. Examples include Italians, Greeks, Czechs, and Hungarians. The identities of other clearly recognizable groups do not readily conform to current national boundaries. Ukrainians (excluding Jews from the same geographic area), for instance, are distinguished by language and religion, yet their geographic origins, in terms of today's countries, correspond to the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and to small parts of Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Romania. The populations of some recognizable groups in the U.S. are so small that analyzing them separately precludes statistical reliability. In such cases, ethnic groups have been aggregated largely on the basis of geographic proximity of the areas of origin. For instance, Serbs have been grouped with two other closely related Southern Slavic groups, the Croats and the Slovenes. Taking into account the above considerations, the following detailed groups were selected as the focus of this report: Italians, Greeks, Estonians/Latvians/Lithuanians, Czechs, Slovaks, Poles, Russians, Ukrainians, Romanians, Hungarians, Serbs/Croats/Slovenes, and a catch-all "other Eastern European" category.³

² Stephan Thernstrom, ed., *Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups* (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press, 1980), p. vi.

³ See app. A, table 1, for a more detailed specification of these groups.

⁴ Refer to Barry R. Chiswick, "The Earnings and Human Capital of American Jews," *Journal of Human Resources*, vol. 18 (1983).

⁵ Another data base that identifies ancestry information, as well as religious background, is the General Social Survey of the National Opinion Research Center. As of 1986, these combined

Many Americans in Eastern and Southern European ethnic groups are Jewish or Catholic, and ideally it would be desirable to make this distinction. Conceivably, present-day discrimination against members of Euroethnic groups could run along religious rather than, or in addition to, ethnic lines. Thus it would be of considerable interest to analyze the economic performance of groups distinguished both by national origin and religious affiliation. Unfortunately for the purposes of this study, census data lack information on religious affiliation; following a long-standing government policy, the religion of individuals is not asked in the census questionnaire. However, using an indirect method based on language spoken at home, Jews of East European descent can be identified in the 1970 census data, and this has been done in the report.⁴

Data from the 1980 Census of Population permit a more thorough empirical analysis of the current economic and social characteristics of ethnic groups of Southern and Eastern European descent than has been previously possible.⁵ The 1980 census contains information on individuals' ancestral background. It also has detailed data on a very large number of individuals, their demographic characteristics, labor market experience, and income. One drawback of the 1980 data, however, is that it is not possible to distinguish how many generations the individual's family has been in the United States beyond the first generation. That is, with the exception of those born abroad, it is only known that at some time the family emigrated from a particular foreign place. The 1970 Census of Population, however, did request information on both the respondent's and the parents' place of birth, and this enables identification of first and second generations. These data have been used to analyze intergenerational changes as well as to address certain other issues that could not be addressed with the 1980 data.⁶

surveys contained information on 20,000 individuals. The surveys from 1963 through 1974 were used a decade ago by Andrew M. Greeley in a seminal study that examined the relative achievements of American ethnic groups. The Euroethnic groups examined in that study were Polish Catholics, Italian Catholics, and Slavic Catholics. (Andrew M. Greeley, *Ethnicity, Denomination and Inequality*, Sage Research Papers in the Social Sciences, vol. 4, series 90-029, National Opinion Research Center, 1976).

⁶ See chap. 2 and app. A for a detailed summary of the contents of these data sets.

The Framework of the Analysis

The census data on Euroethnic identity and worker characteristics make it possible to analyze the economic attainments of Euroethnics. To determine whether there is any statistical basis for believing that the economic status of Euroethnics has been adversely affected by labor market discrimination, this study compares the earnings of Euroethnics with those of other whites.⁷

Of course, intergroup differences in earnings may occur for many reasons other than discrimination: older workers tend to earn more than workers just beginning their careers; the more educated earn more than the less educated; and persons who live in large urban centers tend to earn more than those in rural places or small towns. Thus, an analysis of the extent to which discrimination influences intergroup differences in earnings requires careful control of these and other worker characteristics. Controlling for worker traits, such as education, work experience, and region of residence, this study analyzes how well Euroethnics do in the labor market compared to other whites.

The lack of any group-specific difference in wages, after controlling for group differences in worker traits, cannot rule out the possible influence of discrimination affecting factors other than wages. Discrimination may restrict educational opportunities or limit the range of occupations a person may enter. This type of discrimination would not be evident in an analysis of earnings differences that controls for educational achievement or occupation. Therefore, to determine whether disparities possibly indicative of discrimination in these areas exist, this study also uses census data to compare the educational and occupational status of Euroethnics with that of other whites.

The approach used in this report to determine whether Euroethnics have been adversely affected by labor market discrimination is largely a statistical as opposed to a qualitative approach. A qualitative approach is characterized by case studies of personal experiences. Testimonies concerning individual experiences in applying for jobs and promotions would fall under the purview of a qualitative approach. One disadvantage of a qualitative approach is that individuals may perceive certain results, such as

failure to get a job or a promotion, as evidence of discrimination when in fact their cause has other origins. Conversely, individuals who lack an appropriate means to compare their personal experiences in the labor market with persons not of their race, sex, or ethnicity may be unaware of discriminatory practices that affect their employment and earnings. Another disadvantage of a qualitative approach is that the individual cases presented are not necessarily representative. For this reason, it would be inappropriate to generalize based on a few examples.

Statistical analysis overcomes individual motivations and perceptions that may bias an investigation of discrimination. It also provides a vehicle whereby the experiences of one group can be compared with those of another group, and it permits the analysis of large national samples that are representative of the groups. Statistical analysis is limited, however, by the ability of the analyst to control for all of the characteristics that affect performance in the labor market. The ability to control accurately for such characteristics is, in turn, limited by the ability to measure accurately these characteristics. Since a person's race or ethnicity may statistically "stand in" for factors that are either unmeasured or unmeasurable, a statistical analysis cannot yield conclusive evidence about the existence or nonexistence of labor market discrimination. Nevertheless, statistical evidence of large wage differences (controlling for intergroup differences in measured worker characteristics) combined with qualitative evidence of discrimination would suggest that discrimination was likely to be affecting labor market outcomes, unless evidence on unmeasured differences in skill or work effort was shown to exist. Similarly, the absence of any wage difference, controlling for worker characteristics, combined with the absence of qualitative evidence of discrimination or of evidence of unmeasured disparities in skill would suggest the likely absence of labor market discrimination.

Thus, a statistical overview of the labor market performance of Euroethnics relative to other whites provides an important component of any evaluation of the likely extent to which members of Euroethnic groups face discrimination. However, the measurement problems alluded to above should always be

⁷ Other whites are defined in this report as non-Euroethnic whites. In the cross-tabulations presented in the report, non-Euroethnic whites include whites of Spanish origin. Approximately 5 percent of non-Euroethnic whites are of Spanish origin.

The multivariate regression analyses of chapter 4 exclude all persons of Spanish origin. In these analyses, Euroethnics are compared to non-Hispanic, non-Euroethnic whites and to white persons of British origin.

taken into account when assessing the presence of discrimination.

Outline of the Report

The outline of this report is as follows. Chapter 1 presents a brief historical background, reviewing the timing of migration and documenting some of the discriminatory incidents experienced by Euroethnic groups in the past. Chapter 2 discusses strengths and weaknesses of the ethnicity data used to measure the economic and social characteristics of Euroethnics. Following this discussion, the number of Americans who reported Eastern or Southern European ancestry in 1980 is enumerated along with the percentage who are foreign born and their date of immigration. Chapter 3 describes characteristics of Euroethnics and other Americans that affect performance in the

labor market. These characteristics include region of residence, age, and education. Chapter 4 analyzes several dimensions of labor market behavior taking into account the characteristics detailed in chapter 3. This analysis forms the core of the report's evaluation of the degree to which Euroethnics are economically advantaged or disadvantaged relative to other white Americans. Euroethnics are compared throughout the report to other (non-Euroethnic) white Americans, since concerns about discrimination and possible adverse consequences of affirmative action for Euroethnics prompted the report. Chapter 5 is an addendum; it examines certain aspects of assimilation and how they differ between generations of Euroethnics. Conclusions are given in chapter 6, including recommendations for future research and data collection.

Historical Background

This chapter briefly reviews basic background information on the Euroethnic groups. First, the timing of immigration from Eastern and Southern Europe is reviewed; then certain episodes in American history are noted. These episodes provide documentation of the discrimination faced by Euroethnics around the turn of the century.

Patterns of Immigration

The American population is primarily the product of immigration. Table 1.1 traces the history of immigration to the United States from various parts of the world from 1850 to the present. As can be seen in the table, the character of immigration has varied over time. From the 1850s through the 1870s over two-thirds of the immigrants came from Britain and Western Europe. By the 1890s, however, a rapidly growing share of immigrants was arriving from Eastern and Southern Europe. From the 1870s through the 1890s, immigration from Italy rose from 2 percent to 18 percent of the total; the share from Eastern Europe rose from 4 percent to 30 percent. Between 1901 and 1910 alone nearly 9 million persons immigrated to the U.S., almost 10 percent of the Nation's population. Roughly 45 percent of these immigrants were from Eastern Europe; another 25 percent were from Italy. Meanwhile, the share from Northwestern Europe had fallen to less than 15 percent.

¹ Thomas J. Archdeacon, *Becoming American: An Ethnic History* (New York: The Free Press, 1983), chap. V. For an analysis of the push-pull factors that influenced immigration and how these affected settlement patterns, occupational choices and mobility strategies, see Frank Thistlethwaite, "Migration from Europe

Those who immigrated to the U.S. from Southern and Eastern Europe were known as the "new" immigrants, as opposed to the "old" immigrants from Ireland, England, Germany, and other parts of Northern and Western Europe, most of whom arrived before 1880. Table 1.2 focuses on the "new immigration" alone. More than 6 million persons arrived from Eastern or Southern European countries between 1901 and 1910; roughly one-third came from Italy and smaller but sizable percentages from Poland and Russia. Greek immigration has been somewhat more recent.

A combination of economic, social, and political factors in Europe and the United States helped to account for the vast migration. The immigrants responded both to push factors from their countries of origin and pull factors from their country of destination. Persecution under the czars contributed to the large emigration of Jews from Russia; Otto von Bismarck's policies in Prussia forced many Poles from their homeland; and Italy was faced with a series of agricultural crises.¹ On the pull side of the equation, the rapid industrialization in the United States produced a large demand for unskilled labor. During the late 19th century, employers, either on

Overseas in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries" in H. Moller, *Population Movements in Modern European History* (New York: MacMillan, 1964), and Philip Taylor, *The Distant Magnet: European Emigration to the U.S.A.* (New York: Harper and Row, 1971).

TABLE 1.1
Immigration, 1850s-1970s

	1851-1860	1861-1870	1871-1880	1881-1890	1891-1900	1901-1910	1911-1920
Total immigration	2,598,214	2,314,824	2,812,191	5,246,613	3,687,564	8,795,386	6,735,811
Total (as percent- age of U.S. pop.)	8.26	5.81	5.61	8.33	4.85	9.56	5.43
Individual countries as percentage of total immigration							
Northwestern Europe							
Great Britain ¹	16.32	26.22	19.49	15.39	7.36	5.98	5.95
Ireland	35.18	18.83	15.53	12.49	10.53	3.86	2.55
Scandinavia ²	0.95	5.46	8.64	12.51	10.07	5.75	3.56
Germany ^{3 4}	36.66	34.02	25.54	27.69	13.70	3.88	2.51
Eastern Europe							
Poland ³	0.04	0.08	0.46	0.99	2.62	na	0.07
USSR ^{3 5}	0.02	0.11	1.40	4.07	13.70	18.16	16.06
Austria/Hungary ^{3 4}	na	0.34	2.59	6.74	16.07	24.39	15.63
Romania ⁶	na	na	0.00	0.12	0.35	0.60	0.23
Bulgaria ⁷	na	na	na	na	0.00	0.45	0.39
Czechoslovakia ⁸	na	na	na	na	na	na	0.06
Lat./Lith./Est. ⁸	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Yugoslavia ⁷	na	na	na	na	na	na	0.03
Southern Europe							
Greece	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.04	0.43	1.90	3.21
Italy	0.36	0.51	1.98	5.86	17.68	23.26	19.34
Asia	1.60	2.80	4.42	1.33	2.03	3.68	4.31
America ⁹	2.88	3.23	14.37	8.14	1.06	4.11	19.94
Africa	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.08	0.15

¹Great Britain includes England, Scotland, and Wales.

²Scandinavia includes Sweden, Norway, Denmark, and Finland.

³Poland is recorded as a separate country from 1820 to 1898 and since 1920. From 1899-1919, Poland is included with Austria-Hungary, Germany, and Russia.

⁴Data for Austria-Hungary were not reported until 1861. Austria and Hungary have been recorded separately since 1905. From 1938 to 1945, Austria is included in Germany.

⁵From 1931 to 1963, the USSR is broken down into the European and Asian USSR. Since 1964, total USSR has been reported in Europe.

⁶No record of immigration from Romania until 1880.

⁷Bulgaria, Serbia, and Montenegro were first reported in 1899. Bulgaria has been reported separately since 1920; also, in 1920 a separate enumeration was made for the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes. Since 1922, the Serb, Croat, and Slovene Kingdom has been recorded as Yugoslavia.

TABLE 1.1 (continued)

	1921-1930	1931-1940	1941-1950	1951-1960	1961-1970	1971-1980
Total immigration	4,107,209	528,431	1,035,039	2,515,479	3,321,677	4,493,314
Total (as percent- age of U.S. pop.)	3.35	0.40	0.69	1.40	1.63	1.98
Individual countries as percentage of total immigration						
Northwestern Europe						
Great Britain	8.04	5.56	12.71	7.62	6.32	2.75
Ireland	5.37	2.49	2.54	2.28	1.13	0.31
Scandinavia	5.23	2.54	2.77	2.41	1.38	0.40
Germany	10.04	21.58	21.89	18.99	5.74	1.66
Eastern Europe						
Poland	5.54	3.22	0.73	0.40	1.61	0.82
USSR	1.50	0.26	0.05	0.02	0.07	0.87
Austria/Hungary	1.55	2.16	2.75	4.12	0.78	0.36
Romania	1.65	0.73	0.10	0.04	0.08	0.28
Bulgaria	0.07	0.18	0.04	0.00	0.02	0.03
Czechoslovakia	2.49	2.72	0.81	0.04	0.10	0.13
Lat./Lith./Est.	na	0.74	0.12	0.05	0.04	0.01
Yugoslavia	1.19	1.10	0.15	0.06	0.61	0.79
Southern Europe						
Greece	1.24	1.73	0.87	1.89	2.59	2.06
Italy	11.09	12.87	5.57	7.37	6.45	2.88
Asia	2.73	3.04	6.76	5.97	12.88	35.35
America	36.93	30.29	41.25	39.63	51.67	44.12
Africa	0.15	0.33	0.08	0.56	0.58	1.80

*Countries added to the list since the beginning of World War I are included with the countries to which they belonged. Figures available since 1920 for Czechoslovakia and Finland, and since 1924 for Albania, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

*America includes Canada and Newfoundland, Mexico, West Indies, Central America, and South America.

Note: From 1820-67, figures represent alien passengers arrived; from 1892-94 and 1898 to the present, immigrant aliens admitted. Data for years before 1906 relate to country whence the alien came; thereafter, to country of last permanent residence. Because of changes in boundaries and changes in lists of countries, data for certain countries are not comparable throughout. ["na" means data not available.]

Sources: Data for every decade but the 1970s (1971-80) come from *Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups*, app. 2, pp. 1047-49 (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard Univ. 1980). Data for 1971-80 came from *The 1980 Statistical Yearbook of the Immigration and Naturalization Service*, table 2, p. 4.

TABLE 1.2
Eastern and Southern European Immigration to the United States, 1850s-1970s

	1851-1860	1861-1870	1871-1880	1881-1890	1891-1900	1901-1910	1911-1920
Total Southern/ Eastern European immigration to U.S.	10,833	24,136	181,203	934,772	1,875,499	6,048,256	3,296,185
Individual countries as percentage of total Eastern and Southern European immigration to U.S.							
Southern Europe							
Greece	0.28	0.30	0.12	0.25	0.85	2.77	5.59
Italy	84.82	48.58	30.77	32.88	34.76	33.83	33.51
Eastern Europe							
Poland	10.70	8.40	7.16	5.54	5.16	na	4.37
USSR ^{1 3}	4.20	10.41	21.68	22.82	26.94	26.41	27.95
Austria/Hungary ^{1 2}	na	32.32	40.27	37.84	31.60	35.47	27.19
Romania ⁴	na	na	0.01	0.68	0.68	0.88	0.40
Bulgaria ⁵	na	na	na	na	0.01	0.65	0.68
Czechoslovakia ⁶	na	na	na	na	na	na	0.10
Lat./Lith./Est. ⁶	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Yugoslavia ⁵	na	na	na	na	na	na	0.06

¹Poland recorded as a separate country from 1820 to 1898 and since 1920. From 1899-1919, Poland is included with Austria-Hungary, Germany, and Russia.

²Data for Austria-Hungary were not reported until 1861. Austria and Hungary have been recorded separately since 1905. From 1938 to 1945, Austria is included in Germany.

³From 1931 to 1963, the USSR is broken down into the European and Asian USSR. Since 1964, total USSR has been reported in Europe.

⁴No record of immigration from Romania until 1880.

⁵Bulgaria, Serbia, and Montenegro were first reported in 1899. Bulgaria has been reported separately since 1920; also, in 1920 a separate enumeration was made for the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes. Since 1922, the Serb, Croat, and Slovene Kingdom has been recorded as Yugoslavia.

⁶Countries added to the list since the beginning of World War I are included with the countries to which they belonged. Figures available since 1920 for Czechoslovakia and Finland, and since 1924 for Albania, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

TABLE 1.2 (continued)

	1921-1930	1931-1940	1941-1950	1951-1960	1961-1970	1971-1980
Total Southern/ Eastern European immigration to U.S.	1,081,322	135,889	11,712	358,476	410,016	337,646
Individual countries as percentage of total Eastern and Southern European immigration to U.S.						
Southern Europe						
Greece	4.72	6.71	7.75	13.28	20.90	27.36
Italy	42.11	50.06	49.83	51.74	52.22	38.31
Eastern Europe						
Poland	21.07	12.53	6.54	2.79	13.06	11.03
USSR	5.71	1.00	0.47	0.16	0.57	11.54
Austria/Hungary	5.88	8.41	24.48	28.94	6.35	4.75
Romania	6.26	2.85	0.93	0.29	0.62	3.67
Bulgaria	0.27	0.69	0.32	0.03	0.15	0.35
Czechoslovakia	9.45	10.59	7.21	0.26	0.80	1.78
Lat./Lith./Est.	na	2.86	1.09	0.22	0.30	0.16
Yugoslavia	9.54	4.29	1.36	2.29	4.97	1.05

Note: From 1820-67, figures represent alien passengers arrived; from 1892-94 and 1898 to the present, immigrant aliens admitted. Data for years before 1906 relate to country whence the alien came; thereafter, to country of last permanent residence. Because of changes in boundaries and changes in lists of countries, data for certain counties are not comparable throughout. ["na" means data not available.]

Sources: Data for every decade but the 1970s (1971-80) come from *Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups*, app. 2, pp. 1047-49 (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard Univ. Press, 1980). Data for 1971-80 came from *The 1980 Statistical Yearbook of the Immigration and Naturalization Service*, table 2, p. 4.

their own or through steamship companies, recruited Euroethnic immigrants to the United States.² The decline of agriculture and the rise of industry partly explain the large proportion of Euroethnics who settled in urban areas and in the Northeast.³

Economic Status of Immigrants

Most of the Euroethnics who arrived in the U.S. were without belongings and had little or no knowledge of English. Although over 30 percent of the "old" immigrants arriving in the first half of the 19th century claimed to have owned or managed farms in their homelands, by 1900 the occupations most frequently reported by new arrivals were the menial and poorly remunerated callings of laborer, farm laborer, and servant.⁴ The new immigrants were, by and large, utilized as unskilled labor in the United States. For the years 1908 through 1910, according to the Commissioner General of Immigration, nearly 60 percent of the foreign-born Bulgarian, Croatian, Italian, Lithuanian, Macedonian, Magyar, Polish, Portuguese, Romanian, Russian, Ruthenian, Serbian, and Slovak males earned less than \$400 per year, compared to only 15 percent of the foreign-born English, Dutch, Irish, Norwegian, Scotch, Swedish, and Welsh.⁵

Discriminatory Obstacles

The progress of the new immigrants was made difficult not only by their lack of wealth or property, but also by discrimination, whether based on religion or cultural differences, or because they represented a new source of competition for jobs. Prejudice against Euroethnic groups was evident in numerous ways. Many prejudices were legalized and codified at Federal, State, and local levels. Beginning in the late 19th century and continuing into the 20th, noncitizens were barred in various places from practicing many professions and skilled trades that

required State and local licenses, including such occupations as mining and barbering. Noncitizens were also barred by law from employment on public works projects, such as the construction of the New York subway.⁶ Although these laws were not necessarily directed against Southern and Eastern European immigrant groups per se, the pattern and timing of immigration was such that these groups were disproportionately noncitizens, and thus the laws fell most heavily upon them.⁷

Some State and Federal authorities were bent on showing that the new immigrant stocks were inherently inferior to the old, and social science studies were done to confirm this thesis. The government-appointed Dillingham Commission issued its findings in 1910 that the "Mediterranean" character and the Eastern European character contained less intelligence, more tendency toward violent crime, and less capability of Americanization than the Nordic or Teutonic character of the previous wave of immigrants.⁸ Because Southern and Eastern Europeans were presumed to possess "inborn socially inadequate qualities,"⁹ influential restrictionist organizations lobbied to check their entry into the United States.

