PRIMCED Discussion Paper Series, No. 69

Educational Status of Non-biological Children
in the United States: New Evidence
from Federal Census Microdata

Chiaki Moriguchi

March 2015

Educational Status of Non-biological Children in the United States: New Evidence from Federal Census Microdata

Chiaki Moriguchi*

chiaki@ier.hit-u.ac.jp
Institute of Economic Research, Hitotsubashi University

March 20, 2015

Abstract

A substantial number of American children reside in adoptive or step households. Empirical research has found strong correlations between family structure and child outcomes in modern data, showing that non-biological children have lower outcomes than biological children. Few studies have examined how non-biological children fared in historical times, however. In this study, I use the public use samples of federal census microdata in 1900-1930 and 2000 to compare educational status of adopted, step, and biological children in the United States. I find that, for both whites and blacks, non-biological children experienced major educational disadvantages compared to biological children in 1900-1930 even after controlling for child and parental characteristics. By 2000, however, the educational disadvantages of white and black adopted children have been greatly reduced or even reversed in some measures. For stepchildren, educational disadvantages have persisted for both whites and blacks, but their extent was smaller than in 1900-1930. For Asian children, I find no significant difference in educational status among adopted, step, and biological children in 2000 once we control for household characteristics. These findings are consistent with major transformations of adoption practices and stepfamily formation in the U.S. during the twentieth century that improved parental incentives and resources to invest in non-biological children.

JEL classification codes: J13, N32, I24

1. Motivation

Living arrangements of children vary widely across households in modern societies. In the United States, according to the 2010 Current Population Survey, 69% of children under the age of 18 lived with two parents, 27% lived with only one parent, and 4% lived with no parent but with other relatives or nonrelatives. Among children living in two-parent households, 88% lived with two biological parents, 9% lived with one biological parent and one stepparent, and 2% lived with adoptive parents. In other words, only 60% of children reside in the so-called "traditional" families (with both birth parents present) in contemporary America.

Empirical research shows that family structure matters for child outcomes. Most notably, it has been widely established that children in two-parent families fare better than children in single-parent families in a wide range of outcomes (see MacLanahan and Sandefur 1994; Biblarz and Raftery 1999). Within two-parent families stepchildren are shown to have worse outcomes than biological children, although the reasons are in dispute (see Case et al. 2000 and 2001; Ginther and Polak 2004; Gennetian 2005). According to clinical and epidemiological studies, adopted children, too, fared developmentally worse compared to biological children (see Brodzinsky et al. 1998; Feigelman 2001).

Although there are many studies evaluating the effects of family structure on child outcomes using modern data, few studies have investigated how adopted children and stepchildren fared in historical times.[1] Needless to say, however, not all children lived in the "traditional" families in the past (Ruggles 1994; Moehling 2002). As children faced much greater risk of parental death, illness, and poverty in the early 20th century than the present day, many children did not have two birth parents to care fore them. Moreover, as I discuss below, parental motivations for adoption and the process of stepfamily formation changed greatly during the last century, impacting parental incentives to invest in adopted children and stepchildren. Therefore, it is of our great interest to investigate the well-being of non-biological children in the past and compare their conditions to the present.

A major obstacle in carrying out a historical analysis, however, is data availability. In the absence of large-scale household surveys before the 1960s, it has been difficult to find data that contain a sufficient number of non-biological children. The primary purpose of this study

---

[1] Important exceptions are studies by contemporary observers, most notably, Theis (1924) and Leahy (1935), and a more recent study by Moehling (2004).

is to use U.S. federal census microdata in 1900-1930 and 2000 to compare educational status of adopted, step, and biological children over the twentieth century. To the best of my knowledge, this study provides one of the first historical outcome studies of non-biological children using nationally representative data (Moriguchi 2014).

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, I summarize historical developments of child adoption and stepfamily formation. In Section 3, I introduce the census microdata and present descriptive statistics of adopted children and stepchildren in 1900, 1930, and 2000. I conduct the empirical analysis using the 1900-1930 census data in Section 4 and then analyze the 2000 census data in Section 5. In Section 6, I summarize the findings and conclude.

2. History of Child Adoption and Stepfamily Formation

The U.S. is a leading nation in the diversity of family today. Adoptive families and stepfamilies, however, were neither numerous nor socially accepted at the turn of the twentieth century. In this section, I briefly discuss the historical developments of child adoption and stepfamily formation in the U.S.

2.1 Child Adoption in the U.S., 1850-2000

The historical process by which adoption became a widely accepted means of forming a family in the U.S. can be divided into three phases: the period of *pragmatic* adoption since the 1850s, the rise of *sentimental* adoption since the 1920s, and the rise of international and foster care adoption after the 1970s (see Moriguchi 2009 and 2012 for more details).

In 19th-century America, due to parental death, illness, poverty, neglect, and stigma against out-of-wedlock births, many children had no birth parents to care for them and were placed in substitute care (Moehling 2002). Although the most common arrangement was to live with relatives, a substantial number of children were placed in orphanages. In the 1850s, social reformers began advocating that children should be cared in home rather than in institutions. In what is known as the "orphan train movement" led by charitable organizations, more than 100,000 homeless children in eastern cities were transported by railroads and placed in foster or adoptive homes in the Midwest during the latter half of the 19th century (Holt 1992). Many families took these children in as farm laborers or housekeepers, signing an agreement to

provide proper care and schooling until the child reached 18. In concurrent development, Massachusetts enacted the first modern adoption law in 1851 that enabled a permanent transfer of parental rights from birth to adoptive parents upon court approval. Most states passed similar laws by 1900. Despite the legal innovations, however, adoption remained mostly informal and relatively uncommon throughout the 19th century, motivated primarily by pragmatic demand for labor or altruism to help destitute children (Carp 2000; Moriguchi 2009).

From the late 19th century to the early 20th century, the society began to value children for reasons more emotional than economic (Zelizer 1994). Child labor began to decline with urbanization and industrialization, as it was most valuable in agriculture. The spread of compulsory education and child labor laws (which restricted child labor in manufacturing and mining) across states further reduced the economic value of children (Goldinand Katz 2004; Gratton and Moen 2004). Adoption, too, evolved from pragmatic adoption to *sentimental* adoption, reflecting the changing value of children. With an invention of infant formula and a growing perception that nurture matters more than nature, a greater number of white couples began to adopt an unrelated infant to rear "as their very own" (Berebitsky 2000). At many city orphanages, the demand for adoptable infants began to exceed the supply in the 1920s for the first time (Gill 2002; Carpe 2002). By 1940, adopting a child, as an alternative to bearing a child, became an accepted means of forming a family among whites. Much less is known about adoption practices among blacks.

The number of unrelated adoptions increased rapidly after WWII, reaching its historic peak of nearly 90,000 in 1970. A vast majority of them were by married couples adopting an out-of-wedlock newborn of the same race motivated by infertility. The number of unrelated adoptions fell dramatically in the 1970s, however, due to a decline in domestic infants relinquished for adoption as a result of abortion legalization and the diffusion of contraceptive pills (Bitler and Zavodny 2002). To this day, domestic unrelated adoption is constrained by the number of adoptable infants, and prospective parents face long waiting time and high adoption costs. In the 1990s, the number of unrelated adoptions resurged due to an increase in both international adoption and foster care children (Moriguchi 2012). With the rise of multiculturalism and the shortage of adoptable domestic infants, a greater number of white couples began to adopt children from foreign countries, most notably from Korea since the 1970s and China since the 1990s. As a result, a sizable share of unrelated adoption in 2000 is

not only international but also *interracial*. Since the 1980s, federal and state governments began to promote the placement of foster care children in adoptive homes, providing subsidies for adoptions of children with *special needs* (e.g., physical, mental, or emotional disability, older age, minority group membership). Importantly, the demand for foster care adoption is motivated not solely by altruism but also by infertility (Gumus and Lee 2012). Consequently, child adoption in 2000 is characterized by the great diversity and heterogeneity in adoptive parents as well as adopted children.

To summarize, the nature of child adoption in the U.S. underwent a major transformation in the course of the twentieth century. Most notably, the primary motivation for adoption evolved from the demand for labor to the desire to experience parenthood, which would increase parental incentive to make educational investment in adopted children.