Early in the 20th century some American educators were doubtful that new immigrants could be efficiently incorporated into the public education system; it was thought that they retarded the pace of schooling. U.S. cities commissioned studies with titles like *Laggards in Our Schools*, in which the failings of immigrant and nonwhite children compared to nonimmigrant white children were exaggerated.¹⁰

Economic pressures affected the collage of relationships between the old and new immigrants. "Old" immigrant workers pursued measures to help protect their jobs and pay from the surge of new entrants into the labor pool. During the 1870s, for

² For information on demand factors influencing European immigration see: Charlotte Erickson, *American Industry and the European Immigrant 1860-1885* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1957); Korman Gerd, *Industrialization, Immigrants and Americanizers: The View from Milwaukee, 1860-1921* (Madison, Wis.: The State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1967); and Michael J. Piore, *Birds of Passage: Migrant Labor and Industrial Societies* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979).

³ Archdeacon, *Becoming American*, pp. 140-41.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 133.

⁵ Peter Roberts, *The New Immigration: A Study of Industrial and Social Life of Southeastern Europeans in America* (New York: Macmillan, 1972), p. 366.

⁶ John Higham, *Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American*

Nativism, 1860-1925 (Westport Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1981), pp. 72-73.

⁷ The movement towards licensing and regulation during this period cannot be wholly ascribed to nativist prejudices. Some of these changes were simply a reflection of modernization and increased bureaucratization.

⁸ Oscar Handlin, *Race and Nationality in American Life* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1950), pp. 81, 96-102.

⁹ Geneticist Harry Laughlin of the Eugenics Records Office, "Analysis of America's Modern Melting Pot," in Handlin, *Race and Nationality*, p. 105.

¹⁰ Michael R. Olneck and Marvin Lazerson, "Education" in Stephan Thernstrom, ed., *Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups* (Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press, 1980), p. 316.

example, Anglo-American and Irish miners fought the introduction of low-wage Italian and Eastern European immigrants into the mines. During a recession in the 1880s, unions petitioned for the imposition of a Federal immigrant head tax to reduce the flow of immigrants into the American labor market.¹¹ In New York City, Italian workers in the building trades were sometimes excluded from joining the trade unions, which were controlled by the Irish. Irish leaders considered the Italians as cheap labor undercutting the market.¹²

Religion was another source of tension between the old and the new immigrants. In 1855 Abraham Lincoln wrote to Joshua Speed: "As a nation, we began by declaring that 'all men are created equal'! We now practically read it. . . 'all men are created equal, except Negroes and foreigners and Catholics'."¹³ Since it was the leadership of the Protestant denominations who had begun the expansion of standardized or common schooling in the mid-19th century, the public education system began as, and to some extent remained, an inculcator of Protestant values. Many Catholics were averse to participating in the public system because it represented "the imposition of a barely disguised Protestant sectarianism on Catholic children."¹⁴ During the last quarter of the 19th century, anti-Catholic sentiments surfaced in the formation of nativistic associations such as the American Protective Association that worked during the 1880s and 1890s for public control of parochial schools.¹⁵ Anti-Catholicism, along with anti-Semitism, later fed the large growth in membership of the Ku Klux Klan in the 1920s.¹⁶

Discrimination on the basis of religion affected Jews in public accommodations and employment. Certain clubs and hotels were closed to Jews, and they were restricted from entering many occupations. They crowded into the areas of the economy that were open to them, such as the garment industry in New York and the motion picture industry in Hollywood.¹⁷ In education, Jews experi-

enced discrimination in the form of quotas that served as ceilings to their admission into Ivy League and other schools. For example, at Yale in 1921, quotas held the proportion of Jews to 8 percent of the student body; Harvard also discussed the institution of quotas at that time. Yale's unofficial enrollment limits on Jews are purported to have lasted until around 1960.¹⁸

Occasionally, tensions based in prejudice culminated in vigilante violence against presumed criminals from Euroethnic groups. In 1891 nine Italians were acquitted of the murder of the police chief of New Orleans, but the nine were beaten to death by mobs who stormed the jail. In 1915 Leo Frank, a Jew sentenced to life imprisonment for murder and rape, was kidnapped and lynched in Georgia.¹⁹ (Evidence was later brought forward indicating his innocence. The State of Georgia recently granted Leo Frank a posthumous pardon.)²⁰

The history of immigration policy was also colored by prejudicial sentiments against Euroethnics as a group. Beginning in the 1910s, immigration policies tightened. A test of literacy in the adult entrant's native language was instituted in 1917. Since the countries of Southern and Eastern Europe had far higher illiteracy rates than the countries of Northern and Western Europe, the intent of the law was to reduce immigration from the former.²¹ When the literacy test failed to weed out Southern and Eastern Europeans in satisfactory amounts (education was becoming more universal in their home countries), restrictionists pressed for immigration quotas based on national origin. The Immigration Acts of 1921 and 1924 imposed quotas on how many people from each foreign country could enter the U.S. Outright quotas that linked the number of newcomers allowed to the number of that nationality already in the country put the brunt of the restrictions more heavily on immigration from Southern and Eastern Europe. The quotas for the

¹¹ George M. Fredrickson and Dale T. Knobel, "History of Prejudice and Discrimination" in Thernstrom, *Harvard Encyclopedia*, p. 843.

¹² Nathan Glazer and Daniel Patrick Moynihan, *Beyond the Melting Pot* (Cambridge, Mass: M.I.T. Press and Harvard University Press, 1963), pp. 191-92.

¹³ Letter, August 24, 1855, cited in "Response to Lydio F. Tomasi" in *Civil Rights Issues of Euro-ethnic Americans in the United States: Opportunities and Challenges* (consultation sponsored by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Chicago, Illinois, Dec. 3, 1979), p. 498.

¹⁴ Michael R. Olneck and Marvin Lazerson, "Education" in Thernstrom, *Harvard Encyclopedia*, pp. 308-09.

¹⁵ George M. Fredrickson and Dale T. Knobel, "History of Prejudice and Discrimination" in Thernstrom, *Harvard Encyclopedia*, p. 843.

¹⁶ George M. Fredrickson and Dale T. Knobel, "History of Prejudice and Discrimination" in Thernstrom, *Harvard Encyclopedia*, p. 845.

¹⁷ Thomas Sowell, *The Economics and Politics of Race* (New York: William Morrow and Co., 1983), p. 92.

¹⁸ *New York Times*, Mar. 4, 1986.

¹⁹ Archdeacon, *Becoming American*, p. 159.

²⁰ *Washington Post*, Mar. 12, 1986.

²¹ Archdeacon, *Becoming American*, pp. 163, 167.

1921 act were based on the 1910 U.S. census. Each group would be enlarged by no more than 3 percent of its 1910 size, with a total immigration ceiling set at 357,000.

When the 1921 act went into effect, restrictionists still thought the allowance too high, and so they pressed for another bill limiting the enlargement of each group to 2 percent of its 1890 constituency, a year when few Southern or Eastern European immigrants lived in the U.S. Selection of the 1890 census as a base was decried as blatant discrimination. Therefore, a compromise of sorts was made: in the Johnson-Reed Immigration Act of 1924, it was planned that the 1890-based formula would expire in 1927, when a complicated 1920-based formula—ostensibly more equitable, but still disproportionately exclusive of Southern and Eastern Europeans—would be put into effect.²²

Referring back to table 1.1, it is possible to trace the probable effect of the restrictive immigration legislation on the composition and magnitude of U.S. immigration. Although the percentage contribution to total immigration from countries of Northwest Europe had been dropping in the years preceding the legislative changes, it increased for all of these countries in the 1921–1930 decade. For instance, the percentage contribution to total immigration of Great Britain increased from 5.95 percent in 1911–1920 to 8.04 percent in 1921–1930; the corresponding increase for Germany was 2.51 percent to 10.04 percent. Concurrently, the percentage contribution from several countries of Eastern and Southern Europe dropped. For instance, Greece's contribution decreased from 3.21 percent to 1.24, and

Italy's contribution fell from 19.34 to 11.09 percent in the same period.

Total immigration as a percentage of the U.S. population reached a peak of 9.56 percent in 1901–1910, but then declined in the following decades. Through the depression of the 1930s, the flow of immigrants fell to less than one-half of 1 percent of the population. Although the restrictive immigration policies undoubtedly influenced the composition and magnitude of immigration, other important factors such as the Great Depression came into play as well. Indeed, large portions of most quotas went unfilled during the 1930s.²³ However, since the 1924 law made no special provision for refugees, the immigration into the United States of Jews who were fleeing the Fascist regimes of Europe was dramatically curbed during the 1930s and 1940s.²⁴

No longer compatible with public opinion or international relations, the immigration quota system based on national origins was abandoned in 1965. Once again, the face of immigration has been completely transformed as more than 80 percent of current arrivals come from the Americas or from Asia. The lower level of Euroethnic immigration in recent decades relative to its peak at the turn of the century no longer reflects discriminatory immigration policies, but rather a change from the push and pull matrix of factors that characterized the late 19th and early 20th century immigration. Since Euroethnic immigration dropped so dramatically in the early 20th century, the Americans who form the focus of this report are, for the most part, the second- and third-generation descendants of persons who arrived during the “new immigrant” wave of 1880–1920.

²² Handlin, *Race and Nationality*, p. 76, and Archdeacon, *Becoming American*, pp. 171–73.

²³ William S. Bernard, “Immigration: History of U.S. Policy” in Thernstrom, *Harvard Encyclopedia*, p. 493.

²⁴ Ibid.

Euroethnics: Their Identification, Numbers, and Immigrant Population

The primary concern of this chapter is to determine the number of Euroethnics in the United States, the extent to which the population is foreign or native born, and how recently the foreign born immigrated to the U.S. Ascertaining these basic facts is more easily said than done. Individuals are rarely asked directly about their ethnicity in demographic and economic surveys. Moreover, there are several different ways to define ethnicity, and the available data are characterized by various strengths and weaknesses in meeting these definitions. No single

source provides all the desired information. For these reasons, the investigation begins by discussing available sources of data and the types of analyses they permit.

Ethnicity Data

Two samples from the decennial Censuses of Population, one from 1970 and one from 1980, were used to analyze the social and economic characteristics of Euroethnics. Both the 1970 and 1980 census samples are very large. The 1970 survey is a 1 percent sample of the population containing data on 1.4 million adults; 14 percent of this total are second-generation Americans and another 7 percent are immigrants (first generation). The 1980 sample contains 5 percent of the U.S. population: more than 8.4 million adults ages 16 and above, 945,000 of whom report either Southern or Eastern European ancestry.

These surveys are of unique value because they contain information on the labor force status and income as well as ethnicity of a large number of individuals. The information contained in these two surveys is not entirely consistent, however. The scope of ethnicity-related information in the 1970 and 1980 census samples is summarized in table 2.1.¹

As this table indicates, both the 1970 and 1980 census contain information on a respondent's birthplace. As a result, immigrants and their country of

TABLE 2.1
Ethnicity-Related Questions in the
1970 and 1980 Censuses of
Population

	1970	1980
Respondent's birthplace	yes	yes
Parental birthplace	yes	no
Year of immigration	no	yes
Ancestry	no	yes
Mother tongue	yes	no
Language spoken at home	no	yes
Population coverage	1%	5%

¹ In 1970 two separate long-form questionnaires were used. One such form was sent to 5 percent of the Nation's population; another was sent to 15 percent. One in 100 samples of the population were created by the Census Bureau from each of these questionnaires. The 15 percent survey contains data on parental

birthplace or mother tongue but not year of immigration. The 5 percent survey contains information on year of immigration but not parental birthplace. The data described in this section reflect the 15 percent survey.

origin can be identified in both surveys. However, only the 1980 survey permits identification of an individual's year of arrival in the United States. The 1970 survey alone contains information about the country in which a respondent's parents were born. This permits identification of second-generation Americans—persons born in the U.S. having at least one parent born abroad—as well as the parents' country of origin. These data are not available for 1980.

The 1980 survey incorporated, for the first time, a question on an individual's ancestry, "the self-identified origin, lineage, nationality group or country in which the person or persons' ancestors were born before their arrival in the United States."² Since parents' country of origin was not asked in the 1980 census, it is impossible to differentiate between second- and later generation individuals within ancestry groups. Nevertheless, the 1980 ancestry information is of considerable importance, since it makes it possible to include in the study group the children of American-born Euroethnics. Using previous census data, the Euroethnic study population must necessarily be limited to foreign-born Americans and their children.

Respondents in the 1980 census had the option of reporting multiple ancestries, for example "Greek-Italian."³ The availability of multiple responses yields valuable information but also complicates the statistical analysis. In this report, persons of multiple ancestry in the 1980 census are represented as a proportion of each listed ancestry. That is, a Greek-Italian person is counted as 0.5 of a Greek person and 0.5 of an Italian. This procedure eliminates double counting and avoids the problem of producing separate tabulations for each ancestry combination. It is based on the implicit assumption that persons who report multiple ancestry reflect in equal parts the characteristics of the groups they reported.

Note, however, that this procedure results in a lower percentage distribution of particular ethnic groups than published census figures in which persons of multiple ancestries are weighted equally with persons of single ancestry.⁴ In addition to examining how the combined group of single and multiple ancestry Euroethnics fare relative to non-Euroethnic whites, this study also examines the relative economic performance of men who report a single Euroethnic ancestry.⁵

The 1970 and 1980 census data do not identify religious affiliation. Since substantial numbers of Euroethnics are Jewish, Catholic, or Greek Orthodox, it would be of interest to investigate how well different religious groups have done, independent of the effect of national origin factors. Although the census data do not permit analysis of the effect of being Catholic or Greek Orthodox, an investigation of the effect of being Jewish is possible with the 1970 census data. The 1970 census has information on mother tongue (the language spoken at home during childhood) and on parental birthplace. Using the 1970 census data, Chiswick indirectly identified second-generation Jewish Americans as individuals born in the U.S. with a foreign-born parent and whose mother tongue was Yiddish or Hebrew.⁶ Data presented below indicate that this strategy identifies about 70 percent of all second-generation Jewish Americans.

Population Characteristics

The number of Americans who reported Eastern or Southern European ancestry in the 1980 census is reported in table 2.2. These "ethnicity rates" indicate that 4.7 percent of Americans reported a Southern European ancestry, of whom Italians form the vast majority with Greeks making up the rest. Another 6.5 percent of the U.S. population reported an Eastern European ancestry. Poles make up the

² For discussion and evaluation of the 1980 census ancestry data, refer to Michael J. Levin and Reynolds Farley, "Historical Comparability of Ethnic Designations in the United States," Social Statistics Section, *Proceedings of the American Statistical Association* (1982); Nampeo R. McKenney, Reynolds Farley, and Michael J. Levin, "Direct and Indirect Measures of Ethnicity: How Different Definitions Affect the Size and Characteristics of Various Ethnic Groups," Social Statistics Section, *Proceedings of the American Statistical Association* (1983); and U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1980 Census of the Population, Supplementary Report, *Ancestry of the Population by State: 1980*, PC80-S1-10 (1983).

³ Entries of more than two ancestries were allowed. In general, however, only the first two reported ancestries were coded for responses of three or more ancestries.

⁴ Refer to table 172 and app. B-8 of 1980 Census of Population, *General Social and Economic Characteristics, United States Summary*, PC80-1-C1 (Bureau of the Census, 1983).

⁵ Individuals who listed an ancestry, but who also listed responses such as American, United States, or white were considered of single ancestry.

⁶ Barry R. Chiswick, "The Earnings and Human Capital of American Jews," *Journal of Human Resources*, vol. 18 (1983).

largest share of this group (42 percent) followed by Russians, Czechs, and Hungarians.⁷

As described in the introduction, the principal wave of Southern and Eastern European immigrants arrived in the U.S. between 1880 and 1920. As a result, the vast majority of Americans reporting Eastern or Southern European ethnicity in 1980 were born in the U.S. Table 2.3 shows that more than 88 percent of Americans of Eastern European ancestry are native born. The same percentage is observed among Italians. The immigration of Greeks has generally been more recent; only 65 percent are native to the U.S.

The data in table 2.3 are also classified by the dates of immigrants' arrival and show the rapid decline in the importance of Southern and Eastern Europeans in terms of total immigration. More than 30 percent of immigrants alive in 1980 who arrived in the U.S. before 1950 were from either Eastern or Southern Europe. Among persons arriving between 1950 and 1965, this figure fell to 21 percent, although the share of immigration made up by certain groups—Greeks, Hungarians, Serbs/Croats, and Ukrainians—was stable or higher than before. Since 1965 more immigrants to the U.S. are non-white (often Asian), and the flow from Eastern and Southern Europe has slowed considerably. Italians remain the largest percentage of Euroethnics, yet their 3 percent share of recent immigration is down from 13 percent of the pre-1950 arrivals. Greeks are about 2 percent of recent immigrants.

As discussed above, an important limitation of the 1980 data is that second-generation persons—the sons and daughters of immigrants—cannot be differentiated from other generations. The 1970 census data can be used to learn about the distribution of Euroethnics by generation. These data can also be used to identify Jewish Americans.

Table 2.4 presents estimates of the percentage of Euroethnics in the 1970 census who are first- and second-generation Americans, along with the percentage who are identified as Jewish. It should be emphasized that the 1970 data reflect national origin groups, which are not identical to the ancestry categories defined in the 1980 data, and that the 1970 data do not count Euroethnics who are third

generation and earlier. The 1970 data indicate that 7.4 percent of adults (ages 16 and over) were immigrants. Of these, roughly 12 percent were Southern European and 15 percent were Eastern European. Another 4.5 percent were identified as Jewish—persons who spoke Yiddish or Hebrew as a child.

Southern and Eastern Europeans form a much larger percentage of second-generation Americans—nearly 35 percent—than of first-generation Americans. Jewish Americans comprise another 5 percent of the second-generation group, but this understates their true numbers. The “mother tongue” methodology fails to account for second-generation Jewish Americans who spoke English at home as a child or had a different mother tongue. Although no hard data are available with respect to the number of persons omitted by this procedure, roughly 70 percent of all second-generation Americans of Eastern European origin have a non-English mother tongue (table 2.5). Assuming a similar proportion holds among Jewish Americans, the mother tongue procedure identifies at best 70 percent of the target population.

The extent to which the various groups in the 1980 census data reflect Jewish Americans can be analyzed through some tabulations available from the 1920 census. These data, reported in table 2.6, indicate the share of the foreign born from various countries whose mother tongue was Yiddish or Hebrew. The data reflect the period shortly after the peak of the “new immigration” wave. As such, it is likely that a majority of individuals who reported Russian ancestry in the 1980 census are Jewish. Similarly, a substantial number of ethnic Romanians are also likely to be Jewish. This is an important consideration in analyzing labor market experience using ancestry data in the 1980 census.

Summary

To summarize, Americans of Eastern European ancestry constitute 6.5 percent of Americans; Poles are the largest subgroup (2.8 percent) and Russians the next largest (1.0 percent). Americans of Southern European ancestry are 4.7 percent of the U.S. population; more than 90 percent of this group is

⁷ The residual category “other Eastern European” includes the following groups: Armenian (38 percent); Bulgarian (7 percent); Albanian (11 percent); Macedonian (2 percent); Slav, not else-

where classified (25 percent); Eastern European, n.e.c. (14 percent); Central European, n.e.c. (1 percent), and Gypsy (1 percent).

TABLE 2.2
United States Population by Ancestry Groups,¹ 1980

	Total (000s)	% Major group	% U.S. total
Southern European	7,957.8	100.00	4.72
Italian	7,354.7	92.4	4.36
Greek	603.1	7.6	0.36
Eastern European	10,946.5	100.00	6.50
Est./Lat./Lith.	536.4	4.9	0.32
Czech	1,244.6	11.4	0.74
Slovakian	300.9	2.7	0.18
Polish	4,673.7	42.7	2.77
Russian	1,680.8	15.4	1.00
Ukrainian	465.5	4.3	0.28
Romanian	180.3	1.6	0.11
Hungarian	1,004.2	9.2	0.60
Serbian/Croatian	513.5	4.7	0.30
Other East European	346.6	3.2	0.21
Other whites	124,279.0	—	73.78
Nonwhites	25,272.1	—	15.00
Total	168,456.0	—	100.00

¹Noninstitutional population ages 16+.

Estimates based on the 1980 Census of Population, 5 percent "A" Public Use Sample.