2.2 Stepfamily Formation in the U.S., 1900-2000

At the turn of the twentieth century, due to high adult mortality and low divorce rates, the leading cause of remarriage was a death of a spouse. With limited job opportunities for mothers and little public assistance for dependent children, a death of the father often meant that the mother had to remarry to care for her children, or alternatively, to place them in substitute care (Moehling 2002). The introduction of mothers' pensions by states in the 1910s mitigated the plight of widows, but the grants provided were typically too small to cover even the basic family needs. Moreover, only a small fraction of black mothers received any pensions even though single motherhood was more prevalent among the black than the white (Moehling 2007). In other words, in the early twentieth century, most stepfamilies were formed as a result of parental death and remarriage.

From the late 1960s to the 1980s, divorce rates in the U.S. rose dramatically with the increase in female earnings, major changes in divorce laws (e.g., the introduction of no-fault divorce and equitable financial settlements), and less social stigma attached to divorce (Marcassa 2013). Consequently, in 2000, the majority of stepfamilies were formed as a result of divorce and remarriage. As a result, we expect that the selection into stepfamilies were more negative in the earlier period and thus stepchildren in historical times faced even greater disadvantages than today.

3. Data and Definitions

3.1 IPUMS Federal Census Microdata

In this study, I compile a dataset of adopted and step children using U.S. federal census microdata from the Integrated Public Use Microdata Series (IPUMS)[2]. In the U.S., the federal government conducts a population census every decade, and complete census records (including individual names) are released to the public after being sealed for 72 years. From these records, IPUMS constructs nationally representative random samples of the 1850-1940 census records. In addition, IPUMS also offers random samples of the 1950-2000 census records after removing any personally identifiable information.

Among researchers, it is well-known that adopted children were assigned an independent category, separately from biological children and stepchildren, for the first time in the 2000 census questionnaire (U.S. Census Bureau 2003). As I have shown in Moriguchi (2009), however, from IPUMS's detailed family relationship codes, one can identify adopted children (and stepchildren) also in the 1880-1930 data. In this study, I use 1900, 1910, 1930 and 2000 IPUMS samples to compile a dataset of non-biological children.[3]

The merits of using census microdata are multitude. First, the data contain more than 5,000 adopted children in 1900-1930, a large number even compared to modern adoption studies whose sample size rarely exceeds 100. Second, because family relationships were self-reported in the 1900-1930 censuses,[4] unlike court records, adopted children in IPUMS data include both formal (legal) and informal (de facto) adoption. This is particularly important for capturing adoption practices in the early twentieth century (when informal and formal adoption coexisted) and especially among black families (who were less likely to use a legal system during the era of segregation). Furthermore, census records contain rich demographic and socio-economic information on every person residing in the same household including nonfamily co-residents. Lastly, the 2000 census data provide a modern counterpoint to the

---

[2] IPUMS data (Ruggles et al., 2010) are publicly available online at: https://usa.ipums.org/usa/

[3] More specifically, I use IPUMS 1900 2.5% sample (with minority oversamples), 1910 1.4% sample (with minority oversamples), 1920 1% sample, 1930 1% sample, and 2000 5% sample. Alaska and Hawaii are excluded from all years to maintain consistency across years.

[4] The census instructions to enumerators in 1900-1930 read: "*Relationship to head of family.* – Designate the head of the family, whether husband or father, widow, or unmarried person of either sex, by the word 'head'; for other members of a family write wife, father, mother, son, daughter, grandson, daughter-in-law, uncle, aunt, nephew, niece, boarder, lodger, servant, etc., according to the particular relationship which the person bears to the head of the family."

historical data, which allows us to compare adopted children and stepchildren in the U.S. across the twentieth century.

There are major limitations in IPUMS data, however. Most critically, unlike in 2000, because households were not instructed to identify adopted children in 1900-1930 and such information was voluntary, adopted children were likely to be underreported with potentially large reporting bias. Second, we observe the age of children at the time of census, but do not observe at what age a child was adopted or became a stepchild. Third, we cannot distinguish unrelated adoption (adoption by individuals unrelated by blood or marriage) from related adoption (adoption by relatives or stepparents). In particular, in the 2000 census, adopted stepchildren were explicitly instructed to be included in adopted children. Because as much as 56% of adopted children in 1975 were adopted stepchildren (Moriguchi 2012, Table 2; no data are available after 1975), we expect that adopted children in 2000 include a large number of adopted stepchildren.

In this study, I define a child as any person under the age of 18 (aged 0-17) residing in a household whose relationship to a household head is reported as "child" (which I assume to be biological child), "adopted child," or "stepchild."[5] It must be noted that child type is always defined in relation to a *household head* and that the relationship between a child and a spouse of the household head is *not* directly identified. To clarify our definitions of child type, consider a married two-parent household with children. In the 1900-1930 data, in virtually all such households, the household head is children's father. In these households, children are labeled "biological" if they are residing with their biological father, regardless of their relationship to a mother. Thus, "biological children" in our definition include not only children living with two birth parents but also those who were residing with a birth father and a stepmother (such as Cinderella). As a result, our definition of "stepchildren" includes children living with a stepfather, but do not include children living with a stepmother. Similarly, children are labeled "adopted children" when they are residing with an adoptive father even if their mother is a birth mother. As noted above, our definition of "adopted children" may include adopted stepchildren. These misclassifications will lead us to underestimate any differences across child types in the following analyses.

---

[5] Brother, sister, nephew, niece, grandchild, and child-in-law of a household head are not included in "child" even if they are under age 18 residing in the same household.

3.2 Living Arrangements of Biological, Adopted, and Step Children

The primary object of this study is to investigate whether non-biological children faced educational disadvantages compared to biological children in the early twentieth century. Because living arrangements of children varied widely, to reduce unobserved heterogeneity, I restrict our sample to *married two-parent* households with at least one (biological, adopted, or step) child in the empirical analyses. But before doing so, it is important to observe the representativeness of such households. In **Table 1**, I report the distribution of children by the marital status of their household head by race and child type.[6] The results are presented for white and black children in 1900-1930 and for white, black, and Asian children in 2000. Several important observations follow.

First, in 1900-1930, 93% of white biological children and 84% of black biological children lived in a married two-parent household (labeled "married, spouse present" in Table 1). In 2000, the share of biological children living with two parents declined to 79% for white children and to 41% for black children. The share of biological children living in a separated or divorced single-parent household was only 1.6% for whites and 3.7% for blacks in 1900-1930, compared to 15% for whites and 25% for blacks in 2000, reflecting lower divorce rates in the earlier period. By contrast, the share of biological children living in a widowed single-parent household in 1900-1930 (5.4% for whites and 11.5% for blacks) was substantially higher than the 2000 counterpart (1.0% for whites and 1.8% for blacks), reflecting higher mortality rates in the earlier decades.

Second, the percentage of biological children living in a household with a never-married parent is less that 0.1% for whites and 1.1% for blacks in 1900-1930, compared to 5.0% for whites and 33% for blacks in 2000. The dramatically smaller numbers in 1900-1930 indicate strong social stigma against unwed mothers and out-of-wedlock children before WWII for both races.

Third, turning to adopted children, adoptive parents were more diverse than biological parents in 1900-1930. Compared to biological children, for both races, adopted children were consistently less likely to live in a married two-parent household and more likely to live in a

---

[6] Because the unit of observation is child, a household with multiple children is counted multiple times in the statistics.

widowed or never-married single-parent household. By sharp contrast, in 2000, reflecting the preferences of a majority of adoption agencies, adopted children were more likely to live in a married two-parent household compared to biological children.

Fourth, as one would expect, for both races, almost all stepchildren resided in a married two-parent household in 1900-1930. They were much less likely to live in a widowed household than biological children, because stepchildren were considerably older and thus less likely to experience the death of (another) parent before they reach 18. In 2000, too, stepchildren were more likely to live in a married two-parent household than biological children.[7] It is important to note that adopted children and stepchildren consistently exhibit *opposite* characteristics relative to biological children in 1900-1930, which suggests that these two categories were well differentiated in the historical data with no major presence of adopted stepchildren.