TABLE 2.3
Nativity of United States Population by Ancestry Group, 1980

	Percent born in USA	Percentage of foreign born by year of arrival		
		1965-80	1950-65	Pre-1950
Southern European	86.6	4.8	9.0	14.7
Italian	88.4	3.1	7.3	13.1
Greek	64.8	1.7	1.8	1.6
Eastern European	88.5	4.9	11.6	17.9
Est./Lat./Lith.	82.8	0.1	1.2	1.4
Czech	92.8	0.3	0.5	1.8
Slovakian	98.3	—	—	0.1
Polish	91.9	1.2	3.7	5.7
Russian	88.9	0.8	1.0	3.7
Ukrainian	77.5	0.2	1.5	1.3
Romanian	79.2	0.3	0.2	0.4
Hungarian	84.4	0.4	2.0	2.1
Serb/Croat	78.4	0.8	1.1	0.9
Other East European	72.6	0.8	0.5	0.9
Other whites	95.0	39.7	58.6	58.4
Nonwhite	84.3	50.6	20.7	8.9

Estimates based on the 1980 Census of Population, 5 percent "A" Public Use Sample.

TABLE 2.4
Population by Generation and National Origin, 1970

	Old stock ¹ (%)	2nd generation (%)	1st generation (%)
Southern European	—	15.5	11.6
Italian	—	14.5	10.0
Greek	—	1.0	1.6
Eastern European	—	19.3	14.6
Est./Lat./Lith.	—	1.2	1.2
Czech	—	2.7	1.5
Polish	—	7.6	4.7
USSR	—	4.0	2.5
Ukrainian	—	0.3	0.6
Romanian	—	0.4	0.5
Hungarian	—	1.9	1.9
Yugoslav	—	1.2	1.5
Other	—	0.1	0.2
Jewish ²	—	4.9	4.5
Other whites ³	87.2	57.9	60.6
Nonwhite	12.8	2.4	8.7
Column total	100.0	100.0	100.0
(Population total)	78.3	14.3	7.4)

¹Third- and later generation Americans.

²Individuals for whom mother tongue is Yiddish or Hebrew are excluded from all other ancestry categories. All such individuals are included in the Jewish category.

³The "Other white-Old stock" category includes third- and later generation other white Americans as well as third and later generation Americans of Eastern and Southern European descent.

Estimates based on the 1970 Census of Population, 1 percent Public Use Sample (15 percent questionnaire).

TABLE 2.5
Percentage of Persons with Non-English Mother Tongue,¹ 1970

	Old stock	2nd generation	1st generation
Southern European	—	80.9	98.1
Eastern European	—	72.5	98.4
Jewish	—	100.0 ²	100.0 ²
Other whites	11.9	47.7	73.4

¹Mother tongue is the language spoken at home during childhood.

²By definition: Jewish people identified by Yiddish or Hebrew mother tongue. (Individuals for whom mother tongue is Yiddish or Hebrew are excluded from all other ancestry categories.)

Estimates based on the 1970 Census of Population, 1 percent Public Use Sample (15 percent questionnaire).

TABLE 2.6
Percentage of Immigrants with Yiddish or Hebrew Mother Tongue,
By Country of Origin

Poland	10.0%	Russia	56.6%
Czechoslovakia	0.6	Lithuania	3.7
Hungary	4.3	Romania	36.3
Yugoslavia	0.0	Italy	0.0

Source: 1920 Census.

made up of persons of Italian descent. The vast majority of Euroethnics were born in the United

States. Most are descendants of immigrants who arrived between 1880 and 1920.

Region of Residence, Age, and Education

A primary goal of this report is to assess how Euroethnics have fared along a spectrum of economic indices compared to other white Americans. The economic indices include earnings, labor force participation, unemployment, and occupation; their treatment is the subject of chapter 4. Of particular interest is whether significant differences in these variables exist between Euroethnics and other whites. The presence of large intergroup differences in economic performance might indicate the presence of labor market discrimination.

Any meaningful comparison of economic behavior between Euroethnics and other whites requires taking into account group differences in characteristics that affect labor force outcomes. For instance, the northeast and north central regions of the U.S. have generally experienced higher than average unemployment in recent years. Thus persons residing in these regions might be expected to have higher unemployment rates than individuals, similar in every other respect, living in other regions. By the same token, older persons usually earn more than persons just beginning their careers. A group composed of older working-age persons would tend to earn more than a group primarily composed of young workers. Earnings increase with education, so that more highly educated groups would tend to earn more than less educated groups. Differences in geographic distribution, age composition, and education between Euroethnics and other whites would cause differences in earnings quite apart from any consideration of discrimination in employment. The purpose of this chapter is to document such differ-

ences. It is, of course, possible that schooling is influenced by other forms of discrimination. Hence, a comparison of the educational achievement of Euroethnics with that of other whites is of interest in and of itself. Using the 1970 and 1980 census data, this chapter describes where Euroethnics live, their age distribution, and their educational attainment as compared to other whites.

Regional Patterns of Residence

Immigrants from Eastern and Southern Europe typically arrived in the Northeast and are still disproportionately concentrated there. The 1970 census data (table 3.1) reveal only minor differences in the region of residence of first- and second-generation Americans. Table 3.2 shows that almost 60 percent of Southern Europeans reside in the Northeast compared to less than 20 percent of other (non-Southern, non-Eastern European) whites. Only 12 percent of Southern Europeans reside in the South, compared to 34 percent of "other" whites. Eastern Europeans also tend to be concentrated in the Northeast, although they are heavily represented in the North Central U.S. as well. Within these generalizations there is, however, a substantial amount of variation in regional patterns of residence among Euroethnic groups. For example, more than 70 percent of Slovaks live in the North Central U.S. compared with 15 percent of Russians. Almost half of all persons reporting Serb/Croat ancestry reside in the Midwest.

Eastern and Southern European descendants are also heavily concentrated in urban areas. More than

TABLE 3.1
Region of Residence By National Origin and Generation, 1970
 (Percent)

	Northeast	North central	South	West
Southern European				
1st generation	66.4	17.0	6.4	10.3
2nd generation	66.0	15.4	7.7	10.6
Eastern European				
1st generation	46.9	31.2	8.0	13.8
2nd generation	46.4	34.5	8.3	10.4
Jewish ¹				
1st generation	67.6	11.7	10.3	10.3
2nd generation	66.9	12.4	10.5	10.2
Other whites				
1st generation	39.1	17.5	17.2	26.1
2nd generation	34.3	30.8	12.1	22.8
Old stock ²	19.6	29.5	33.7	17.1

¹Individuals for whom mother tongue is Yiddish or Hebrew are excluded from all other ancestry categories. All such individuals are included in the Jewish category.

²The "Other white-Old stock" category includes third- and later generation other white Americans as well as third- and later generation Americans of Eastern and Southern European descent.

Estimates based on the 1970 Census of Population, 1 percent Public Use Sample (15 percent questionnaire).

TABLE 3.2
Region of Residence and Residence in a Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA) by Ancestry Group, 1980
 (Percent distribution)

	Northeast	North central	South	West	Percent living in an SMSA
Southern European	58.5	15.7	12.4	13.4	93.0
Italian	59.8	15.0	12.0	13.1	92.9
Greek	42.2	23.7	17.6	16.5	94.5
Eastern European	40.7	33.8	12.7	12.8	90.8
Est./Lat./Lith.	45.7	29.1	12.8	12.4	92.1
Czech	34.6	38.2	16.3	11.0	86.0
Slovak	3.7	73.7	9.8	12.8	73.6
Polish	41.6	38.1	11.3	9.0	90.7
Russian	48.8	15.8	16.6	18.8	95.6
Ukrainian	55.7	22.9	10.9	10.5	91.5
Romanian	38.9	27.2	15.1	18.8	95.5
Hungarian	39.9	31.7	14.0	14.5	91.8
Serbian/Croatian	25.0	48.0	7.2	19.8	91.3
Other East European	41.5	21.3	8.7	28.5	93.5
Other whites	18.9	27.5	34.1	19.5	78.0

Estimates based on the 1980 Census of Population, 5 percent "A" Public Use Sample.

TABLE 3.3
Age Distribution of Population by Ancestry Group,¹ 1980

	Mean years of age	Percentage distribution		
		16-14	25-54	55+
Southern European	42.2	21.5	49.5	29.0
Italian	42.6	21.4	49.2	29.4
Greek	41.2	22.0	53.7	24.3
Eastern European	44.4	17.9	48.9	33.2
Est./Lat./Lith.	47.4	14.3	44.8	40.9
Czech	45.0	17.8	47.3	34.9
Slovak	43.9	20.0	47.7	32.3
Polish	43.2	19.6	49.1	31.3
Russian	45.3	14.7	51.3	34.0
Ukrainian	45.2	16.0	47.0	36.0
Romanian	46.5	13.6	48.9	37.5
Hungarian	44.9	7.4	48.2	34.4
Serbian/Croatian	44.3	17.9	49.4	32.7
Other East European	43.1	19.2	52.2	28.6
Other whites	42.3	21.8	50.1	28.1

¹Persons ages 16 and over.

Estimates are based on the 1980 Census of Population, 5 percent "A" Public Use Sample.

TABLE 3.4
Age Distribution of Population by Generation and National Origin, 1970

	16-24 (%)	25-54 (%)	55+ (%)
Southern European			
1st generation	6.5	32.5	61.0
2nd generation	6.3	66.8	26.9
Eastern European			
1st generation	6.6	31.6	61.8
2nd generation	5.3	60.2	34.6
Jewish ¹			
1st generation	4.1	16.8	79.1
2nd generation	3.7	55.1	41.3
Other whites			
1st generation	13.3	47.3	39.4
2nd generation	10.1	44.2	45.7
Old stock ²	25.5	51.3	23.2

¹Individuals for whom mother tongue is Yiddish or Hebrew are excluded from all other ancestry categories. All such individuals are included in the Jewish category.

²The "Other white-old stock" category includes third- and later generation other white Americans as well as third- and later generation Americans of Eastern and Southern European descent.

Estimates are based on the 1970 Census of Population, 1 percent Public Use Sample (15 percent questionnaire).

TABLE 3.5
Mean Years of Schooling Completed by Generation and Age, 1970

	Second generation			First generation	
	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Southern European	12.5	11.7	10.5	7.5	5.6
Italian	12.4	11.6	10.8	7.4	5.5
Greek	13.3	12.9	12.0	8.6	6.6
Eastern European	13.3	12.3	11.1	9.5	6.8
Est./Lat./Lith.	13.1	12.5	11.5	10.3	7.1
Czech	12.7	12.1	11.0	9.5	7.0
Polish	13.0	11.8	10.6	9.3	5.8
Russian	14.1	13.1	12.2	10.0	7.9
Ukrainian	14.1	12.3	10.8	8.9	6.9
Romanian	13.7	12.9	12.4	9.8	7.7
Hungarian	13.1	12.2	11.1	9.9	7.7
Yugoslav	12.7	12.0	11.2	7.9	5.7
Other East European	13.1	12.0	12.2	8.1	6.2
Jewish ¹	14.5	13.9	13.0	10.1	7.6
Other whites	12.3	11.7	11.3	9.5	8.3
Old stock white ²	12.2	11.7	11.2	10.4	9.3

¹Individuals for whom mother tongue is Yiddish or Hebrew are excluded from all other ancestry categories. All such individuals are included in the Jewish category.

²All third- and later generation whites, classified by age. The "Other white-Old stock" category includes third- and later generation other white Americans as well as third- and later generation Americans of Eastern and Southern European descent.

Estimates are based on the 1970 Census of Population, 1 percent Public Use Sample (15 percent questionnaire).

TABLE 3.6
Mean Years of Schooling Completed for Males, by Age and Ancestry Group, 1980

	25-34	45-54	65+
Southern European	13.7	12.0	8.7
Italian	13.7	11.9	8.7
Greek	13.7	12.3	8.8
Eastern European	14.5	13.1	10.2
Est./Lat./Lith.	14.9	13.4	11.2
Czech	14.3	12.7	9.4
Slovak	13.6	12.1	9.4
Polish	14.0	12.5	9.5
Russian	15.9	15.0	12.1
Ukrainian	14.6	12.8	9.7
Romanian	15.2	14.4	11.8
Hungarian	14.2	13.1	10.4
Serbian/Croatian	13.9	12.2	9.0
Other Eastern European	14.9	13.1	9.6
Other whites	13.4	12.2	10.1

Estimates based on the 1980 Census of Population, 5 percent "A" Public Use Sample.

90 percent of them reside in SMSAs compared with less than 80 percent of "other" whites. The only exceptions to this pattern are, again, Slovaks and to a lesser extent Czechs.

Age Distribution

Differences in the age composition of ancestry groups reflect various factors, including timing of immigration, fertility patterns, and the strength of ancestral attachments. The mean age of adults (ages 16 and above) of Southern European ancestry is nearly identical to that of "other" whites whereas persons of Eastern European ancestry tend to be older (table 3.3).

The difference in mean age between persons of Eastern European ancestry and other whites may appear relatively small—about 2 years—but the mean tends to mask more dramatic group differences that are revealed in data on the share of persons above age 55. For example, 40 percent of adult Estonian/Latvians/Lithuanians and 37 percent of Ukrainians and Romanians are above age 55 whereas only 28 percent of other whites are above age 55.

The age distribution of first- and second-generation Americans is particularly skewed. Because most Eastern and Southern European immigrants arrived around the turn of the century (table 3.4), second-generation Americans of Southern and Eastern European ancestry were older than average in 1970.

Educational Attainment

The "new immigrants" arrived in the U.S. with very little formal education. This situation, however, was to change quickly. Data from the 1970 census reveal a dramatic increase in educational attainment between immigrants and their descendants. Table 3.5 traces this phenomenon. The increase in education between the first and second generation can be examined by comparing first-generation 55–64 year olds to second-generation 25–34 year olds. Members of the latter group, born 30 years after the former, can crudely be considered the sons and daughters of the persons who arrived at the end of the immigration wave.

The increases in educational attainment reflected in this table are quite extraordinary. Over the course of a single generation, the mean years of schooling

completed by persons of Southern European origin increased by 5 years. For Eastern Europeans, the corresponding increase was almost 4 years, and the increase was about 2 years for "old stock" whites, persons whose families have been in the U.S. at least three generations.

Comparisons with earlier immigrants and their children are also possible, given the data in table 3.5. Persons of Eastern and Southern European origin went from an educational deficit relative to the native born to one of relative advantage. Older first-generation Americans from Eastern Europe (ages 65 and over) had on average 2.5 fewer years of schooling than "old stock" Americans. Younger second-generation Americans of Eastern European origin, however, have completed an average of 1 year *more* schooling than "old stock" whites of the same age. The single generation increase in schooling is even more dramatic for particular ethnic groups. Although first-generation Jewish Americans had a 2-year schooling deficit relative to "old stock" Americans, second-generation Jews had a 2-year advantage. Italian Americans started with close to a 4-year deficit relative to the "old stock" and edged ahead by the second generation.

The story of educational advance can also be traced using the more aggregate ancestry data available in the 1980 census (table 3.6). Although many first-generation Euroethnics were no longer alive in 1980, it is still evident that older Euroethnics, particularly those of Southern European ancestry, have relatively less schooling than "other" whites; the reverse holds among the young.

The relative educational advantage held by young persons of Eastern and Southern European ancestry is examined in more detail in table 3.7. This table presents a distribution of the number of years of schooling completed for persons ages 25–34 from the various ancestry groups. All of the Euroethnic groups have higher rates of college attendance than other whites. As a group, persons of Eastern European ancestry have completed college at a rate 55 percent higher than other whites. Persons who report Southern European ancestry have completed college at a rate 12 percent higher than other whites.¹

¹ Using the General Social Survey of the National Opinion Research Center, Greeley found that of the ethnic/religious groups he examined, Italian Catholics and Polish Catholics had the highest rate of educational mobility. The other groups in his

comparison were British Protestants, Irish Catholics, Irish Protestants, German Catholics, German Protestants, Scandinavian Protestants, Slavic Catholics, French Catholics, and "American" Protestants. Refer to table 30 of Andrew M. Greeley, *Ethnicity*,

TABLE 3.7
Percentage Distribution of Years of Schooling
Completed by Ancestry Group, 1980, 25-34 Year Olds

	0-7	8-11	12-15	16+
Southern European	1.9	8.4	62.8	26.9
Italian	1.6	8.3	63.6	26.5
Greek	5.6	9.8	53.3	31.5
Eastern European	0.8	5.6	56.2	37.4
Est./Lat./Lith.	0.5	3.8	51.7	44.0
Czech	0.5	4.0	61.2	34.4
Slovak	0.5	6.3	69.1	24.2
Polish	0.7	6.9	62.2	30.2
Russian	0.6	2.5	36.9	60.0
Ukrainian	0.6	4.1	56.5	38.7
Romanian	1.7	4.5	42.1	51.7
Hungarian	0.7	6.5	59.1	33.8
Serbian/Croatian	1.8	8.4	58.9	30.9
Other Eastern European	2.4	6.3	44.0	47.2
Other whites	2.4	11.3	62.2	24.1

Estimates based on the 1980 Census of Population, 5 percent "A" Public Use Sample.

Summary

Euroethnics are more highly concentrated in the Northeast and Midwest and in urban areas than are other whites. Nearly 60 percent of persons reporting Southern European ancestry reside in the Northeast; more than 93 percent live in metropolitan areas. Nearly 75 percent of Eastern Europeans live in the northeastern or north central regions. By contrast, about 19 percent of other whites live in the Northeast and 27 percent live in the North Central U.S.; 78 percent of other whites live in metropolitan areas. The average age of persons of Southern European descent and other whites is practically the same. Eastern European descendants are, on average, 2 years older.

The Euroethnic groups have made remarkable intergenerational progress with respect to educational attainment. Although Euroethnics started with an educational deficit, their educational attainment has grown by 4 or more years in one generation compared to an intergenerational change of about 2 years for other whites. Combining data across generations, working-age Americans of Southern European ancestry have an educational attainment roughly equal to that of other whites; Eastern Europeans have, on average, completed 1 year of schooling more than other whites. Young Euroethnics (ages 25-34) have completed college at a substantially higher rate than other whites.

Denomination, and Inequality, Sage Research Papers in the Social Sciences, vol. 4, series 90-029 (National Opinion Research Center, 1976). Lieberman shows that a large gain in educational and occupational achievement took place for the 1925-35 birth cohort of several Southern and Eastern European ethnic groups. (Stanley Lieberman, *A Piece of the Pie: Black and White Immigrants Since 1880*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980, pp.

200-06, 328-32.) Using 1979 CPS data, Alba found a narrowing of Italian and British American educational achievement. (Richard D. Alba, "The Twilight of Ethnicity among Americans of European Ancestry: the Case of Italians," in *Ethnicity and Race in the U.S.A.*, Richard E. Alba, ed., London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1985.)

The Employment and Earnings of Americans of Eastern and Southern European Ancestry

This chapter documents the labor market experiences of Americans of Eastern and Southern European descent, as well as the experiences of other whites. New data are presented and analyzed relating to labor force participation, employment, and unemployment. The occupational distribution of the work force within various ethnic groups is examined. Finally, and perhaps most important, the income and earnings of Euroethnics are examined.

Labor Force Status

This section presents an overview of labor force participation, employment, and unemployment for Americans of Eastern and Southern European ancestry and comparison groups. These measures of labor force status are perhaps the most fundamental indicators of work activity. Most of the data discussed in this section are from the 1980 Census of Population. It should be noted that the data refer to April, just before the beginning of the recession of 1980.

Employed persons include individuals at work in the week in which the census was taken. The unemployed include persons who are not working but have actively searched for a job within the 4 weeks prior to the survey. The labor force is defined to include both the employed and the unemployed. Persons who are neither employed nor looking for a job are considered to be out of the labor force.

¹ These measures are related by definition: $E/P = (1 - (U/L)) \cdot (L/P)$. Thus, the employment to population ratio can be expressed as the product of the labor force participation rate and the "employment rate," which reflects the employed share of the

labor force, the complement of the unemployment rate. As such, group differences in employment can be attributed to differences in labor force participation and unemployment.

These concepts are used to define three basic measures of labor force status: the labor force participation rate, which reflects the share of the relevant group in the labor force; the unemployment rate, which reflects the share of the labor force who are not working; and finally, the employment to population ratio.¹ Table 4.1 presents estimates of these rates for Americans of Eastern and Southern European ancestry as well as for comparison groups. The tabulations are limited to persons in the "prime" earning years, ages 25-54, and are presented separately for men and women.

Table 4.1 reveals only minor differences between Eastern and Southern European groups and other whites with respect to labor force status. Among men, labor force participation is between $\frac{1}{2}$ and 1 percentage point higher among the Eastern and Southern European ancestry groups than it is for other whites. Unemployment rates are generally a bit lower among these groups than among other whites. Only among Ukrainians is the unemployment rate greater (although only by 0.3 percent) than among other whites. As labor force participation is a bit higher and unemployment a bit lower among persons of Southern and Eastern European ancestry, employment as a share of population is generally as high or higher among these groups as among other whites.

labor force, the complement of the unemployment rate. As such, group differences in employment can be attributed to differences in labor force participation and unemployment.