In the rest of the analysis, I restrict the sample to married two-parent households and drop all single-parent households. In light of **Table 1**, this means that the sample becomes highly selective in 2000, especially for black biological children and black adopted children. In other words, when comparing stepchildren against biological children among blacks in 2000, we must keep in our mind that the latter group is positively selected.

3.3 Biological, Adopted, and Step Children in Married Two-parent Households

To provide a data overview, I present the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of biological, adopted, and step children and their households in 1900, 1930, and 2000 in **Tables 2-4**. The sample is restricted to children residing in married two-parent households. I report the mean of each characteristic by the race of a child (which may be different from the race of parents) and child type. I also test if the mean of adopted children or stepchildren is significantly different from that of biological children.

First, I focus on white children in 1900. According to **Table 2**, adopted children were significantly more likely to be female than biological children, indicating that parental preference for adopting a girl was already present in 1900. Both adopted children and stepchildren were substantially older than biological children, as they entered the current

---

[7] One may note that a sizable share of stepchildren in 2000 lived with a never-married household head: these were mostly biological children of an unmarried partner of the household head who were reported as "stepchildren" (U.S. Census Bureau 2003, p.3).

households not at birth but at a later point in life. Furthermore, adoptive parents were substantially older (almost by 6 years) than biological parents, while stepparents were only slightly older than biological parents. The race of adopted children was the same with the race of at least one adoptive parent, showing that inter-racial adoption was rare in 1900. The duration of parental marriage was substantially longer for adopted children (18.5 years) than for stepchildren (6.3 years), providing some assurance that adopted children did not include too many adopted stepchildren.[8] Compared to biological parents who had on average 3.9 biological children under 18 in the household, adoptive parents had only 0.6, which suggests that infertility might already have been an important reason for adoption in 1900. As a result, adopted children have fewer siblings compared to biological and stepchildren. According to **Table 3**, demographic characteristics of biological, adoptive, and step households changed relatively little from 1900 to 1930.

Surprisingly, only 57% of white adopted children shared the same surname with their parents in 1900, while the remaining 43% had a surname that was different from their adoptive parents.[9] The same surname likely indicates that a child was legally adopted and renamed upon adoption, although it might also result from the adoption of a related child (of the same surname). By contrast, the different surname indicates that either a child was informally adopted or a child was old enough to recognize his or her surname when adopted and not renamed. In 1930, the share of white adopted children with the same surname increased to 76%, due possibly to a rise in legal adoption. For stepchildren, it was common to keep their surname after their mother's remarriage. Only 13% of stepchildren had the same surname with their parents in 1900 and only 11% did in 1930.

When we compare the socio-economic conditions of households across child types, compared to biological fathers, white adoptive fathers in 1900 were less likely to be in labor force (due presumably to the higher age) but had higher SEI (socio-economic index based on occupation and occupation-imputed income) conditional on being in labor force, were substantially more likely to own a house, and were more likely to have a domestic servant residing in the household. By sharp contrast, white stepfathers were associated with lower SEI

---

[8] For additional evidence, the number of mother's marriages (available only in 1910) was 1.04 for mothers of biological children, 1.14 times for mother of adopted children, and 1.97 times for the mothers of stepchildren.
[9] Virtually all married couples in 1900-1930 shared the same surname.

and a lower likelihood of owning a house or having a domestic servant. When we compare mother's labor force participation, which is a measure of economic hardship as less than 2% of white mothers worked in 1900, stepchildren's mothers were more likely to be in labor force than biological children's mothers. Only educational measure available for parents in 1900 is literacy (can read and write), where stepchildren's parents were associated with lower literacy rate than biological children's parents. All of these observations also hold in 1930 (see **Table 3**). One notable difference, however, is that white adoptive households were more likely to be a farm household than biological households in 1900, but it was no longer the case in 1930.

With respect to children's education, we observe three outcomes: literacy, school attendance, and labor force participation. **Tables 2 and 3** show general improvements in children's education from 1900 to 1930: the literacy rate of white children (aged 10-17) increased from 95% to 99%, their school attendance rate rose from 76% to 87%, and their labor force participation rate declined from 18% to 3%. When we compare across child types, stepchildren were associated with lower educational outcomes than biological children in all measures in both years, while the results are mixed for adopted children.