TABLE 4.1
Labor Force Status, 1980, 25-54 Year Olds

	Male			Female		
	LFP	UR	EP	LFP	UR	EP
Southern European	94.8	4.3	90.7	61.2	5.1	58.1
Italian	94.8	4.3	90.7	61.2	5.1	58.3
Greek	94.0	4.0	90.2	59.2	4.9	56.3
Eastern European	95.5	4.0	91.7	65.1	4.8	62.1
Est./Lat./Lith.	95.6	3.7	92.0	68.0	4.3	65.1
Czech	96.0	3.6	92.5	64.2	4.2	61.5
Slovakian	96.1	3.6	92.6	64.9	3.8	62.4
Polish	95.4	4.3	91.3	64.5	4.8	61.4
Russian	95.5	2.9	92.8	67.8	4.6	64.7
Ukrainian	95.3	4.8	90.6	65.1	5.0	61.9
Romanian	95.1	3.9	91.4	67.1	5.0	63.7
Hungarian	95.5	4.0	91.7	63.9	4.9	60.8
Serbian/Croatian	95.4	4.7	90.9	63.4	5.5	59.9
Other Eastern European	93.6	4.0	89.9	64.0	5.0	60.8
Other whites	94.3	4.5	90.4	62.5	4.8	59.6

Note: LFP = Labor force participation ratio; UR = Unemployment rate; EP = Employment to population ratio.
Estimates based on the 1980 Census of Population, 5 percent "A" Public Use Sample.

The overall similarity in labor force participation between Eastern and Southern European ancestry groups and others is maintained when the focus is shifted to women. In comparison to other whites, labor force participation is generally a bit higher among Eastern European women and a bit lower among Southern European women compared to other whites. There are no sizeable differences in unemployment rates between these groups. The employed share of the population is roughly 3 percentage points higher among Eastern European women than among other white women and is roughly 1 percentage point lower among women of Southern European descent.

As discussed in chapter 3, persons of Eastern and Southern European ancestry are much more heavily concentrated in the northeastern and north central areas of the country than is the population as a whole. These areas have generally experienced higher than average unemployment. Thus, the unemployment rates of these groups likely reflect regional patterns of residence as well as ethnicity.

To examine these effects, expected region-specific unemployment rates for other white males were

calculated in table 4.2 to reflect the regional distribution of the various ancestry groups. The statistics in table 4.2 suggest that if other white males had the same regional distribution as Italians, for instance, their average unemployment rate would be 4.6 percent instead of the 4.5 rate reported in table 4.1; if their geographic distribution paralleled that of Slovaks, the corresponding unemployment rate would be 5.2 instead of 4.5 percent. Thus table 4.2 indicates that if Euroethnics and other whites shared the same regional distribution, the unemployment rates of Euroethnics would be even lower relative to other whites than what is reported in table 4.1.

Related measures of work activity are weeks worked per year and hours worked per week. These data are presented in table 4.3. The principal conclusion one can draw from these data is that persons of Eastern and Southern European ancestry worked about as many weeks and hours (in 1979) as did other whites.

Occupational Distribution

Occupational data from the 1970 census reveal a dramatic shift in the occupational distribution of

TABLE 4.2
Male Unemployment Rates, 25-54 Year Olds, 1980

	Ancestry unemployment rate	Expected U.S. unemployment rate for "other whites"*
Southern European	4.3	4.6
Italian	4.3	4.6
Greek	4.0	4.6
Eastern European	4.0	4.7
Est./Lat./Lith.	3.7	4.7
Czech	3.6	4.7
Slovak	3.6	5.2
Polish	4.3	4.6
Russian	2.9	4.6
Ukrainian	4.8	4.7
Romanian	3.9	4.8
Hungarian	4.0	4.8
Serbian/Croatian	4.7	4.9
Other Eastern European	4.0	4.8

* Shows what the unemployment rate for "other" white males would be if they had the regional distribution of the relevant ancestry group. Thus, regional U.S. unemployment rates (25-54 year olds) for other white males were weighted by the regional distribution of the relevant ancestry group (25-54 year-old males). Regional rates are: Northeast, 4.6; North central, 5.5; South, 3.2; West, 5.0.
Estimates based on the 1980 Census of Population, 5 percent "A" Public Use Sample.

TABLE 4.3
Weeks and Hours Worked in 1979, 25-54 Year Olds

	Weeks per year	Hours per week	Weeks per year	Hours per week
	Male		Female	
Southern European	48.2	43.2	42.3	34.1
Italian	48.3	43.0	42.3	34.0
Greek	47.4	45.0	42.2	35.5
Eastern European	48.5	43.5	42.5	34.6
Est./Lat./Lith.	48.6	43.4	43.0	34.5
Czech	48.9	43.6	42.7	34.9
Slovakian	49.0	45.2	42.0	34.8
Polish	48.6	43.2	42.7	34.5
Russian	48.2	46.9	41.9	34.0
Ukrainian	48.2	43.0	42.6	34.9
Romanian	47.7	43.4	42.3	34.8
Hungarian	48.6	43.7	42.2	34.6
Serbian/Croatian	48.0	42.9	42.6	35.3
Other Eastern European	47.8	43.8	42.5	35.0
Other whites	48.3	44.0	41.9	35.7

Sample includes individuals who worked in 1979.
Estimates based on the 1980 Census of Population, 5 percent "A" Public Use Sample.

TABLE 4.4
Generational Differences in Occupational Distribution for
Males by Country of Origin, 1970

Birth cohort	Prof., technical, managerial	Sales, clerical kindred	Service	Farm	Crafts and kindred	Operatives	Others
Southern Eur.							
1st: 1905-14 ¹	14.1	7.7	19.5	0.9	23.2	34.7	-
2nd: 1935-44 ²	34.4	16.6	8.4	0.6	21.5	17.3	1.3
Eastern Eur.							
1st: 1905-14	22.2	13.4	12.1	1.5	23.9	26.7	0.1
2nd: 1935-44	44.5	14.8	4.6	1.3	15.5	15.5	1.9
Jewish: ³							
1st: 1905-14	34.8	28.7	4.6	-	14.3	17.6	-
2nd: 1935-44	61.4	25.2	2.2	-	4.9	4.7	1.6
Other whites							
1st: 1905-14	23.8	11.9	13.5	4.5	24.7	21.9	0.1
2nd: 1935-44	32.2	13.8	6.4	2.8	20.1	21.5	3.3
Nat: 1905-14 ⁴	24.1	13.7	7.7	8.1	24.0	22.2	0.1
Nat: 1935-44 ⁵	29.1	13.1	4.8	2.8	22.0	23.8	3.8

¹First-generation men born 1905-14.

²Second-generation men born 1935-44.

³Individuals for whom mother tongue is Yiddish or Hebrew are excluded from all other ancestry categories. All such individuals are included in the Jewish category.

⁴Native (third- and later generation) white men born 1905-14. Includes third- and later generation Americans of Eastern or Southern European descent.

⁵Native (third- and later generation) white men born 1935-44. Includes third- and later generation Americans of Eastern or Southern European descent.

Estimates based on the 1970 Census of Population, 1 percent Public Use Sample (15 percent questionnaire).

men between the first and second generations, away from "blue-collar" craft and operative occupations toward "white-collar" professional and managerial occupations. Table 4.4 reports occupational distributions for representative first- and second-generation birth cohorts.² The immigrant cohort reflects persons born abroad between 1905 and 1914, shortly after the peak of the immigration wave; the second-generation cohort reflects persons born 30 years later. The second-generation cohort is loosely considered to be the "sons" of the first-generation cohort.³

Between the first and second generation, the share of workers who were employed in professional occupations increased by more than 20 percentage

points among both Eastern and Southern Europeans. The share in managerial occupations also increased among men of Southern and Eastern European descent. Correspondingly, the share of workers employed in operative occupations fell by half for men of Southern European descent and by almost that much for men of Eastern European origin. The share in craft occupations also fell, although these magnitudes are less dramatic.

There has been, of course, a general shift in the occupational distribution of employment over time. This is demonstrated in the data on third- and later generation Americans reported in table 4.4. However, the growth in professional and managerial employment for men of Eastern and Southern

² A birth cohort is a group of persons all born within the same time period (e.g., from 1905-1914).

³ Due to changes in the occupational classification system, the 1980 and 1970 categories are not exactly comparable.

European descent far exceeds the increases for other white men. In total, second-generation men of Southern and Eastern European ancestry are overrepresented in managerial and professional ranks, relative to other native whites.

Averaging the experiences of all generations of men of Eastern and Southern European ancestry in 1980 reveals an occupational distribution quite similar to that of other whites. As shown in table 4.5, relative to other whites, Eastern and Southern European men tend to be slightly underrepresented in the blue-collar occupations ("operators, fabricators, and laborers" and "precision production, craft, and repair"). Southern European men are more concentrated in service occupations than are other whites (11.4 percent vs. 8.5 percent) and are somewhat overrepresented in the "managerial and professional specialty" and "technical, sales and administrative support" categories. An unusually high percentage of Eastern European men are concentrated in managerial and professional occupations (30 percent vs. 22 percent for other whites). For Russians, a group that contains many Jewish persons, fully 48 percent are in these occupations. Americans of Romanian ancestry and of Estonian/Latvian/Lithuanian ancestry also are highly concentrated in the managerial and professional occupations. Euroethnics are underrepresented in farming occupations.

Table 4.6 shows that the occupational distribution of American women of Eastern and Southern European ancestry is practically indistinguishable from that of "other" white women. The largest difference is in managerial and professional occupations where Eastern European women are somewhat overrepresented relative to other white women.

Earnings Differences: Basic Results

Concerns about discrimination often arise from race, sex, and ethnic differentials in earnings. Largely because of a dearth of appropriate data, there has been little analysis of the earnings of Euroethnics. This section tries to correct that deficiency. Data from the 1980 Census of Population are used to develop estimates of average earnings for men and women of Eastern and Southern European ancestry. These estimates are then compared to estimates of average earnings for "other" whites.

⁴ Earnings reflect the sum of wages and salaries and self-employment income. Weekly and hourly earnings reflect the "ratio of means" as opposed to the "mean of the ratios." More specifically, weekly earnings are calculated as the mean annual

Table 4.7 presents simple measures of average earnings for men of Southern and Eastern European ancestry and comparison groups. The measures are calculated on an annual, weekly, and hourly basis in order to examine sensitivity of the results to alternative specifications.⁴ These tabulations are restricted to persons in their prime earning years, ages 25–54.

Whether the data are calculated on an annual, weekly, or hourly basis, the results indicate that the average earnings of men of Southern European ancestry exceed those of non-Southern, non-Eastern European whites by 4 to 6 percent. Mean earnings for men of Eastern European ancestry exceed the level for other whites by 17 to 18 percent.

These basic ratios, of course, do not account for any differences between groups with respect to their productive characteristics. As shown in chapter 3, the Euroethnic groups have made enormous gains in educational attainment over the generations and are now comparatively well educated. Since schooling is known to be positively related to earnings, the high educational attainment of Euroethnics could help explain their higher earnings. Table 4.7 presents estimates of earnings ratios that adjust for differences in years of schooling. Ratios of hourly earnings are presented for workers with 0–11, 12–15, and 16+ years of schooling completed, respectively. These tabulations reveal that the aggregate earnings ratios are not simply the consequence of differences in educational attainment among groups, since within each educational class the earnings of persons of Eastern and Southern European descent tend to be higher than for other whites. However, the differentials between most Euroethnic groups and the "other" white category are reduced when education is taken into account.

Women of Eastern and Southern European ancestry also have higher earnings than other white women, but the magnitude of their earnings advantage is somewhat smaller than the men's. These results are reported in table 4.8. Women of Southern European ancestry earn up to 7 percent more than others; women of Eastern European ancestry earn between 10 and 15 percent more than "other" white women. As with men, the hourly earnings advantage is maintained within education classes.

earnings divided by mean weeks per year for members of the particular group. Hourly earnings are calculated as mean annual earnings divided by mean hours per year (weeks worked multiplied by usual hours per week).

TABLE 4.5
Occupational Distribution, Males, 1980
(Percent)

	Managerial and prof. specialty	Technical sales and adm. support	Service	Farming	Precision production craft and repair	Operatives, fabricators, laborers	Others
Southern Eur.	24.5	20.6	11.4	1.7	20.3	20.0	1.5
Italian	24.0	20.8	10.1	1.8	20.6	20.3	1.5
Greek	30.4	19.0	16.0	1.1	16.6	15.6	1.3
Eastern Eur.	30.0	20.7	8.0	2.3	18.7	19.0	1.3
Est./Lat./Lith.	34.8	21.3	8.1	1.4	17.0	16.1	1.3
Czech	25.6	19.0	7.7	4.4	21.0	20.8	1.5
Slovakian	20.3	16.6	8.0	8.7	22.7	22.2	1.4
Polish	24.7	19.7	8.9	2.1	20.7	22.5	1.5
Russian	47.8	26.3	5.6	1.2	9.8	8.7	0.8
Ukrainian	28.9	19.7	8.6	1.8	19.8	19.7	1.4
Romanian	42.8	25.0	6.8	0.9	12.2	11.3	0.9
Hungarian	29.4	20.4	7.9	1.6	20.1	19.0	1.6
Serb./Croat.	23.7	16.9	9.2	2.2	24.0	22.9	1.2
Other	34.9	21.8	8.1	1.8	17.2	15.5	0.8
Other whites	22.2	18.2	8.5	5.0	21.1	22.9	2.2

Estimates based on the 1980 Census of Population, 5 percent "A" Public Use Sample.

TABLE 4.6
Occupational Distribution, Females, 1980
(Percent)

	Managerial and prof. specialty	Technical sales and adm. support	Service	Farming	Precision production craft and repair	Operatives, fabricators, laborers	Others
Southern Eur.	19.4	50.9	16.1	0.4	2.4	10.8	0.2
Italian	19.1	51.2	16.0	0.4	2.3	10.8	0.2
Greek	22.4	46.3	16.4	0.5	3.1	11.0	0.3
Eastern Eur.	25.1	48.3	14.7	0.6	2.0	9.1	0.2
Est./Lat./Lith.	28.5	47.0	13.6	0.5	1.8	8.5	0.1
Czech	23.3	48.7	15.7	0.9	2.1	9.2	0.2
Slovakian	18.2	48.0	19.9	1.9	1.9	9.9	0.2
Polish	21.0	48.8	16.1	0.7	2.1	11.1	0.3
Russian	37.3	48.2	9.1	0.4	1.3	3.6	0.1
Ukrainian	23.9	45.6	16.2	0.5	2.2	11.3	0.2
Romanian	33.4	47.5	10.6	0.2	1.7	6.5	0.1
Hungarian	24.5	48.8	15.0	0.5	2.2	8.9	0.1
Serb./Croat.	20.9	47.2	17.6	0.4	2.5	11.1	0.2
Other	29.7	46.8	12.7	0.5	3.0	7.3	0.1
Other whites	20.8	46.1	17.7	1.2	2.3	11.6	0.3

Estimates based on the 1980 Census of Population, 5 percent "A" Public Use Sample.

TABLE 4.7
Earnings of Eastern and Southern European Ancestry Groups
Relative to Other Whites, Males, Ages 25-54, 1980

	Annual	Weekly	Hourly	Hourly (by years of schooling)		
				0-11	12-15	16+
Southern European	1.04	1.05	1.06	1.11	1.07	1.02
Italian	1.04	1.04	1.07	1.12	1.07	1.02
Greek	1.09	1.07	1.05	0.96	1.03	1.08
Eastern European	1.18	1.17	1.18	1.14	1.10	1.14
Est./Lat./Lith.	1.21	1.20	1.22	1.12	1.10	1.13
Czech	1.09	1.07	1.09	1.07	1.07	1.00
Slovakian	1.01	1.00	0.98	1.03	0.98	0.94
Polish	1.08	1.08	1.10	1.13	1.07	1.06
Russian	1.52	1.51	1.51	1.20	1.27	1.35
Ukrainian	1.09	1.08	1.12	1.20	1.06	1.03
Romanian	1.33	1.33	1.35	1.12	1.19	1.24
Hungarian	1.17	1.16	1.17	1.17	1.08	1.14
Serb./Croat.	1.09	1.10	1.13	1.22	1.13	1.02
Other East Eur.	1.18	1.19	1.19	1.05	1.10	1.11
Other whites	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00

Estimates based on the 1980 Census of Population, 5 percent "A" Public Use Sample.

The 1970 census data can be used to track gains in relative earnings between the first and second generations in the U.S. The tabulations are analogous to those used to follow intergenerational progress in educational attainment and occupational distribution. The results are reported in table 4.9.

The results indicate that immigrants from Southern and Eastern Europe have fared quite well in the U.S. labor market. Earnings data from 1970, of course, reflect the end of this cohort's working lives, but nonetheless indicate that any overall earnings disadvantage faced by immigrants was close to eliminated by 1970. For example, immigrants from Southern Europe had mean earnings that were 95 percent of those of "native" (third- and later generation) Americans of the same age. The earnings of immigrants from Eastern Europe were 11 percent higher and of Jewish immigrants, 35 percent higher. Of course, many of these immigrants likely arrived in the U.S. as children and may not have faced the same earnings patterns as immigrants who arrived later in life.

The sons of these immigrants have attained even higher relative incomes. Second-generation Americans of Southern European heritage (ages 25-34 in 1970) earned 13 percent more than "native" whites; the figure for men of Eastern European descent is 22 percent; for Jewish men, 43 percent.

Earnings Differences: Regression Analysis

The basic tabulations of relative earnings discussed above fail to control jointly for differences across groups with respect to factors such as years of work experience, schooling, and region. For instance, Euroethnics tend to live in the Northeast where wages are high. They also tend to be more educated than non-Euroethnics, and Eastern European men are, on average, older than other men. Controlling for these characteristics may eliminate the earnings advantage of Euroethnics found in the preceeding analyses. The question is whether Euroethnics do as well as non-Euroethnics who have the same level of education, work experience, and region of residence.

TABLE 4.8
Earnings of Eastern and Southern European Ancestry Groups
Relative to Other Whites, Females, 25–54, 1980

	Annual	Weekly	Hourly	Hourly earnings by years of schooling		
				0–11	12–15	16+
Southern European	1.00	1.02	1.07	1.09	1.07	1.05
Italian	1.00	1.02	1.06	1.09	1.07	1.04
Greek	1.05	1.08	1.09	1.05	1.07	1.07
Eastern European	1.10	1.12	1.15	1.14	1.09	1.09
Est/Lat/Lith	1.15	1.16	1.20	1.14	1.11	1.09
Czech	1.05	1.06	1.08	1.09	1.06	1.01
Slovakian	0.94	0.97	0.99	1.00	0.99	0.95
Polish	1.05	1.07	1.10	1.11	1.07	1.06
Russian	1.22	1.26	1.32	1.22	1.17	1.13
Ukrainian	1.10	1.12	1.14	1.17	1.11	1.04
Romanian	1.20	1.23	1.28	1.13	1.17	1.12
Hungarian	1.08	1.11	1.14	1.09	1.07	1.07
Serb./Croat.	1.11	1.29	1.14	1.20	1.14	1.07
Other East Eur.	1.16	1.18	1.21	1.20	1.08	1.12
Other white	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00

Estimates based on the 1980 Census of Population, 5 percent "A" Public Use Sample.

TABLE 4.9
Earnings of First- and Second-Generation Euroethnic Men Relative to
Native White Men Born at the Same Time, 1970

	Men born 1906–15 First generation or native	Men born 1936–45 Second generation or native
Immigrants		
Southern European	0.95	1.13
Eastern European	1.11	1.22
Jewish ¹	1.35	1.43
Other white	1.02	1.06
Native whites ²	1.00	1.00

¹Individuals for whom mother tongue is Yiddish or Hebrew are excluded from all other ancestry categories. All such individuals are included in the Jewish category.

²All third- and later generation white men including those of Euroethnic descent who could not be identified in the 1970 census.

Estimates based on the 1970 Census of Population, 1 percent Public Use Sample (15 percent questionnaire).

Multiple regression analysis is used to control statistically for the various factors that affect earnings. Hourly earnings, as opposed to annual or weekly earnings, were used as the measure of compensation so as to take into account the number of hours persons worked in a given year.⁵ The earnings analysis is limited to men who were born in the U.S. Within this group, the first issue is how well men who report a single Euroethnic ancestry fare relative to other native-born, non-Hispanic white men. The second set of results compares the economic performance of Euroethnic men, including those who report mixed ancestries, such as Slovak-German or Hungarian-Czech, with other non-Hispanic white men.

The numbers in the four columns of table 4.10 show the effect on hourly earnings of being in a particular ancestry group by comparison to other non-Hispanic whites. This effect is first estimated controlling for education, years of work experience, ability to speak English, region, and urban residence.⁶ Controlling for these characteristics, regression 1 shows the effect on earnings, relative to other non-Hispanic whites, of being in one of the detailed single Euroethnic ancestry categories. That is, it relates the earnings of men who report only one Euroethnic ancestry to the earnings of other non-Hispanic white men who report non-Euroethnic ancestries.

After controlling for schooling and the additional factors cited, several of the single Euroethnic ancestry groups continue to do significantly better than non-Euroethnics.⁷ For instance, the Italians earn 4 percent more than other whites, the Poles earn about 6 percent more, and men reporting only Russian ancestry earn 11 percent more than their non-Euroethnic counterparts. Only the group composed of those reporting Estonian, Latvian, or Lithuanian single ancestry do worse. The earnings of the other groups do not differ significantly from those of non-Euroethnic whites.