Turning to black children, many of the characteristics of black adopted and step children in 1900 and 1930 were qualitatively similar to the case of white children. For example, compared to biological children, adopted children were more likely to be female, were older, had substantially older parents, and had a fewer number of siblings. The share of adopted children with a different surname from their parents was as high as 65% in 1900, which declined to 37% in 1930. Compared to biological households, black adoptive households were in better socio-economic conditions, while black step households fared worse in both 1900 and 1930. Black adoptive fathers were more likely to own a house and employ a domestic servant, but black stepfathers had lower SEI, less likely to own a house or employ a domestic servant, and less likely to be literate. Black adoptive households were more likely to be a farm household than biological households in 1900, but by 1930 they were less likely to be a farm household and more likely to live in a metropolitan area.

In terms of children's education, black children as a whole experienced major advances between 1900 and 1930, as their literacy rate jumped from 57% to 86% and school attendance rose from 62% to 80%, while their labor force participation rate fell from 45% to 19%.

Nevertheless, compared to biological children, black stepchildren had a lower likelihood of school attendance and a greater likelihood of labor participation.

In the 2000 census, we observe additional variables, such as income, parental education, and child's disability status (having any sensory, physical, or mental disabilities). The results are reported for white, black, and Asian children in **Table 4**. For all races, compared to biological children, adopted children in 2000 were older, had older parents, less likely to be female or native born (for whites and Asians), and had fewer siblings. Reflecting the rise in international adoption since the 1990s, 24% of black adopted children and 66% of Asian adopted children had adoptive parents whose races were different from the race of the child (i.e., inter-racial adoption).

In general, despite the fact that adopted children in 2000 include a substantial number of adopted stepchildren, adoptive households and step households differed sharply in many of their characteristics. For all races, adoptive parents were more likely to own a house and had higher income, higher SEI, and higher educational attainments than biological parents, while the opposite was true for stepparents.

In terms of children's educational outcomes, compared to biological children, adoptive children in 2000 were *more* likely to attend private school at age 12-17, but were also *more* likely to participate in labor force at age 16-17. Stepchildren were less likely to attend private school at age 12-17 and more likely to participate in labor force. Note that adopted children were substantially more likely to have a disability than biological children, as they were more likely to experience adversarial conditions at birth, if not into early childhood. Stepchildren were also associated with a higher likelihood of having disability then biological children. These factors must be taken into consideration when we compare educational outcomes across child types.

5. Educational Status of Adopted Children and Stepchildren in 1900-1930

The descriptive statistics in the previous section clearly indicate that adopted and step households differed systematically and consistently from the households with biological children throughout the 20th century. In 1900 and 1930, compared to biological children, stepchildren resided in households with less favorable socio-economic conditions, while the

opposite was true for adopted children. But, at the same time, there were substantial differences in child age and sex, parental age, and sibling composition across child types. Do educational outcomes still differ among biological, adopted, and step children when we control for child attributes? If yes, do such educational differences persist when we control for household characteristics? And finally, did some adopted children fare better than other adopted children? To answer these questions, in this section, I pool the 1900-1930 census data and conduct multivariate regression analyses of children's educational outcomes.

Due to a cross-sectional nature of the data, only limited outcome variables are available, namely, literacy, school attendance, and labor force participation. Literacy is defined as the ability to "read and write" and is available for age 10 and above. School attendance is defined as having attended a school during a specified period (of 4-12 months depending on census year) and is available for all ages. Labor force participation is defined as reporting any "gainful occupation" and the occupational information is available for age 10 and above. School attendance and labor force participation, however, are not mutually exclusive outcomes, as children could and did work and attend school at the same time. Therefore, I also examine combined outcomes of the two in the following analysis. I assume that desirable outcomes for children were being literate, attending school, and not in labor force.

In the following analysis, each educational outcome is regressed on the child-type indicator variables of "adopted" and "step" (where an omitted category is "biological") and a set of control variables. I assume a linear probability model and use an OLS regression for simpler interpretation, but the results are robust to the use of logistic regression. To control for state-level characteristics that change across time (most importantly, variations in adoption laws, child labor laws, and compulsory education laws), I include state and year fixed effects and their interactions in all specifications. As one household may have multiple children, standard errors are clustered at the household level.