⁵ One group may have higher annual earnings than another by virtue of working longer hours. Thus a comparison of economic performance based on annual or weekly earnings may hide labor market discrimination if certain groups are excluded from jobs with higher hourly wages. It should be noted, however, that the hourly earnings measure may be more subject to measurement error than annual or weekly earnings. Therefore, regressions were also run using annual and weekly earnings as the dependent variable. The annual earnings regressions may be found in table B.2 of appendix B. Regressions using weekly earnings as the dependent variable are available upon request.

⁶ Table B.1 of appendix B presents all variables used in the

Controlling for the same characteristics, regression 2 examines the effect on earnings, relative to other whites, of being in detailed Euroethnic ancestry groups that include persons who report a mixed ancestry. The estimated earnings effects are similar to those reported in regression 1 except that the estimated adverse effect on earnings of being in the Estonian/Latvian/Lithuanian group is reduced and no longer statistically significant. The large positive effect on earnings associated with the Serbo-Croatian ancestry group⁸ becomes statistically significant once multiple ancestries are included in the group.

Regressions 1-a and 2-a control for occupation, industry, and self-employment in addition to the characteristics controlled for in regressions 1 and 2. Controlling for type of employment barely alters the results. The estimated ancestry effect on earnings is raised for some groups and lowered for others. All changes, however, are small.

In sum, controlling for various characteristics that affect earnings, these results indicate that men of Southern and Eastern European ancestry on the whole fare about as well as non-Euroethnic, non-Hispanic white men. Men reporting Russian or Serbo-Croatian ancestry actually earn between 11 and 16 percent more than non-Euroethnic men with similar characteristics. Men of Italian or Polish ancestry consistently earn at least 4 percent more than non-Euroethnic men. The earnings of the other groups, with the exception of Estonian/Latvian/Lithuanian men, show no statistically significant difference from the earnings of non-Euroethnic men.

The benchmark group, non-Hispanic non-Euroethnic whites, used in the regressions presented in table 4.10 is composed of numerous diverse groups. The earnings of some of these groups could, conceivably, be affected by labor market discrimination. If this were the case, a comparison of their economic performance with that of Euroethnics would underestimate the presence of labor market discrimination

analysis and their estimated effects on earnings. Separate regressions were also run for each group. The results from the separate estimated regressions are shown in table B.4 of appendix B.

⁷ Since the results are based on a sample, rather than the entire U.S. population, they are subject to sampling variation. Results that are statistically significant at the 5 percent level are starred. Generally speaking, a statistically significant result is one for which it would be very unlikely to estimate the result had the true effect on earnings of being in a particular ancestry group been zero.

⁸ Includes persons who report Yugoslavian (not elsewhere classified), Croatian, Serbian, or Slovene ancestries.

TABLE 4.10
Approximate Percentage Impact of Ethnicity on Hourly Earnings of
Native-Born Males, Ages 25-64, 1980

(Benchmark Group Is Non-Hispanic, Non-Euroethnic White Males)

	Single ancestry Euroethnics relative to other non-Hispanic whites <i>Regression results</i>		Single and mixed ancestry Euroethnics relative to other non-Hispanic whites <i>Regression results</i>	
	1	1-a	2	2-a
Southern European				
Italian	.043*	.060*	.040*	.056*
Greek	.045	.041	.065	.055
Eastern European				
Est./Lat./Lith.	– .152*	– .153*	– .085	– .088
Czech	.029	.024	.034	.027
Slovak	– .022	– .015	– .015	– .018
Polish	.058*	.049*	.064*	.057*
Russian	.113*	.149*	.135*	.161*
Ukrainian	.140	.112	.102	.081
Romanian	– .040	– .009	.034	.080
Hungarian	.064	.063	.079	.077
Serb./Croat.	.141	.112	.145*	.126*
Other East Eur.	.067	.089	.055	.075
Control variables				
Education	x	x	x	x
Work experience	x	x	x	x
English ability	x	x	x	x
Region	x	x	x	x
Urban	x	x	x	x
Occupation		x		x
Industry		x		x
Self-employment		x		x

* Significant at .05 level.

Notes: Results derived from regression estimates that include listed "controls" as independent variables. The results indicate the approximate proportionate amount by which the earnings of a particular ancestry group differ from the earnings of non-Hispanic non-Euroethnic white males controlling for various factors that affect earnings.

The data set used for this analysis is a .1% microdata sample of the 1980 "A" sample. It is restricted to the native born and excludes Hispanics, students, persons who reported zero earnings for the year 1979, and unpaid family workers. The sample is discussed in appendix A. Full regression results are presented in table B.1 of appendix B.

TABLE 4.11
Approximate Percentage Impact of Ethnicity on Hourly Earnings of
Native-Born Males, Ages 25–64, 1980
 (Benchmark Group Is British-Origin White Males)

	Single ancestry Euroethnics relative to British-origin white males <i>Regression results</i>		Single and mixed ancestry Euroethnics relative to British-origin white males <i>Regression results</i>	
	1	1-a	2	2-a
Southern European				
Italian	.042*	.060*	.036*	.053*
Greek	.044	.039	.060	.051
Eastern European				
Est./Lat./Lith.	– .153*	– .154*	– .089	– .091
Czech	.028	.023	.029	.023
Slovak	– .026	– .019	– .021	– .023
Polish	.056*	.046*	.059*	.053*
Russian	.113*	.148*	.130*	.156*
Ukrainian	.140	.108	.099	.078
Romanian	– .044	– .014	.028	.076
Hungarian	.061	.061	.074	.072
Serb./Croat.	.139	.109	.140*	.121*
Other East Eur.	.065	.087	.050	.070
Control variables				
Education	x	x	x	x
Work experience	x	x	x	x
English ability	x	x	x	x
Region	x	x	x	x
Urban	x	x	x	x
Occupation		x		x
Industry		x		x
Self-employment		x		x

* Significant at .05 level.

Notes: Results derived from regression estimates that include listed "controls" as independent variables. The results indicate the approximate proportionate amount by which the earnings of a particular ancestry group differ from the earnings of British-origin white males controlling for various factors that affect earnings. Full regression results including estimated coefficients for various Euroethnic and non-Euroethnic groups are given in table B.3 of appendix B.

TABLE 4.12
Percentage of Persons in
Families with Income
Below Poverty Line, 1980

	25-64	65+
Southern European	5.5	10.0
Italian	5.4	9.9
Greek	6.8	11.0
Eastern European	4.8	9.3
Est./Lat./Lith.	4.1	7.5
Czech	4.4	10.7
Slovakian	5.3	12.1
Polish	4.9	9.7
Russian	4.6	7.3
Ukrainian	4.8	9.4
Romanian	5.5	7.8
Hungarian	4.9	9.0
Yugoslav	4.6	9.3
Other East Eur.	6.4	11.1
Other whites	7.0	13.2

Estimates based on the 1980 Census of Population, 5 percent "A" Public Use Sample.

against Euroethnics. Taking this consideration into account, further analysis was done wherein the benchmark group included only persons who listed British origin as their sole ancestry on the 1980 census. The results, which follow the same format as those given in table 4.10, are given in table 4.11. Comparing tables 4.10 and 4.11 shows that changing the comparison group barely affects the results. The same conclusions that were reached when the earnings of Euroethnics were compared to the earnings of non-Hispanic non-Euroethnic white males still hold.

The multivariate regression results give information on the relative earnings of native-born men who list a Southern or Eastern European ancestry on the

⁹ The analysis uses the 1970 Census of Population, 1/1000 sample, 15 percent questionnaire. See, Barry R. Chiswick, "Sons of Immigrants: Are They at an Earnings Disadvantage?" in *American Economic Review Papers and Proceedings*, vol. 67 (February 1977), pp. 376-78.

¹⁰ The analysis uses the 1970 Census of Population, 1/100 sample, 5 percent questionnaire. See, Barry R. Chiswick, *An Analysis of the Economic Progress and Impact of Immigrants*,

1980 census. The 1970 census data allow a partial check on the validity of the results based on ancestry data. Using the 1970 data, it is possible to identify second-generation persons of Eastern and Southern European descent by their parents' place of birth and compare their earnings with those of other second-generation persons. Controlling for characteristics such as education and labor market experience, Chiswick found no significant earnings difference between Americans with parents born in the British Isles and persons with parents born in Southern and Eastern Europe.⁹ Chiswick also used the 1970 census data to investigate the economic progress of immigrants. Using immigrants from the British Isles as the benchmark, his analysis shows no significant earnings differences for immigrants from Southern and Eastern Europe.¹⁰

Poverty Statistics

Most of the data presented in the previous section deal with average earnings. Such statistics can mask important differences between groups with respect to the number of persons at the extremes of the income distribution. Of particular concern is the low end of that distribution—the share of persons who live in poverty.

Table 4.12 reports the percentage of persons in families with income below the poverty line. These results indicate that for all Eastern and Southern European ancestry groups, the share of persons living in families with income below the poverty line is smaller than it is among other whites.

Employment Discrimination at the Top

Despite the economic gains Euroethnic groups have made, some argue that access to the highest levels of the corporate ladder remains limited. For instance, in a paper examining this issue, Barta concludes that Poles and Italians are "grossly under-represented in the executive suites of Chicago's major corporations."¹¹ This conclusion was based on a study of the ethnic origins of 2,635 executives (officers and members of the board of directors) in 92 Chicago-based major corporations in 1983. To

monograph prepared for the Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor (June 1980).

¹¹ Russell Barta, "The Representation of Poles, Italians, Hispanics and Blacks in the Executive Suites of Chicago's Largest Corporations," *Minority Report No. 2*, Institute of Urban Life (Chicago, Ill., 1984). (The report is also available from the National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs, Washington, D.C.).

assess the degree of representation of Poles and Italians in top management, their percentage representation in such positions was compared to their percentage representation in the overall population of the Chicago area. This comparison, however, may be misleading, since the applicant pool for high positions in large corporations is typically nationwide. Despite the ambiguity surrounding the degree of underrepresentation of Poles and Italians in Chicago's corporations, the Barta study shows that Poles and Italians have increased their shares in Chicago's corporate life between 1972 and 1983.

A trend towards greater ethnic representation in the upper echelons of corporate employment was also found in a comparison between a 1986 survey of 4,350 senior executives of the Nation's largest companies and a similar survey done in 1979.¹² The 1986 survey revealed that the dominant representation of Protestants had dropped significantly—from 68.4 percent in 1979 to 58.3 percent in 1986—and that the representation of Jews and Catholics had risen. The representation of Catholics rose from 21.5 percent to 27.1 percent; that for Jews rose from 5.6 percent to 7.4 percent. Minority gains were greater when the comparison was limited to those under the age of 40.

The Chicago study and the nationwide executive surveys suggest two tentative conclusions about employment discrimination against Euroethnic groups in management positions of major corporations: one, that such discrimination has been a factor in top corporate employment and, two, this situation may be changing.

¹² *Korn/Ferry International's Executive Profile: A Survey of Corporate Leaders* (John A. Sussman, Vice President, Research) New York, N.Y., 1979) and *Korn/Ferry International's Executive Profile: A Survey of Corporate Leaders in the Eighties* (1986). These

Conclusions

This chapter utilizes new data from the 1980 census, supplemented with information from the 1970 census, to examine the economic status of men and women of Eastern and Southern European ancestry. Several dimensions of economic conditions, including patterns of employment and unemployment, occupational distribution, and earnings, have been examined. The results reveal that along virtually every dimension, Americans of Southern and Eastern European ancestry have generally succeeded as well or better than other Americans. This does not imply that many individuals of Eastern or Southern European heritage have not suffered from prejudice or discrimination; it only suggests that for the groups as a whole, there is no overt indication of current and widespread discrimination against them in the labor market—that is, the existence of group-specific differences that cannot be explained by standard economic variables such as those accounted for in this report.

Admittedly, the measures of skill available to the analysis as controls are far from complete. Thus, it is possible that Euroethnics do as well or better than other whites only because they have superior, unmeasured characteristics, such as higher quality schooling or training, or greater work effort. In that case they may even earn less than other whites with the *identical* worker characteristics. Although this hypothesis is not testable with the data at hand, it seems unlikely that these unmeasured traits vary enough between Euroethnics and other white groups to reverse sharply the outcomes shown. On the other hand, unmeasured factors likely are responsible for some of the differences in effects among the Euroethnic groups and between these groups and non-Euroethnics.

studies were described along with other discussion about ethnic representation in the banking industry in an article by Robert A. Bennett in the June 18, 1986, issue of the *New York Times*.

The Melting Pot Revisited

Throughout this report, Euroethnics are treated as a distinct group. But to what extent do persons of Southern and Eastern European ancestry perceive themselves as members of distinct groups and how is this identification changing? The extent of ethnic cohesion cannot be gauged with census data. However, some information about aspects of assimilation can be gleaned by comparing the responses of young and old persons to certain questions in the 1980 census. An ethnic group, of course, can become assimilated in many respects and yet maintain strong cultural ties.¹

The 1980 census measures the extent to which persons who report a particular ancestry report a single ancestry as opposed to multiple ancestries.² Multiple ancestries probably reflect patterns of intermarriage that may affect attachment to a single ethnic group. Ethnic "homogeneity" can be defined as the extent to which people identify with a single ethnic group. A measure of homogeneity is constructed as the ratio of persons who report a single ancestry to the number of persons who report that ancestry, either in whole or in part:

Homogeneity Index =

$$\frac{\text{number who report single ancestry } i}{\text{total number who report ancestry } i}$$

Estimates of this index are presented in table 5.1.

The census data reveal large differences in ethnic homogeneity between young and old. For example, among persons ages 55 and above who report Italian ancestry (either in whole or in part) 93 percent reported Italian alone and 7 percent reported Italian in combination with another ethnic category. By contrast, among persons ages 16–24 who reported any Italian ancestry, only 44 percent reported Italian as their sole ancestry.³ For Greeks, who have a higher proportion of recent immigrants than the other groups, 90 percent of those over 54 years of age reported a single ancestry as opposed to 61 percent of persons 16 to 25 years old.

The difference by age in reporting a single ancestry is as large or larger for the Eastern European groups as it is for persons reporting Italian ancestry. For instance, 85 percent of Czechs 55 years of age and older reported a single ancestry, whereas only 27 percent of those 16 to 25 years of

¹ For discussion and analysis of changes in ethnic identity as reported in ancestry responses, refer to Stanley Lieberson and Mary C. Waters, "Ethnic Groups in Flux: The Changing Ethnic Responses of American Whites," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* (September 1986), and Stanley Lieberson, "Unhyphenated Whites in the United States," *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, vol. 8 (January 1985).

² In a study of the 1980 census ancestry data, Edward Fernandez and Nancy Sweet found that about 83 percent of the United States population reported at least one specific ancestry, 10 percent did not report any ancestry, 6 percent reported "Ameri-

can" or "United States," and 1 percent provided a religious or unclassifiable response. These percentages were found to vary by region. (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1980 Census of the Population, Supplementary Report, *Ancestry of the Population by State: 1980*, PC80-S1-10, 1983.)

³ Using the 1979 CPS, Alba analyzed intermarriage rates among Americans of Italian descent by generation and cohort. (Richard D. Alba, "The Twilight of Ethnicity Among Americans of European Ancestry: the Case of Italians" in *Ethnicity and Race in the U.S.A.*, Richard D. Alba, ed., London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1985.)

TABLE 5.1
Persons Reporting Single Ancestry as a Share of
All Persons Who Report Ancestry, 1980

	16-24	25-54	55+
Southern European	.46	.68	.93
Italian	.44	.67	.93
Greek	.61	.76	.90
Eastern European	.32	.51	.82
Est./Lat./Lith.	.28	.48	.86
Czech	.27	.51	.85
Slovakian	.22	.35	.64
Polish	.32	.52	.84
Russian	.35	.48	.76
Ukrainian	.37	.57	.86
Romanian	.31	.45	.73
Hungarian	.26	.45	.73
Serbian/Croatian	.35	.57	.86
Other East Eur.	.52	.69	.88
Other whites with reported ancestry	.35	.42	.50

Estimates based on the 1980 Census of Population, 5 percent "A" Public Use Sample.

age did so. The corresponding figures for the Serbian/Croatian ethnic group are 86 percent and 35 percent. For Ukrainians, 86 percent of persons 55 years of age or older reported Ukrainian as their sole ancestry compared to 37 percent of persons 16 to 25 years old.

Another possible indicator of ethnic attachment is whether persons speak their ancestral language. Census data can be used to estimate the proportion of persons in a given ancestry group who speak a language other than English at home. Analysis of these data, presented in table 5.2, reveals substantial differences between young and old with respect to the use of non-English languages. In each ancestry group, young persons speak exclusively English much more frequently than do older persons. Among Italians 16 to 25 years of age, only 9 percent speak Italian at home compared to 37 percent of persons ages 55 and older. Even among Greeks, who of all groups speak their native language most frequently at home, there are substantial differences among young and old. For all Eastern Europeans combined, the percentage of older persons who

speak a language other than English at home is 30 percent compared to 8 percent of the younger group. Despite their historically recent immigration to the U.S., their rate of speaking English is nearly identical to that of non-Euroethnic whites.

Patterns of the use of languages other than English may also reflect differences in the timing of immigration—persons born abroad are much more likely to speak a non-English language at home. As such, rates indicating use of languages other than English for the native born alone are reported in table 5.3. Although these rates are lower than the population-based measures, the pattern of less frequent use of languages other than English among the young still prevails.

The 1970 census collected data about individuals' "mother tongue"—the language spoken at home during childhood. Table 5.4 presents a comparison of these data with information from the 1980 survey about the extent to which people currently speak a language other than English at home. These data indicate that nearly 70 percent of native-born white

TABLE 5.2
Percentage Speaking a Language Other than English at Home,¹ 1980

	Total	16-24	25-54	55+
Southern European	22.6	11.3	17.9	38.9
Italian	20.0	9.0	14.6	36.9
Greek	54.0	39.1	53.7	68.4
Eastern European	17.1	7.6	12.1	29.6
Est./Lat./Lith.	21.6	11.0	14.9	32.5
Czech	15.1	4.0	9.0	29.1
Slovakian	6.0	2.6	2.8	12.8
Polish	16.8	5.5	10.5	33.8
Russian	9.0	6.8	7.5	12.2
Ukrainian	27.5	16.2	21.0	40.8
Romanian	18.5	12.4	17.9	21.5
Hungarian	18.3	8.2	13.5	30.1
Serbian/Croatian	28.1	16.4	25.7	38.1
Other East European	35.7	26.1	31.0	50.8
Other whites	7.5	7.3	7.6	7.5

¹At least occasionally.

Estimates based on the 1980 Census of Population, 5 percent "A" Public Use Sample.

TABLE 5.3
Percentage of Native-Born Population Who Speak a Language Other than English at Home,¹ 1980

	Total	16-24	25-54	55+
Southern European	13.4	7.7	9.3	26.7
Italian	12.2	6.3	7.9	25.7
Greek	33.5	27.1	31.2	48.5
Eastern European	10.4	5.1	6.1	20.9
Est./Lat./Lith.	21.6	11.0	14.9	32.5
Czech	11.2	3.4	6.6	22.8
Slovakian	5.3	2.5	2.6	11.4
Polish	12.3	4.0	6.7	28.1
Russian	3.8	4.1	3.1	4.8
Ukrainian	13.4	13.9	8.5	20.7
Romanian	6.6	4.9	5.0	9.8
Hungarian	9.1	6.4	5.2	17.3
Serbian/Croatian	12.8	8.0	7.9	23.9
Other East European	16.0	10.6	13.6	26.8
Other whites	4.7	5.2	4.6	4.5

¹At least occasionally.

Estimates based on the 1980 Census of Population, 5 percent "A" Public Use Sample.

TABLE 5.4
Language Use Among Native-Born Whites

	Non-English mother tongue¹	Non-English language spoken at home²
Cohort born:		
1915–1924	25.9	6.9
1925–1934	21.5	5.8
1935–1944	16.7	4.7
1915–1944	21.3	5.8

¹Percentage of cohort who spoke a language other than English at home as a child. Estimated from the 1970 Census of Population 1 percent Public Use Sample (15 percent questionnaire).

²Percentage of cohort who currently speak a language other than English at home (on occasion). Estimated from the 1980 Census of Population, 5 percent "A" Public Use Sample.

Americans whose mother tongue was not English now speak English exclusively.⁴ Unfortunately, these tabulations cannot be produced on the basis of particular ethnic groups.

The language and single ancestry measures suggest that in certain respects Euroethnic groups have become more assimilated. However, these measures cannot capture the true extent to which ethnic ties are maintained. Thus, persons with a multiple

ancestry or who speak only English may in fact have retained strong bonds with their ethnic group. Furthermore, the economic progress made by these groups should not be causally linked to the type of assimilation measured in this report. Indeed, as shown in the multivariate earnings analyses of chapter 4, persons who report a single Euroethnic ancestry do as well as persons who report multiple ancestries.

⁴ For the 1915–1944 cohort, this is calculated as $(1 - (5.8/21.3))$ and is based on the implicit assumption that all members of the

cohort who currently speak a language other than English had a non-English mother tongue.

Conclusion

This report has documented the social and economic status of Americans of Southern and Eastern European descent. This broad category includes Italians, Poles, Russians, Ukrainians, Hungarians, Greeks, Czechs, Serbs, and several other groups. A wide variety of cultures and customs are represented by members of these groups. The historical experiences of each, both before and after their arrival in the United States, reflect certain unique circumstances. A common thread, however, is that most of these Americans are, historically speaking, relative newcomers to the United States. Most are the descendants of immigrants who arrived in the U.S. between 1880 and 1920 and thus reflect the second and third generation of their family in this country.