For each outcome, I estimate three specifications. In the first specification I only control for child attributes (age and sex), while in the second specification I control for all observable household characteristics such as birth order, sibling composition, the age, race, literacy, employment, and socioeconomic index (SEI) of parents, house ownership, urban and metropolitan residence, and an indicator for farm household. In the third specification, to distinguish adoption types, I interact the indicator variable for the adopted with an indicator

variable for *same surname* adoption (defined as having the same surname with both parents). If same surname adoption is capturing legal adoption or infant adoption, then we expect adopted children with the same surname to have better educational outcomes than the rest of adopted children. Same surname adoption may result also from the adoption of patrilinearly related child.

The regression results for white children are reported in **Tables 5 and 6**. The outcome variables in **Table 5** are literacy by gender (boys aged 10-17 in columns (1)-(3) and girls aged 10-17 in columns (4)-(6)) and school attendance by age group (children aged 6-11 in columns (7)-(9) and children aged 12-17 in columns (10)-(12)). In **Table 6**, the first two outcome variables are school attendance and labor force participation for children aged 10-17 shown in columns (1)-(6). From columns (7) to (18), I examine four combined outcomes in the order of desirability: (a) in school and not in labor force, (b) in school but also in labor force, (c) not in school and in labor force, and (d) neither in school nor in labor force. The last category may result from parental neglect, a child's sickness or disability, or a child engaging in housework. In both tables, mean probability of each outcome is reported in the bottom panel. For example, according to **Table 6**, among white children aged 10-17, 75.9% belonged to the first best outcome of attending school and not working, 6.4% were in the second best outcome of attending school and working, 9.3% were working and not attending school, and 8.4% were neither attending school nor working. In general, observe that desirable household characteristics (i.e., parental literacy and SEI, mother not working, house ownership, the presence of domestic servant) are strongly and positively associated with better educational outcomes for children (being literate, in school, and not in labor force) in all specifications.

I first focus on the results for white adopted children. The first specification in columns (1), (4), (7), and (10) in **Table 5** show that, compared to biological children of the same age and sex, adopted children were not significantly different in their literacy, but were *less* likely to receive primary and secondary education. For example, the secondary school attendance rate of adopted children was 2.4 percentage points below the mean attendance rate of 77.8%. When we control for household characteristics in the second specification in columns (2), (5), (8), and (11), the relative outcomes of adopted children become *worse*. Compared to biological children in comparable households, adopted children were 1.5 percentage points less likely to be literate if male and 5.1 percentage points less likely to attend secondary school. When the interaction

term is added in the third specification in column (3), adopted boys with the same surname were 3.6 percentage points more likely to be literate than adopted boys with different surname, but their literacy rate was still 1.3 percentage points below that of biological boys. For secondary school attendance in column (12), adopted children with the same surname were 4.5 percentage points more likely to attend school than adopted children with different surname, and their attendance rate was not different from that of biological children. Similar results follow from **Table 6**. Educational disadvantages of adopted children are more apparent *after* controlling for household characteristics. According to columns (2) and (5), white adopted children aged 10-17 were 5.2 percentage points less likely to attend school and 1.8 percentage points more likely to participate in labor force than biological children in comparable households. When examined in more detail, being adopted increased the likelihood of being in the last two categories, "not in school but in labor force" and "neither in school nor in labor force" (columns (14) and (17)). Adopted children with the same surname fared significantly better, however, as they were more likely to be in the second best category of "in school and in labor force" and much less likely to be in the last category than the rest of adopted children (columns (12) and (18)).

Next, I turn to white stepchildren. The results of the first specification in **Table 5** and **Table 6** show that stepchildren had a lower educational outcome than biological children of the same sex and age in almost every measure: they were less likely to be literate regardless of gender, less likely to attend school at any age, and more likely to be in the worst two categories of school attendance and labor force participation combinations. Even more strikingly, the results remain mostly the same even when we control for household characteristics. According to columns (8), (14), and (17) in **Table 6**, compared to biological children in comparable households, stepchildren aged 10-17 were 6.0 percentage points less likely to be in the first best category of "in school and not in labor force," 4.0 percentage points more likely to be "not in school but in labor force," and 1.7 percentage points more likely to be "neither in school nor in labor force."