Analysis of the data from the 1970 and 1980 censuses reveals that immigrants from Southern and Eastern Europe arrived in the United States with less schooling than native-born whites. Yet, in the course of a single generation, the educational attainment of their descendants surpassed the national average, which, in turn, was rising rapidly; educational attainment among Euroethnics grew by 4 or more years compared to an intergenerational change of about 2 years for other whites.

Although historical accounts indicate that members of these groups were concentrated in industrial blue-collar occupations that earned relatively low wages, such a situation no longer represents the norm. Instead, the data examined in this report reveal that the members of these groups are now more likely to be concentrated in professional and managerial occupations than is true of other whites.

Data from the 1980 census were used to compare various aspects of the labor market experience of Euroethnics and other whites. Analysis of these data revealed that the employment patterns and earnings of Euroethnics are similar to those of white Americans who are not of Euroethnic descent.

The unemployment rates of Euroethnic men for the year 1979 tend to be lower than those of non-Euroethnic white men; the former's comparative advantage would be even larger if their residence was not concentrated in the Northeastern United States where unemployment rates tend to be higher than the national average. Patterns of employment and unemployment among Euroethnic women are virtually indistinguishable from those of non-Euroethnic white women.

Whether measured on an annual, weekly, or hourly basis, Southern European men earn from 4 to 6 percent more than non-Euroethnic white men, and Eastern European men earn 18 percent more. Eastern European women earn 10 to 15 percent more than non-Euroethnic white women, and Southern European women earn from zero to 7 percent more.

Since Euroethnics tend to be better educated and somewhat older than non-Euroethnic whites, and since they live in high-income areas of the country, it may be the case that Euroethnics earn less than non-Euroethnic whites of the same age, educational level, and geographic region. The data analysis revealed, however, that on average, Euroethnics earn at least as much as non-Euroethnic whites even after controlling for the effects of schooling and other factors. These results held whether the com-

parison group was all non-Euroethnic whites (excluding Hispanics) or was confined to Americans of British descent. The economic success of Euroethnic groups was maintained regardless of whether these groups included persons who reported single as well as multiple ancestry, or whether the comparison was limited to persons who reported only a single Euroethnic ancestry. The data also show that poverty rates among Euroethnic groups tend to be lower than among non-Euroethnic whites.

In the course of doing this study, several important research questions arose that could not be answered with available data. Key among these questions is how these groups overcame their initial handicaps and the discrimination they faced. A more complete understanding of the economic success of these groups would come from an examination of their mobility strategies, including an analysis of factors such as settlement patterns, investment in education and other forms of human capital, land acquisition, entrepreneurial activities, community structures, the establishment of unions, and the use of political power.

The study found that the economic success of Euroethnic groups persisted regardless of whether single or multiple ancestry was used to delineate these groups. This finding suggests that Euroethnic progress cannot be attributed to a dilution of their ethnic attachments. Nevertheless, a fuller study of discrimination would include more information about possible discrimination against individuals on the basis of ethnic names or other purported ethnic characteristics.

The study presented here is limited in its ability to evaluate the existence or extent of employment discrimination in particular situations such as high corporate positions. A study of this subject would require unique data collection, for example, tracking the job experiences of graduating classes from top-ranking business schools. More generally, a statistical analysis such as this one is limited by the ability of the analyst to control for all of the characteristics that affect performance in the labor market. Since a person's race or ethnicity may statistically "stand in" for factors that are either unmeasured or unmeasurable, a statistical analysis cannot yield conclusive evidence about the existence or nonexistence of labor market discrimination.

Data limitations inevitably restrict the questions that can be addressed. The addition to the 1980 census of information on ancestry made possible a

more complete assessment of the economic achievement of detailed Euroethnic groups than has heretofore been possible. Data quality and analytical considerations strongly argue for the continuation in the 1990 census of the question on self-identification of ethnicity. It is equally important, however, to restore in the 1990 census a question on place of birth of parents (and also grandparents) of the individual respondents. Such information is indispensable for identifying generations and for determining the length of time the family has been in the United States. Religion is also an important missing variable in this analysis because of its evident importance in defining groups of common heritage who have been subjected to discrimination. Efforts such as the General Social Survey of the National Opinion Research Center to combine information on religious background with ethnic identification should be encouraged.

According to this study's results, successive generations of Euroethnics have made impressive gains in educational achievement and income and, in fact, are now on a par with, or surpass, the economic status of other white Americans, or even of white Americans of British descent. The finding of no earnings differential, however, does not necessarily mean that members of Euroethnic groups no longer experience discriminatory barriers in the labor market. Rather, it may mean that whatever discrimination exists has not, on average, reduced the money earnings of these groups, although it may have restricted their choices, and, therefore, their economic well-being. Members of Euroethnic groups have experienced prejudice and discrimination that was widespread in the past, and while the more overt forms have undoubtedly diminished, discrimination may yet linger in certain social and economic aspects of life.

The available data do not permit a full assessment to be made of the effect of Federal antidiscrimination legislation on the economic status of Euroethnics. This report, however, provides considerable basic information on the factors that have contributed to the present economic status of these groups. The more specific legal and policy questions concerning the place of Euroethnics in government antidiscrimination policies designed to implement the Civil Rights Act of 1964 will be discussed in the second part of the Commission's response to its congressional mandate.

Recommendations

1. That studies of the mobility strategies employed by Americans of Southern and Eastern European descent be undertaken in order to develop a more complete understanding of the factors that have led to the remarkable economic success of these immigrant groups. Such studies should include analysis of settlement patterns, investment in education and other forms of human capital, land acquisition, entrepreneurial activities, community and support structures, the effect of membership in unions and other collective or fraternal organizations, and the use of political power.
2. Studies of discrimination on the basis of national origin and ethnicity should be undertaken, and should include factors such as ethnic names and other characteristics purportedly attributable to such ethnic groups.
3. Data collection should be undertaken to enable researchers and government agencies to evaluate the existence of employment discrimination on the basis of national origin and religion throughout the work force, including high corporate, educational, and professional positions.
4. The 1990 census should include questions that would gather data on ethnic identification, ancestry, and place of birth information for parents and grandparents.
5. Data should be collected on religion and religious affiliation. Such information is critical to ascertaining the aggregate effect, if any, of discrimination on religious grounds, and will provide researchers with a critical variable that is missing from this report.
6. Researchers should be encouraged to study the methods by which diverse ethnic groups cope with discrimination in employment, education, and other areas, and the effect that discrimination has had on the economic success or failure of these groups over time.

Statement of Commissioner Robert A. Destro

In 1978, Congress requested that the Commission undertake a study of whether Americans of Eastern and Southern European descent have suffered either "denials of equal protection" on the basis of national origin or "adverse effects" under affirmative action programs.¹ Standing alone, the publication of *The Economic Status of Americans of Southern and Eastern European Ancestry* cannot really answer either of the civil rights questions posed by the Congress nearly 8 years ago. As the first part of a two-volume response to the 1978 congressional request, however, it provides an excellent backdrop against which to discuss them.

Economic status is only one factor in an overall evaluation of the position of any racial, ethnic, or religious group in society, and does not provide the Commission or anyone else with an adequate basis for reaching solid conclusions regarding the status of civil rights in that community. Civil rights is not an issue which belongs only to the poor, or to those who currently are deserving of special attention and concern: it belongs to all, and each of us has a stake in the success of our national struggle to attain equality for all Americans.

The publication of this report therefore presents me with an opportunity to sketch out my own views on the relationship between the economic data derived from the Commission's research and a more general conception of civil rights. In doing so I bring

both a personal and a professional interest to bear on the subject: members of my own family are counted among the statistics which fill the pages of this "technical" report. All four of my grandparents entered this country between 1908 and 1911. Each was a penniless Italian immigrant who could not speak a word of English. Their only weapons against language barriers, discrimination, poverty, and lack of formal education were their God-given talents, their faith, hard work, and determination that things could and would get better for them and for their children. And they did.

The story of my family is not unlike the story of millions of American families who trace their ancestry to the immigrants from Southern and Eastern Europe who entered this country between the end of the Civil War and the imposition of immigration restrictions in the 1920s. The dream of a better life in America for their children and grandchildren is what brought them here. The findings of this report indicate that during the 1960s and 1970s that dream came true for many of them.

To neglect the civil rights components of this story, however, is to miss a major component of the historical base upon which the economic record of the 1960s and 1970s was built. Notwithstanding the importance of discrimination on the basis of national origin, ethnicity, and religion in the lives of millions of immigrants and their descendants, these are truly

¹ 42 U.S.C. §1975c.

forgotten topics in the area of civil rights. They have become lost amidst the symbols, practices, and politics of contemporary civil rights policy. Even to raise them challenges the conventional wisdom on certain aspects of current civil rights policy, and runs the risk of upsetting the acute sensitivities of those who have worked so hard and so long to bring concern for civil rights into the mainstream of American life.

Nevertheless, careful examination of difficult and controversial civil rights issues is essential if we are to understand the full range of factors affecting the progress of national, ethnic, racial, and religious minorities in American society. We must learn more about "what works" for those outside the economic mainstream, and the study of immigrant groups which have attained significant levels of economic success is an important place to begin if we are to understand the process by which racial, ethnic, and religious communities have used economic, political, and social strategies to overcome the social, political, and civil rights problems they faced on arrival as immigrants and throughout succeeding generations. Such information is an invaluable part of the history of civil rights in the United States which has been ignored by policymakers for far too long.

Civil rights issues affecting Americans of Southern and Eastern European ancestry are part and parcel of the much larger topic of discrimination on the basis of race, national origin, ethnicity, and religion. The record of history could not be clearer. Immigrants from Southern and Eastern Europe, just like immigrants from other parts of the world considered to be "less desirable," faced pervasive, institutionalized discrimination. The fact that they were "white" apparently escaped those who made the rules. The alleged racial inferiority of Southern and Eastern Europeans was openly debated in the proceedings of the Dillingham Commission and in "reputable" journals such as the *Scientific American*. Not unlike the Hispanic and Asian immigrants of today, both Southern and Eastern European immigrants were considered threats to the existing social fabric because of their languages, religions (predominantly Catholic and Jewish), and different cultural backgrounds.

How strange then that less than 100 years later the same government which had once considered Italians, Greeks, Poles, Jews, and other immigrants from Southern and Eastern Europe to be racially inferior to "Nordic" whites would now lump them

unceremoniously into the category of "white." It is as if the racial classifiers could wipe away, with the strokes of their bureaucratic pens, the history and the relevance of the nativism, racism, anti-Catholicism, and anti-Semitism which was so much a part of their lives.

The effect of such bureaucratic ignorance is to disregard discrimination on the basis of national origin, ethnicity, and religion altogether. Government officials simply assume, in violation of both the letter and spirit of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, that such discrimination does not exist. Even worse, government agencies such as this Commission, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and the Census make no attempt whatever to collect data on either the demographics of those who are not currently designated as "minorities" or the incidence of discrimination against them.

This study is a case in point. It literally took an act of Congress—not the sensitivity or concern of this Commission or of civil rights advocates—to force the Commission to undertake a study of discrimination on the basis of national origin against nonracial minorities. Even then, it has taken 8 years to produce a document which does not address anything more than the politically safe, yet crucially important, economic and political fact that Americans of Southern and Eastern European ancestry have managed to surpass their "majority/white" counterparts in income, notwithstanding their struggles with abject poverty, language barriers, ethnic and religious discrimination, and negative stereotyping. There is indeed a useful story to be told, but the politics and sensibilities of the current civil rights milieu make it extremely difficult to do so.

Perhaps the best example of this difficulty lies in the manner in which press reports and other commentary following the first meeting of the reconstituted Commission in January 1984 described this project. Billed as a study of discrimination against "white males," this project has been cited as evidence of the Commission's lack of concern for "real" and pressing civil rights problems; as an excuse to attack preferential treatment of women and minorities.

But nothing could be farther from the truth. Setting aside the congressional mandate and looking at the substance of the charge, it seems obvious that the implicit message is that discrimination on the basis of ethnicity against immigrant whites and their descendants, both male and female, is not a subject

which merits study by this Commission—or anyone. Their race, apparently, makes it a closed subject.

That there should be discomfort within the civil rights community when the topic is civil rights issues affecting individuals who are members of ethnic groups defined by those charged with enforcing the civil rights laws as “white” is understandable. There are, after all, limited resources available for the protection of civil rights, and it has taken many years to develop a consensus that civil rights should even be a priority item on the Federal agenda.

But there is another, less altruistic, reason for the discomfort. It is often alluded to, but rarely addressed on its merits: the assumption that all who are defined by government as “white” command equal treatment because they are a part of the “majority” responsible for this country’s legacy of discrimination. Available economic data showing that the “white” ethnic groups to be studied have, in the aggregate, done better than “other whites” makes the political problem even worse, for it then seems that we are spending our scarce resources on those who need it least. In all, it is an understandable, but regrettable, state of affairs.

The Commission’s 8-year delay in addressing this issue reflects the unfortunate fact that it is difficult to discuss with the degree of sensitivity needed to avoid the charge that one has gone beyond the bounds of legitimate discussion. But one cannot address the serious and important questions which go to the heart of the current civil rights policy, including affirmative action, without addressing who is a “minority,” and what impact that status has on one’s treatment before the law.

That these are important questions, and that they are raised most clearly in the context of discrimination on the basis of national origin and religion against the national and ethnic minorities of Southern and Eastern Europe, should be obvious to even the casual student of American civil rights policy. An approach to civil rights policy which relegates discrimination on the basis of national origin and religion to a lesser status than race or sex discrimination is both shortsighted and counterproductive. It ignores both the historical record of discrimination, and the lessons that this nation can learn from those

who persevered in the face of discrimination and succeeded economically despite it.

To accept the unpleasant fact that discrimination and bigotry based on national origin, ethnicity, and religion can be leveled against whites as well as against members of other racial groups does not dilute our concern for those most in need of protection; rather, it broadens our perspective and understanding of current civil rights problems. More importantly, it informs our judgments and broadens the political base of support for potential solutions.

In the first phase of its response to the congressional mandate, a consultation entitled “Civil Rights Issues of Euro-Ethnic Americans in the United States: Opportunities and Challenges,”² the prior Commission recognized that Americans of Southern and Eastern European descent are “most decidedly [not] a monolithic group.”³ It is time, in my view, to recognize that *no* racial group (white or nonwhite) is monolithic: each can be, and often is, subdivided along national, ethnic, and religious lines which are recognizable by individuals whose experience, pride, or prejudice makes them sensitive to such distinctions. The American tendency to describe Ukrainians as “Russians,” for example, simply confirms our lack of knowledge of issues central to a proper understanding of discrimination on the basis of national origin.

To Americans, especially those charged with data collection and civil rights enforcement, the importance of ethnic identity and origin are not well appreciated. The lack of adequate census data respecting ancestry made it impossible for this study to disaggregate certain important information concerning ethnic identification, income, and other characteristics of the groups to be studied. Unlike race and sex characteristics, which are relatively easy to quantify, collection of demographic information on national origin and ethnic identification for those perceived to be “white” is not even attempted.

But my own personal, legal, and academic experience teaches me that characteristics which identify religion, ethnicity, or national origin such as the sound or spelling of a name, family or educational background, and language or accent are just as powerful excuses for prejudice for some as the immutable physical features of race, gender, or

² A consultation sponsored by the United States Commission on Civil Rights, Chicago, Illinois, December 3, 1979.

³ United States Commission on Civil Rights, Statement on the Civil Rights Issues of Euro-Ethnic Americans at 2 (January 1981)

(issued “On the occasion of the release of the proceedings of the consultation, *The Civil Rights Issues of Euro-ethnic Americans in the United States: Opportunities and Challenges.*”)

disability are to others. That those charged with the formulation and review of civil rights law, including this Commission, have been indifferent to this fact is a scandal.

It is important to emphasize that by highlighting the influence of discrimination on the basis of national origin, ethnicity, and religion, I do not minimize either the significance or impact of other forms of discrimination in American history. Race, sex, and disability are unquestionably critical factors in provoking discriminatory responses from others. In the American experience, race prejudice has been, without a doubt, the most pervasive and destructive form of discrimination we have known. Yet, at bottom, it is only one of the many forms of human intolerance which devastate the lives, the spirit, and the economic well-being of its victims.

This, of course, is the reason why the history of the Southern and Eastern European immigrants both before and after they came to this country contains so many valuable lessons for contemporary civil rights advocates. Many of the seemingly intractable civil rights and economic problems faced by today's ethnic and racial minorities are neither new nor unique. Each ethnic and racial group does have its own unique history and perspective on the problems it faces, but the problems themselves—discrimination in employment and housing, economic advancement, education, and social mobility to name only a few—are not new or unique. The hopes and dreams of yesterday's immigrant ethnic and racial minorities were no different than those of today's immigrants and minorities. We remain, for all our differences, members of the same human family with far more in common than that which divides us, and we are foolish indeed to the extent that we ignore the history and perspective of yesterday's "minorities" as we formulate the civil rights, educational, and economic policies of tomorrow.

⁴ Chapter one of the report recounts very briefly the manner in which immigration law "reforms"—most notably literacy tests and quotas designed to reduce immigration from Southern and Eastern European countries—were motivated by nativist racial attitudes toward Southern and Eastern European immigrants.

⁵ See, e.g., *Meyer v. Nebraska*, 262 U.S. 390 (1923).

⁶ See, e.g., *Pierce v. Society of Sisters*, 268 U.S. 510 (1925) in which it was argued by the State of Oregon that the culture and preference for religious education of immigrant Catholic children would be a major obstacle to their ever becoming truly "American." Given these attitudes, it is not surprising that the few social welfare programs which did exist at the time assumed that Southern and Eastern European immigrants and their children were simply inferior to their "Nordic white" counterparts, and

It is time that we begin to make comparisons among the mobility and antidiscrimination strategies employed by various national, ethnic, and racial groups. We must take a broad view of civil rights: one which encompasses not only the strategy of continuing civil rights violations against women and minorities, but also the means by which those no longer recognized as "minorities" by government have overcome or managed to get around some of the obstacles placed in their way. And we must recognize that recommendations for future remedial action which are untutored by the experience of those who have succeeded despite a legacy of discrimination will be deficient to the extent that they ignore it.

My belief that Americans of Southern and Eastern European ancestry have far more in common with today's minorities is based on common sense, an appreciation for the difficulties faced by my own relatives and acquaintances, and careful reading of history. "Euroethnics," as they are sometimes called, have a strong feeling of pride in their economic, social, educational, and political achievements. Whether policymakers and social critics admit it or not, their appreciation for the reality of discrimination in this country is very real. Their experience and history make them natural allies in the task of devising workable solutions to today's problems. Those who blindly assume that the issues and concerns of these Americans are at best inconsequential, and at worst evidence of latent bigotry, are bigots themselves.

Whether the issue is immigration "reform,"⁴ controversies over the teaching of foreign languages in the schools,⁵ the impact of social welfare, including education, on the ability of minorities and immigrants to succeed,⁶ or the struggle of individuals of both sexes, drawn from many racial, ethnic, national, and religious groups, for civil rights,⁷ there

doubts were voiced as to whether they could ever truly be assimilated. Chapter one provides a very brief introduction to these issues as well.

⁷ Chapter one also contains a brief introduction to what might be considered the more standard civil rights problems of Southern and Eastern Europeans and their children. Discrimination in employment, labor union membership, education, housing, and other areas was a fact of life. Ethnically inspired violence and lynchings did, in fact, occur; and anti-Semitism and anti-Catholicism were key factors in the large growth of the Ku Klux Klan during the 1920s. See, e.g., Stephan Thernstrom, ed., *Harvard Encyclopedia of Ethnic Groups* (Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press, 1980), pp. 843-45.

are positive lessons which can be taken from history. Unless we learn from them and set aside our current racially oriented notions of what is fair, we are bound to repeat the mistakes of the past. That we cannot afford.

The history of the many immigrant communities which populate this great nation is therefore an invaluable resource in the ongoing struggle for equality. Discrimination, poverty, and lack of educa-

tion were influential factors which shaped individual and collective strategies to overcome them. It is time that we devoted the energy, resources, and commitment to learn from those experiences. This report and its sequel (when and if completed) are a beginning.

Washington, D.C.
August 15, 1986

Appendix A

Data Development

There are only a limited number of data sources that can be used to analyze the economic and social characteristics of ethnic groups. This is due to the simple fact that questions about individuals' ethnic background are rarely obtained in surveys. The available data have particular strengths and weaknesses, but no single data set provides all the desired information. Perhaps the two most valuable sources of information for such an analysis are the Censuses of Population conducted in 1970 and 1980. Together, these data sets can be used to piece together a considerable amount of information about the economic and social characteristics of Americans of Eastern and Southern European heritage.

1980 Census: The principal focus of the analysis is the 1980 Census of Population. These data are well suited to the task at hand for several reasons. First, the 1980 census for the first time recorded information on individuals' *ancestry*, the "self-identified origin, lineage, nationality group or country in which the persons' or persons' ancestors were born before their arrival in the United States."¹ The census data also contain a wide array of information on other social and economic characteristics, including education, earnings, and occupation.

The Census of Population has the further advantage of containing information on a very large number of individuals. A large sample size is necessary in order to provide a statistically reliable

estimate of the characteristics of detailed ancestry groups. The 1980 census data are also of special value due to their timeliness. Microdata samples from the survey have been available only since 1983.

Despite these strengths, there are important limitations to the 1980 data. For example, no information was collected on parental nativity or the number of generations since an individual's family arrived in the U.S. Although immigrants can be identified (as can their country or origin), individuals whose parents immigrated to the U.S. cannot be differentiated from persons whose family arrived centuries ago.

A second weakness is that an individual's religion cannot be ascertained from the data. This is of particular importance to this analysis because many Americans of Eastern European extraction are of Jewish descent. Ideally, Jewish and non-Jewish individuals with an Eastern European ancestry could be differentiated and compared, but this problem is not readily resolved with census data.

1970 Census: Although this survey suffers from more severe weaknesses than the 1980 census in certain respects, the 1970 survey (15 percent questionnaire) can be used to address some of the shortcomings of the 1980 data. The 1970 census did not collect data about ancestry, but instead obtained information about parental nativity. This permits explicit identification of second-generation Ameri-

¹ Technical documentation, p. K-5. The ancestry question was included on the person-specific component of the long-form questionnaire in the following manner:

14 What is this person's ancestry (if uncertain about how to report ancestry, see instruction guide):

(For example, Afro-Amer., English, French, German, Honduran, Hungarian, Irish, Italian, Jamaican, Korean, Lebanese, Mexican, Nigerian, Polish, Ukrainian, Venezuelan, etc.)

Multiple responses are permitted.

cans—individuals born in the U.S. who have a parent born abroad. Parental birthplace is used as a proxy for the ethnicity of first- and second-generation Americans. However, ancestry or ethnicity can not be defined for other individuals.

The 1970 census data also incorporated a question on mother tongue, the language spoken at home during childhood. Questions on parental nativity and mother tongue can be used in combination to partially identify Jewish Americans. Using a procedure developed by Chiswick (1983), individuals with a parent born abroad and whose mother tongue was Yiddish or Hebrew identifies about 70 percent of second-generation Jewish Americans.² The 1970 census, of course, also collected detailed information on social and economic factors, including earnings, education, and occupation.

Data Sets Used in the Analysis

Three data sets based on the 1970 and 1980 censuses were used in this study. From the 1980 census of Population, the 5 percent “A” public use sample of the 1980 census was utilized. Analysis was limited to individuals ages 16 and above who are in the noninstitutional population. This subsample includes more than 8.4 million persons, 945,000 of whom reported either Southern or Eastern European ancestry. Table A.1 gives frequency counts for various relevant variables in the 1980 public use sample.

² This figure is based on the fact that approximately 70 percent of all second-generation Americans report a mother tongue other than English. Comparisons of census estimates with other data on

From the 1970 Census of Population, the 1 percent public use sample (15 percent questionnaire) was utilized. Data on 1.4 million persons ages 16 and above (in the noninstitutional population) are available. About 15 percent of this total are identified as “second generation” and another 7 percent are identified as first generation. Persons of Eastern or Southern European origin are roughly 35 percent of second-generation Americans; and 25 percent of first-generation Americans. Table A.2 gives frequency counts for several relevant variables in the 1970 public use sample.

Given the cost of analysis with the entire 1980 census microdata set, we chose to create a 0.1 percent random sample of the 1980 census “A” sample. This sample, upon which the multivariate analyses of chapter 4 are based, is limited to white men. Excluded from the sample are all students (full or part time), persons with zero earnings in 1979, and unpaid family workers. Hispanics were also excluded from this file. This made it possible to compare the earnings of the various Euroethnic ancestry groups to those of non-Hispanic, non-Euroethnic white men. The resulting file contains observations on 35,875 individuals. A breakdown of the number of observations in each ancestry group is given in table A.3.

the number of second-generation Jews yields a similar estimate of coverage.

TABLE A.1
Relevant Variables, 1980
5 Percent "A" Public Use Sample

Variable definitions:

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1 | <i>Age</i> |
| 1 | 16-19 |
| 2 | 20-24 |
| 3 | 25-34 |
| 4 | 35-44 |
| 5 | 45-54 |
| 6 | 55-64 |
| 7 | 65+ |
| 2 | <i>Sex</i> |
| 1 | Male |
| 2 | Female |
| 3 | <i>Years of schooling completed</i> |
| 1 | 0-7 |
| 2 | 8-11 |
| 3 | 12-15 |
| 4 | 16+ |
| 4 | <i>Occupation</i> |
| 1 | Managerial and professional specialty |
| 2 | Technical, sales and administrative support |
| 3 | Service |
| 4 | Farming, forestry and fishing |
| 5 | Precision production, craft and repair |
| 6 | Operators, fabricators, laborers |
| 7 | Other ¹ |
| 5 | <i>Labor force attachment</i> |
| 1 | Worked, in 1979, non-zero earnings |
| 2 | Other |
| 6 | <i>Language spoken at home</i> |
| 1 | English |
| 2 | Other |
| 7 | <i>Nativity/year of immigration</i> |
| 1 | Born in U.S. |
| 2 | Immigrated 1965-80 |
| 3 | Immigrated 1950-65 |
| 4 | Immigrated pre-1950 |

¹The residual occupation category includes individuals in the Armed Forces, individuals not in the labor force who last worked before 1975, individuals who never worked, and individuals who are unemployed with no civilian work experience since 1975. Of these, only the armed forces worked in the previous year.

TABLE A.1 (continued)

8	<i>Race, ethnicity, ancestry²</i>	<i>Census ancestry codes:³</i>
1	Italian	052-073
2	Greek	046-048,009
3	Estonian	111
	Latvian	117
	Lithuanian	120
4	Czech	104
	Bohemian	106
5	Slovakian	105
6	Polish	122
	Pomeranian	123
	Kashubian	124
7	Russian	140-156
	Georgian	161
	Belorussian	168
8	Ukrainian	166
	Ruthenian	163
	Carpathian	164
9	Romanian	125
	Bessarabian	126
	Moldavian	127
	Transylvanian	128
10	Hungarian	113, 114
11	Yugoslavian (nec)	131
	Croatian	133
	Serbian	136
	Slovene	137
	Other Eastern European (nec)	
	Slav	170
	Gypsy	172
	Albanian	100
	East European	173
	Cent. European	174
	Vlatch	129
	Bulgarian	102
	Macedonian	103
	Armenian	159
13	Other white, with reported ancestry	
14	Other white, no reported ancestry	
15	Black and other	

²Individuals who speak either Yiddish or Hebrew were excluded from ancestry categories 1-12. This serves as a weak filter to disaggregate Jewish Americans from other individuals of Eastern and Southern European ancestry. See text for a discussion. Categories 1-12 are defined only for individuals who reported their race as "white."

³See U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Technical Documentation* (1980), app. E.

TABLE A.1 (continued)
Frequency Counts, 1980
5 Percent "A" Public Use Sample

	Count	Percent		Count	Percent
<i>Age</i>			<i>Language spoken at home</i>		
1	844576	10.028	1	7469182	88.704
2	1044305	12.400	2	951195	11.296
3	1839403	21.841			
4	1273611	15.123	<i>Nativity/year of immigration</i>		
5	1130577	13.424	1	7797602	92.604
6	1080729	12.832	2	297270	3.530
7	1208669	14.352	3	159970	1.900
			4	165526	1.966
<i>Sex</i>					
1	4006333	47.586	<i>Ancestry</i>		
2	4412810	52.414	1	367726	4.366
			2	30152	.358
<i>Years of schooling completed</i>			3	26817	.318
1	689484	8.188	4	62231	.739
2	2225388	26.428	5	15046	.179
3	4341912	51.564	6	233686	2.775
4	1163673	13.820	7	84041	.998
			8	23277	.276
<i>Occupation</i>			9	9014	.107
1	1290547	15.325	10	50212	.596
2	1913637	22.723	11	25673	.276
3	920805	10.934	12	17328	.206
4	206017	2.446	13	5044941	59.900
5	764980	9.084	14	1168520	13.874
6	1207551	14.339	15	1263603	15.003
7	2117923	25.149			
<i>Labor force attachment</i>					
1	5654194	67.159			
2	2764975	32.841			

TABLE A.2
Relevant Variables, 1970
1 Percent Public Use Sample (15 Percent Questionnaire)

Variable definitions:

1 *Age*

- | | |
|---|-------|
| 1 | 16-19 |
| 2 | 20-24 |
| 3 | 25-34 |
| 4 | 35-44 |
| 5 | 45-54 |
| 6 | 55-64 |
| 7 | 65+ |

2 *Sex*

- | | |
|---|--------|
| 1 | Male |
| 2 | Female |

3 *Years of schooling completed*

- | | |
|---|-------|
| 1 | 0-7 |
| 2 | 8-11 |
| 3 | 12-15 |
| 4 | 16+ |

4 *Occupation*¹

- | | | |
|---|----------------------|---------|
| 1 | Prof/tech/managerial | 001-246 |
| 2 | Sales/clerical | 260-396 |
| 3 | Service | 901-986 |
| 4 | Farm | 801-806 |
| 5 | Craftsmen | 401-586 |
| 6 | Operatives | 601-726 |
| 7 | Other | |

5 *Labor force attachment*

- | | |
|---|------------------------------|
| 1 | Worked with nonzero earnings |
| 2 | Other |

6 *Mother tongue: language spoken at home during childhood*

- | | |
|---|---------|
| 1 | English |
| 2 | Other |

7 *Nativity/generation in U.S.*

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1 | Born in U.S.; parents born in U.S. |
| 2 | 2nd generation: Person born in U.S.; parents born outside U.S. |
| 3 | 1st generation: Person born outside U.S. |

TABLE A.2 (cont.)

8 Race/ethnicity²

1	Italy	(35)
2	Greece	(34)
3	Estonia/Latvia/Lithuania	(79,80,81)
4	Czechoslovakia	(24)
5	(not defined)	
6	Poland	(23)
7	USSR	(55,57)
8	Ukraine	(56)
9	Romania	(32)
10	Hungary	(26)
11	Yugoslavia	(27)
12	Other East European	(33,40)
13	Jewish (individuals with Hebrew or Yiddish mother tongue)	
14	Other whites	
15	Nonwhites	

¹Numbers reflect Census Bureau codes; see U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Technical Documentation* (1970).

²Codes 1–12 are defined only for individuals born abroad or whose parents were born abroad. The response refers to parental birthplace (P71–72). Individuals for whom mother tongue (P73–74) is 28 (Yiddish) or 60 (Hebrew) are not included in categories 1–12. All such individuals are included in Code 13. For individuals with income of \$50,000 (the open-ended category), an imputation of \$76,000 was utilized, for individuals with losses of \$–10,000, the lower reporting limit, a value of –15,000 was used.

TABLE A.2 (cont.)
Frequency Counts, 1970
1 Percent Public Use Sample (15 Percent Questionnaire)

	Count	Percent		Count	Percent
<i>Age</i>			<i>Mother tongue</i>		
1	147588	10.664	1	1049726	75.856
2	158889	11.482	2	334122	24.144
3	245672	17.753			
4	227505	16.448	<i>Nativity/generation</i>		
5	228528	16.514	1	1083754	78.315
6	183608	13.268	2	197747	14.290
7	192066	13.879	3	102347	7.396
<i>Years of schooling completed</i>			<i>Ancestry</i>		
1	175362	12.672	1	38829	2.806
2	470732	34.016	2	3598	0.260
3	607707	43.914	3	3563	0.257
4	130047	9.397	4	7016	0.507
<i>Sex</i>			6	19807	1.431
1	656819	47.463	7	10340	0.747
2	727029	52.537	8	1153	0.083
<i>Occupation</i>			9	1402	0.101
1	215941	15.684	10	5591	0.404
2	282131	20.387	11	3972	0.287
3	152472	11.018	12	331	0.024
4	35543	2.568	13	15804	1.142
5	128566	9.290	14	1120382	80.961
6	235364	17.008	15	152060	10.988
7	333831	24.123			
<i>Labor force attachment</i>					
1	906503	65.506			
2	477345	34.494			

TABLE A.2 (cont.)
Ancestry Groups by Nativity, 1970
 Individuals Ages 16+

Ancestry/ nativity	Old stock		Second generation		First generation	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
1	—	—	28631	14.5	10198	10.0
2	—	—	1949	1.0	1649	1.6
3	—	—	2352	1.2	1211	1.2
4	—	—	5426	2.7	1590	1.6
6	—	—	14991	7.6	4816	4.7
7	—	—	7824	4.0	2515	2.5
8	—	—	541	0.3	612	0.6
9	—	—	859	0.4	543	0.5
10	—	—	3674	1.9	1917	1.9
11	—	—	2408	1.2	1564	1.5
12	—	—	171	0.1	160	0.2
13	1479	0.1	9691	4.9	4643	4.5
14	943844	87.1	114516	57.9	62022	60.6
15	138431	12.8	4714	2.4	8915	8.7
Total	1083754	100%	197747	100%	102347	100%

TABLE A.3
Number of Observations by Ancestry Group in 0.1 Percent Extract of 1980 Census "A" Sample—White Non-Hispanic Males

Ancestry group	Single ancestry only	Single and mixed ancestry	Ancestry group	Single ancestry only	Single and mixed ancestry
Italian	608	2,098	Romanian	37	54
Greek	49	130	Bessarabian		
Estonian	81	155	Moldavian		
Latvian			Transylvanian		
Lithuanian			Hungarian	184	333
Czech	172	381	Yugoslavian nec	41	120
Bohemian			Croatian		
Slovak	64	103	Serbian		
Polish	681	1,536	Slovene		
Pomeranian			Other E. Eur. (nec)	32	83
Kashubian			Slav		
Russian	296	606	Gypsy		
Georgian			Albanian		
Belorussian			Eastern Eur.		
Ukrainian	63	143	Central Eur.		
Ruthenian			Vlatch		
Carpathian			Bulgarian		
			Macedonian		
			Armenian		
			Other non-Hispanic non-Euroethnic white males	—	—

Appendix B

Further Results from Regression Analysis

The purpose of this appendix is to give a fuller representation of the regression results presented in chapter 4 and to give additional results that supplement the analyses presented in the text.

Table B.1 gives the full regression results of table 4.10 of chapter 4.

Due to data quality concerns with regard to the hourly earnings variable, the analysis presented in

table B.1 was also done using annual earnings as the dependent variable. The results of this estimation are shown in table B.2.

Table B.3 gives the full regression results of table 4.11 of chapter 4.

Finally, table B.4 shows the estimated coefficients from separate regressions that were run by ancestry group.

TABLE B.1
Regression Analysis of the Effect of Ethnicity and Other Factors on Hourly Earnings of Native-Born Males,
Ages 25–64
Benchmark Group Is Non-Hispanic, Non-Euroethnic White Males

Explanatory variables	Single ancestry Euroethnics relative to other non-Hispanic whites, 1980				Single and mixed ancestry Euroethnics relative to other non-Hispanic whites, 1980			
	Regression coefficients (t-statistics in parentheses)				Regression coefficients (t-statistics in parentheses)			
	1		1-a		2		2-a	
Intercept	.278	(5.22)	.186	(2.80)	.293	(5.87)	.208	(3.33)
Education	.081	(26.26)	.074	(22.25)	.080	(27.79)	.073	(23.38)
Experience	.057	(20.17)	.052	(18.83)	.056	(21.19)	.052	(19.73)
Exp squared	– .0008	(–22.57)	– .0007	(–20.84)	– .0008	(–23.85)	– .0007	(–22.03)
Ed x exp	– .0008	(–6.79)	– .0007	(–6.29)	– .0007	(–6.79)	– .0007	(–6.19)
Poor English	– .066	(–1.33)	– .030	(–.63)	– .070	(–1.52)	– .032	(–.72)
<i>Region</i>								
North central	.040	(3.55)	.051	(4.63)	.038	(3.66)	.049	(4.82)
South	– .014	(–1.23)	– .015	(–1.37)	– .015	(–1.40)	– .015	(–1.55)
West	.052	(4.07)	.064	(5.20)	.050	(4.22)	.062	(5.37)
Central city	.157	(11.55)	.130	(9.67)	.157	(12.22)	.132	(10.42)
Noncentral city	.243	(22.51)	.200	(18.68)	.243	(23.80)	.201	(19.83)
SMSA central city	.148	(11.94)	.117	(9.57)	.145	(12.30)	.113	(9.81)
Mix SMSA	.081	(5.88)	.060	(4.47)	.082	(6.27)	.062	(4.84)

TABLE B.1 (continued)

Explanatory variables	Single ancestry Euroethnics relative to other non-Hispanic whites, 1980				Single and mixed ancestry Euroethnics relative to other non-Hispanic whites, 1980			
	Regression coefficients (t-statistics in parentheses)				Regression coefficients (t-statistics in parentheses)			
	1		1-a		2		2-a	
<i>Ancestry</i>								
Italian	.043	(2.28)	.060	(3.29)	.040	(2.41)	.056	(3.48)
Greek	.045	(0.60)	.041	(0.56)	.065	(1.00)	.055	(0.87)
Est./Lat./Lith.	– .152	(–1.92)	– .153	(–1.98)	– .085	(–1.37)	– .088	(–1.46)
Czech	.029	(0.61)	.024	(0.53)	.034	(0.87)	.027	(.73)
Slovak	– .022	(–.20)	– .015	(–.14)	– .015	(–0.19)	– .018	(–.24)
Polish	.058	(2.41)	– .049	(2.10)	.064	(3.24)	.057	(2.94)
Russian	.113	(2.87)	.149	(3.88)	.135	(4.27)	.161	(5.24)
Ukrainian	.140	(1.83)	.112	(1.51)	.102	(1.62)	.082	(1.33)
Romanian	– .040	(–.25)	– .009	(–.06)	.034	(0.31)	.081	(0.75)
Hungarian	.064	(1.14)	.063	(1.16)	.079	(1.83)	.077	(1.84)
Serbo-Croatian	.141	(1.83)	.112	(1.50)	.145	(2.18)	.126	(1.95)
Other East Europe	.067	(0.70)	.089	(.96)	.055	(0.68)	.075	(.95)
Self-employment			– .061	(–5.12)			– .059	(–5.26)
<i>Industry</i>								
Mine			.463	(10.21)			.459	(10.71)
Construction			.315	(8.15)			.309	(8.48)
Durables			.287	(7.41)			.282	(7.72)
Nondurables			.321	(8.44)			.317	(8.83)
Transportation			.372	(9.45)			.368	(9.92)
Communications			.418	(8.74)			.418	(9.30)
Utilities			.383	(8.81)			.382	(9.32)
Wholesale trade			.222	(5.48)			.214	(5.61)
Retail trade			.019	(.49)			.018	(.49)
Finance, insurance and real estate			.256	(6.21)			.252	(6.49)

TABLE B.1 (continued)

Explanatory variables	Single ancestry Euroethnics relative to other non-Hispanic whites, 1980		Single and mixed ancestry Euroethnics relative to other non-Hispanic whites, 1980	
	1	Regression coefficients (t-statistics in parentheses) 1-a	2	2-a
Business and repair services		.057 (1.40)		.051 (1.34)
Personal services		– .037 (–.74)		– .055 (–1.17)
Entertainment and recreation services		.097 (1.82)		.094 (1.89)
Professional services		.166 (4.25)		.163 (4.45)
Public administration		.281 (6.96)		.278 (7.32)
<i>Occupation</i>				
Professional/technical		.079 (4.49)		.082 (4.97)
Manager		.159 (8.75)		.161 (9.39)
Sales		.048 (2.29)		.050 (2.50)
Clerical		– .044 (–2.29)		– .045 (–2.45)
Craft		.024 (1.51)		.024 (1.62)
Operative		– .025 (–1.20)		– .025 (–1.24)
Transportation equipment operatives		– .081 (–4.01)		– .077 (–4.03)
Laborers		– .147 (–3.78)		– .145 (–3.93)
Farmers		– .240 (–5.30)		– .251 (–5.88)
Farm laborers		– .221 (–5.51)		– .213 (–5.61)
Service		– .196 (–9.36)		– .191 (–9.66)
Private household		– .385 (–2.37)		– .361 (–2.36)
Number of observations	32,123	32,123	35,875	35,875
R-square	.111	.165	.113	.167
Adjusted R-square	.110	.163	.112	.165

Note: The reference category is the intersection of the following variable values: ancestry = non-Hispanic, non-Euroethnic white men; region = Northeast; language ability = speaks English well; non-SMSA; industry = agriculture, occupation = other occupation; and not self-employed.

TABLE B.2**Regression Analysis of the Effect of Ethnicity and other Factors on Annual Earnings of Native-Born Males, Ages 25-64****Benchmark Group Is Non-Hispanic, Non-Euroethnic White Males**

Explanatory variables	Single ancestry Euroethnics relative to other non-Hispanic whites, 1980				Single and mixed ancestry Euroethnics relative to other non-Hispanic whites, 1980			
	Regression coefficients (t-statistics in parentheses)				Regression coefficients (t-statistics in parentheses)			
	1		1-a		2		2-a	
Intercept	7.269	(127.41)	7.169	(100.59)	7.276	(136.06)	7.173	(107.10)
Education	.113	(34.38)	.107	(29.86)	.113	(36.57)	.106	(31.67)
Experience	.086	(28.58)	.080	(27.22)	.085	(30.11)	.080	(28.69)
Exp squared	-.0011	(-31.53)	-.0010	(-29.67)	-.0011	(-33.25)	-.0010	(-31.32)
Ed x exp	-.0015	(-12.45)	-.0015	(-12.55)	-.0015	(-12.89)	-.0015	(-12.99)
Poor English	-.099	(-1.87)	-.057	(-1.11)	-.100	(-2.01)	-.056	(-1.16)
<i>Region</i>								
North central	.062	(5.12)	.065	(5.56)	.063	(5.61)	.066	(6.11)
South	-.003	(-0.27)	-.007	(-0.62)	-.002	(-0.21)	-.006	(-0.58)
West	.026	(1.89)	.037	(2.84)	.026	(2.05)	.037	(3.01)
Central city	.118	(8.11)	.102	(7.15)	.116	(8.44)	.102	(7.59)
Noncentral city	.249	(21.48)	.213	(18.59)	.248	(22.67)	.213	(19.68)
SMSA central city	.148	(11.09)	.126	(9.67)	.142	(11.26)	.121	(9.75)
Mix SMSA	.082	(5.54)	.064	(4.45)	.083	(5.89)	.064	(4.73)

TABLE B.2 (continued)

Explanatory variables	Single ancestry Euroethnics relative to other non-Hispanic whites, 1980				Single and mixed ancestry Euroethnics relative to other non-Hispanic whites, 1980			
	Regression coefficients (t-statistics in parentheses)				Regression coefficients (t-statistics in parentheses)			
	1		1-a		2		2-a	
<i>Ancestry</i>								
Italian	.034	(1.66)	.048	(2.47)	.030	(1.72)	.044	(2.56)
Greek	.029	(0.35)	.005	(0.07)	.031	(0.45)	.009	(0.14)
Est./Lat./Lith.	– .121	(–1.42)	– .123	(–1.49)	– .064	(–0.96)	– .074	(–1.14)
Czech	.010	(0.19)	.014	(0.29)	.013	(0.32)	.013	(0.32)
Slovak	– .015	(–0.12)	– .019	(–0.16)	.018	(0.21)	– .009	(0.11)
Polish	.047	(1.81)	.038	(1.55)	.057	(2.67)	.048	(2.36)
Russian	.142	(3.35)	.164	(3.99)	.156	(4.61)	.169	(5.14)
Ukrainian	.105	(1.27)	.069	(0.87)	.091	(1.34)	.063	(0.97)
Romanian	– .199	(–1.14)	– .179	(–1.06)	– .097	(–0.82)	– .055	(–0.48)
Hungarian	.033	(0.54)	.036	(0.61)	.042	(0.91)	.041	(0.93)
Serbo-Croatian	.062	(0.75)	.044	(0.56)	.084	(1.18)	.073	(1.05)
Other East Europe	.178	(1.74)	.185	(1.87)	.181	(2.08)	.190	(2.25)
Self-employment			.008	(0.66)			.009	(0.77)
<i>Industry</i>								
Mine			.526	(10.82)			.531	(11.53)
Construction			.189	(4.56)			.191	(4.90)
Durables			.342	(8.25)			.343	(8.75)
Nondurables			.358	(8.78)			.361	(9.37)
Transportation			.424	(10.05)			.425	(10.68)
Communications			.484	(9.45)			.497	(10.29)
Utilities			.417	(8.96)			.425	(9.68)
Wholesale trade			.273	(6.31)			.277	(6.77)
Retail trade			.059	(1.43)			.067	(1.70)
Finance, insurance and real estate			.260	(5.90)			.266	(6.40)

TABLE B.2 (continued)

Explanatory variables	Single ancestry Euroethnics relative to other non-Hispanic whites, 1980		Single and mixed ancestry Euroethnics relative to other non-Hispanic whites, 1980	
	1	Regression coefficients (t-statistics in parentheses) 1-a	2	2-a
Business and repair services		.050 (1.16)		.053 (1.29)
Personal services		-.018 (0.34)		-.032 (-0.63)
Entertainment and recreation services		.039 (-0.68)		-.023 (-0.44)
Professional services		.128 (3.07)		.133 (3.39)
Public administration		.324 (7.51)		.331 (8.13)
<i>Occupation</i>				
Professional/technical		.065 (3.45)		.066 (3.78)
Manager		.246 (12.65)		.247 (13.48)
Sales		.061 (2.70)		.059 (2.81)
Clerical		-.077 (-3.72)		-.076 (-3.89)
Craft		.037 (2.19)		.037 (2.31)
Operative		-.068 (-3.03)		-.066 (-3.08)
Transportation equipment operatives		-.077 (-3.59)		-.076 (-3.73)
Laborers		-.288 (-6.90)		-.289 (-7.28)
Farmers		-.055 (-1.15)		-.053 (-1.16)
Farm laborers		-.245 (-5.70)		-.248 (-6.10)
Service		-.241 (-10.73)		-.235 (-11.14)
Private household		-.587 (-3.37)		-.567 (-3.46)
Number of observations	32,123	32,123	35,875	35,875
R-square	.137	.189	.139	.139
Adjusted R-square	.136	.187	.139	.139

Note: The reference category is the intersection of the following variable values: ancestry = non-Hispanic, non-Euroethnic white men; region = Northeast; language ability = speaks English well; non-SMSA; industry = agriculture, occupation = other occupation; and not self-employed.

TABLE B.3
Regression Analysis of the Effect of Ethnicity and other Factors on Hourly Earnings of Native-Born Males, Ages 25–64
Benchmark Group Is British-Origin White Males

Explanatory variables	Single ancestry Euroethnics relative to British-origin whites, 1980				Single and mixed ancestry Euroethnics relative to British-origin whites, 1980			
	Regression coefficients (t-statistics in parentheses)				Regression coefficients (t-statistics in parentheses)			
	1		1-a		2		2-a	
Intercept	.321	(4.69)	.268	(3.19)	.260	(5.54)	.204	(3.50)
Education	.078	(20.01)	.073	(17.27)	.081	(30.50)	.074	(25.60)
Experience	.053	(15.09)	.050	(14.35)	.058	(23.61)	.530	(22.01)
Exp squared	– .0007	(–17.04)	– .0006	(–15.86)	– .0007	(–26.54)	– .0007	(–24.57)
Ed x exp	– .0007	(–5.01)	– .0007	(–4.88)	– .0008	(–7.89)	– .0007	(–7.25)
Poor English	– .072	(–1.33)	– .026	(–0.50)	– .078	(–1.89)	– .038	(–0.95)
<i>Region</i>								
North central	.049	(3.45)	.060	(4.34)	.043	(4.50)	.054	(5.74)
South	.0002	(0.02)	– .002	(–0.14)	– .003	(–0.38)	– .006	(–0.62)
West	.056	(3.46)	.064	(4.07)	.052	(4.82)	.063	(5.95)
Central city	.169	(9.91)	.136	(8.10)	.162	(13.63)	.132	(11.31)
Noncentral city	.264	(19.37)	.213	(15.79)	.247	(26.08)	.202	(21.48)
SMSA central city	.145	(9.20)	.112	(7.21)	.149	(13.65)	.115	(10.76)
Mix SMSA	.095	(5.47)	.068	(4.03)	.087	(7.14)	.064	(5.42)

TABLE B.3 (continued)

<i>Ancestry</i>	Single ancestry Euroethnics relative to British-origin whites, 1980				Single and mixed ancestry Euroethnics relative to British-origin whites, 1980			
Italian	.042	(1.94)	.060	(2.84)	.036	(2.20)	.052	(3.31)
Greek	.044	(0.57)	.039	(0.52)	.059	(1.03)	.050	(0.91)
Est./Lat./Lith.	– .153	(–1.90)	– .154	(–1.97)	– .089	(–1.61)	– .091	(–1.70)
Czech	.027	(0.56)	.023	(0.49)	.028	(0.82)	.023	(0.68)
Slovak	– .025	(–0.23)	– .019	(–0.18)	.021	(–0.30)	– .023	(–0.34)
Polish	.056	(2.12)	.046	(1.82)	.059	(3.14)	.052	(2.86)
Russian	.113	(2.75)	.147	(3.70)	.130	(4.51)	.156	(5.58)
Ukrainian	.139	(1.80)	.108	(1.44)	.098	(1.76)	.078	(1.44)
Romanian	– .043	(–0.26)	– .014	(–0.09)	.028	(0.28)	.757	(0.79)
Hungarian	.061	(1.06)	.060	(1.08)	.073	(1.90)	.072	(1.93)
Serbo-Croatian	.139	(1.79)	.109	(1.44)	.140	(2.36)	.120	(2.10)
Other East Europe	.065	(0.67)	.087	(0.93)	.049	(0.69)	.070	(1.00)
Austrian	.138	(1.33)	.143	(1.43)	.081	(1.38)	.089	(1.57)
Danish	.017	(0.27)	.025	(0.40)	.004	(0.09)	.009	(0.29)
Dutch	– .064	(–1.56)	– .051	(–1.29)	– .042	(–1.80)	– .040	(–1.80)
Welsh	.106	(1.54)	.088	(1.32)	.054	(1.38)	.032	(0.85)
Scottish	.031	(0.68)	.019	(0.44)	.014	(0.71)	.011	(0.56)
French	.057	(1.93)	.041	(1.42)	.008	(0.48)	– .003	(–0.17)
German	– .009	(–0.63)	– .002	(–0.16)	.0006	(0.05)	.004	(0.43)
Irish	.021	(1.18)	.015	(0.90)	.007	(0.66)	.003	(0.26)
Norwegian	– .017	(–0.40)	.000	(0.00)	– .007	(–0.27)	.013	(0.47)
Swedish	.014	(0.33)	.016	(0.41)	.018	(0.69)	.017	(0.70)
Swiss	– .039	(–0.39)	– .003	(–0.03)	– .014	(–0.26)	.021	(0.39)
European	– .018	(–0.80)	– .018	(–0.81)	– .008	(–0.56)	– .009	(–0.62)
Nafrishwa	– .131	(–1.07)	– .111	(–0.94)	– .179	(–1.93)	– .150	(–1.67)
Nortamer	– .098	(–2.52)	– .106	(–2.83)	– .068	(–2.87)	– .075	(–3.25)
Otherwht	– .025	(–1.49)	– .023	(–1.40)	– .029	(–2.10)	– .025	(–1.89)

TABLE B.3 (continued)

Explanatory variables	Single ancestry Euroethnics relative to British-origin whites, 1980		Single and mixed ancestry Euroethnics relative to British-origin whites, 1980	
	Regression coefficients (t-statistics in parentheses)			
	1	1-a	2	2-a
Self-employment		– .073 (–4.88)		– .057 (–5.53)
<i>Industry</i>				
Mine		.428 (7.59)		.440 (10.99)
Construction		.253 (5.29)		.289 (8.55)
Durables		.230 (4.81)		.263 (7.78)
Nondurables		.258 (5.49)		.298 (8.96)
Transportation		.312 (6.44)		.353 (10.28)
Communications		.338 (5.65)		.400 (9.62)
Utilities		.312 (5.75)		.360 (9.45)
Wholesale trade		.149 (2.99)		.193 (5.47)
Retail trade		– .041 (–0.86)		.001 (0.05)
Finance, insurance and real estate		.166 (3.26)		.233 (6.51)
Business and repair services		.005 (0.10)		.041 (1.16)
Personal services		– .066 (–1.05)		– .067 (–1.55)
Entertainment and recreation services		.042 (0.63)		.077 (1.67)
Professional services		.103 (2.15)		.144 (4.25)
Public administration		.217 (4.36)		.262 (7.47)
<i>Occupation</i>				
Professional/technical		.083 (3.72)		.078 (5.17)
Manager		.178 (7.72)		.155 (9.79)
Sales		.072 (2.71)		.049 (2.68)
Clerical		– .043 (–1.76)		– .055 (–3.27)
Craft		.023 (1.13)		.016 (1.17)
Operative		– .018 (–0.69)		– .031 (–1.70)
Transportation equipment operatives		– .068 (–2.71)		– .081 (–4.58)

TABLE B.3 (continued)

	Single ancestry Euroethnics relative to British-origin whites, 1980		Single and mixed ancestry Euroethnics relative to British-origin whites, 1980	
Laborers	– .148	(–3.05)	– .136	(–3.91)
Farmers	– .282	(–5.08)	– .275	(–6.94)
Farm laborers	– .250	(–5.13)	– .238	(–6.77)
Service	– .210	(–7.95)	– .200	(–10.87)
Private household	– .428	(–2.20)	– .383	(–2.68)
Number of observations	20,307	20,307	41,305	41,305
R-square	.114	.169	.117	.171
Adjusted R-square	.112	.166	.116	.169

Note: The reference category is the intersection of the following variable values: ancestry = British origin white men; region = Northeast; language ability = speaks English well; nonSMSA; industry = agriculture, occupation = other occupation; and not self-employed.

TABLE B.4
Separate Regressions by Ancestry Group for Native-Born Men, Ages 25–65

Non-Euroethnic, Non-Hispanic White

Number of observations: 30,134 *R*-square: .1341
Adjusted *R*-square: .1338

Variables	Parameter estimate	T-statistic
Intercept	7.280483	123.996
Education	0.113209	33.095
Experience	0.085623	27.437
Experience squared	-0.00115572	-30.346
Education x experience	-0.00151306	-11.672
Poor English	-0.126272	-1.930
North central	0.067658	5.281
South	-0.000844602	-0.067
West	0.024195	1.691
Central city	0.124767	8.191
Noncentral city	0.244734	20.673
SMSA central city	0.150289	11.075
Mix SMSA	0.083295	5.547

Italian

Number of observations: 2,098 *R*-square: .1289
Adjusted *R*-square: .1239

Intercept	7.330056	33.634
Education	0.112318	9.099
Experience	0.087653	7.593
Experience squared	-0.00113964	-8.627
Education x experience	-0.00169044	-3.408
Poor English	0.078215	0.709
North central	0.015410	0.357
South	-0.010418	-0.225
West	0.125021	2.874
Central city	0.089128	1.430
Noncentral city	0.233999	4.020
SMSA central city	0.083900	1.245
Mix SMSA	0.080477	1.046

Greek

Number of observations: 130 *R*-square: .1785
Adjusted *R*-square: .0942

Variables	Parameter estimate	T-statistic
Intercept	7.412339	6.523
Education	0.152203	2.443
Experience	0.106127	1.878
Experience squared	-0.00122192	-1.818
Education x experience	-0.00338906	-1.447
Poor English	-0.228552	-0.714
North central	-0.241188	-1.277
South	-0.393438	-1.817
West	0.039191	0.168
Central city	-0.447275	-1.138
Noncentral city	-0.019637	-0.051
SMSA central city	-0.035755	-0.089
Mix SMSA	-0.290879	-0.649

Estonians/Latvians/Lithuanians

Number of observations: 155 *R*-square: .2491
Adjusted *R*-square: .1913

Intercept	6.463850	7.292
Education	0.123471	2.427
Experience	0.113480	2.316
Experience squared	-0.00142263	-2.660
Education x experience	-0.00236455	-1.183
Poor English		
North central	0.282036	1.927
South	0.209195	0.950
West	-0.009151	-0.046
Central city	0.405089	1.706
Noncentral city	0.677600	3.186
SMSA central city	0.332417	1.270
Mix SMSA	0.713410	2.423

TABLE B.4 (continued)
Separate Regressions by Ancestry Group for Native-Born Men, Ages 25–65

Czech

Number of observations: 381

R-square: .1639

Adjusted R-square: .1367

Variables	Parameter estimate	T-statistic
Intercept	8.250564	17.113
Education	0.062254	2.238
Experience	0.043973	1.751
Experience squared	−0.000705723	−2.574
Education x experience	−0.000119117	−0.110
Poor English	−0.00299378	−0.011
North central	0.051722	0.753
South	−0.076329	−0.826
West	−0.146229	−1.249
Central city	0.035878	0.326
Noncentral city	0.252730	2.927
SMSA central city	0.135316	1.312
Mix SMSA	0.185718	1.419

Slovak

Number of observations: 103

R-square: .2383

Adjusted R-square: .1368

Intercept	5.817452	4.766
Education	0.183929	2.471
Experience	0.131021	2.140
Experience squared	−0.00154691	−2.131
Education x experience	−0.00386128	−1.484
Poor English	−1.203117	−1.336
North central	0.554848	1.263
South	0.552088	1.114
West	0.418306	0.825
Central city	0.255353	0.765
Noncentral city	0.282391	1.331
SMSA central city	−0.016641	−0.074
Mix SMSA	0.095034	0.243

Polish

Number of observations: 1,536

R-square: .1484

Adjusted R-square: .1416

Variables	Parameter estimate	T-statistic
Intercept	7.641499	32.186
Education	0.096478	7.113
Experience	0.065233	5.090
Experience squared	−0.000847362	−5.731
Education x experience	−0.000962692	−1.813
Poor English	−0.078096	−0.679
North central	0.039794	1.068
South	0.108065	1.886
West	0.071890	1.197
Central city	0.077883	1.223
Noncentral city	0.298376	5.185
SMSA central city	0.089202	1.314
Mix SMSA	0.104984	1.322

Russian

Number of observations: 606

R-square: .2450

Adjusted R-square: .2297

Intercept	6.169746	13.742
Education	0.171692	7.411
Experience	0.148385	6.341
Experience squared	−0.00182223	−6.646
Education x experience	−0.00332441	−3.634
Poor English	−0.465616	−1.259
North central	0.086001	0.987
South	−0.040792	−0.456
West	−0.057328	−0.701
Central city	0.128853	0.920
Noncentral city	0.304077	2.252
SMSA central city	0.038507	0.248
Mix SMSA	0.194880	0.953

TABLE B.4 (continued)
Separate Regressions by Ancestry Group for Native-Born Men, Ages 25–65

Ukrainian

Number of observations: 143 *R*-square: .1696
Adjusted *R*-square: .0929

Variables	Parameter estimate	T-statistic
Intercept	7.248661	8.178
Education	0.136234	2.691
Experience	0.137576	3.116
Experience squared	−0.00139851	−2.767
Education x experience	−0.00458196	−2.476
Poor English	−0.458310	−1.460
North central	−0.073395	−0.464
South	−0.233282	−1.219
West	−0.068062	−0.385
Central city	−0.329347	−1.433
Noncentral city	0.010207	0.055
SMSA central city	0.106980	0.470
Mix SMSA	−0.606899	−2.348

Romanian

Number of observations: 54 *R*-square: .4890
Adjusted *R*-square: .3551

Intercept	5.878059	3.936
Education	0.176618	2.187
Experience	0.095394	1.346
Experience squared	−0.00184005	−2.197
Education x experience	−0.00011794	−0.032
Poor English		
North central	−0.029324	−0.129
South	−0.128515	−0.418
West	−0.306529	−1.186
Central city	0.175160	0.308
Noncentral city	0.466197	0.862
SMSA central city	0.818254	1.380
Mix SMSA	0.106285	0.169

Hungarian

Number of observations: 333 *R*-square: .1970
Adjusted *R*-square: .1669

Variables	Parameter estimate	T-statistic
Intercept	6.968176	10.542
Education	0.131489	3.657
Experience	0.092670	2.690
Experience squared	−0.00121248	−2.928
Education x experience	−0.00129382	−0.941
Poor English	−0.043438	−0.091
North central	0.106070	0.933
South	−0.104373	−0.706
West	0.064455	0.453
Central city	0.151203	0.734
Noncentral city	0.183719	1.016
SMSA central city	−0.193918	−0.928
Mix SMSA	−0.151875	−0.600

Serbian/Croatian

Number of observations: 120 *R*-square: .1747
Adjusted *R*-square: .0822

Intercept	7.950149	7.180
Education	0.096352	1.467
Experience	0.055845	0.933
Experience squared	−0.000501643	−0.748
Education x experience	−0.00136169	−0.554
Poor English	−0.664313	−1.663
North central	−0.124126	−0.694
South	−0.353392	−1.175
West	0.054972	0.265
Central city	−0.024876	−0.097
Noncentral city	0.267601	1.180
SMSA central city	.00008009209	0.000
Mix SMSA	0.004218668	0.009

TABLE B.4 (continued)
Separate Regressions by Ancestry Group for Native-Born Men, Ages 25-65

Other East European

Number of observations: 83

R-square: .2757

Adjusted R-square: .1516

Variables	Parameter estimate	T-statistic
Intercept	6.873487	6.026
Education	0.148392	2.610
Experience	0.140326	2.107
Experience squared	-0.00193658	-2.354
Education x experience	-0.00305358	-1.192
Poor English	-0.755390	-1.399
North central	-0.031065	-0.166
South	0.474511	1.766
West	0.063136	0.288
Central city	-0.150566	-0.487
Noncentral city	0.080949	0.279
SMSA central city	-0.068990	-0.205
Mix SMSA	-0.230473	-0.569

UNITED STATES COMMISSION
ON CIVIL RIGHTS
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20425

OFFICIAL BUSINESS
PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE, \$300

SPECIAL 4TH CLASS RATE
POSTAGE & FEES PAID
US COMMISSION ON
CIVIL RIGHTS G-73

[REDACTED]