The results for black children are reported in **Tables 7 and 8**. In the period of racial segregation and discrimination, black children in general show substantially worse outcomes than white children. For example, according to **Table 8**, among black children aged 10-17, only 50% were in the first best outcome of attending school and not working, 19% were in the

second best outcome of attending school and working, 18% were working without attending school, and 13% were neither attending school nor working. Due partly to a smaller sample size, most results for adopted children are not statistically significant. In the first specification, black adopted children are less likely to be literate if female (column (4) in **Table 7**) than biological children, but show little difference in school attendance or labor force participation. When household characteristics are controlled for, the results show *worse* outcomes. According to columns (6) and (11) in **Table 7**, black adopted boys and girls were 5.8 and 7.9 percentage points less likely to be literate than their biological counterparts, respectively. According to columns (8) and (17) in **Table 8**, black adopted children were 3.5 percentage points less likely to be in the first category ("in school and not in labor force") and 2.5 percentage points more likely to be in the last category ("neither in school nor in labor force") than biological children in comparable households. Unlike white adopted children, having the same surname with parents had no effects on the outcomes of black adopted children. For black children, same surname adoption might be associated more with related adoption than legal adoption.

The results for black stepchildren shared much in common with white stepchildren. According to the results of the first specification in **Tables 7 and 8**, black stepchildren were less likely to be literate if female, less likely to attend secondary school, and more likely to be in the last two categories of schooling and labor force participation combinations. The results are effectively the same when we control for household characteristics. Compared to biological children in comparable households, black stepchildren were 5.3% percentage points less likely to be literate if female, 5.9% less likely to attend secondary school, were 4.6 percentage points less likely to be in the category of "in school and not in labor force," 4.0 percentage points more likely to be in the category of "not in school and in labor force," and 1.1 percentage points more likely to be in the worst category of "neither in school nor in labor force."

To summarize, in the early twentieth century, non-biological children faced educational disadvantages compared to biological children, regardless of their race. White adopted children were associated with substantially lower outcomes compared to their biological children in comparable households, but among the adopted, those children who shared the same surname with adoptive parents fared significantly better. Black adopted children also exhibited lower outcomes especially in literacy, but having the same surname with adoptive parents made no

difference. For both races, stepchildren were associated with significantly lower outcomes even after controlling for the unfavorable socioeconomic conditions of their households.

6. Educational Status of Adopted and Step Children in 2000

To investigate if educational status of biological, adopted, and step children differ in 2000, I closely follow the methods in Section 5. First, I analyze the following five schooling outcomes for 2000: (1) attending preschool (age 3-5), (2) attending primary school (age 6-11), (3) attending private primary school (age 6-11), (4) attending secondary school (age 12-17), and (5) attending private secondary school (age 12-17). Recent empirical studies indicate that early educational opportunities such as attending preschool have major effects on adulthood outcomes (Garces et al. 2002; Heckman et al. 2010). In addition, I examine children's labor force participation (available for age 16-17) and its combination with school attendance (Ahn et al. 2010). I assume that the desirable educational outcome is to attend preschool, attend private (primary and secondary) school, and not participating in labor force. For each outcome, I estimate three specifications. In the first specification I control for child attributes (age, sex, and disability) in addition to state fixed effects, and in the second specification I include all observable household characteristics as additional controls. In the third specification, to distinguish adoption types, I interact the indicator variable for the adopted with an indicator variable for *inter-racial* adoption (defined as the race of child different from both parents).

The results for white children are presented in **Tables 9 and 10**. In general, better parental education, higher SEI of father, and higher parental income improve children's educational status. Having a disability increases the likelihood of attending preschool, but reduces the likelihood of primary and secondary school attendance and labor force participation. The results in **Tables 9** show that white adopted children have substantially *higher* rates of attending preschool and receiving private school education than biological children in the first specification, but their advantages become smaller once we control for household characteristics. For example, adopted children aged 12-17 are 2.2 percentage points more likely to attend a private school than biological children of the same age, sex, and disability, but the difference shrinks to 0.9 percentage point when household characteristics are controlled for (columns (13) and (14)). This is consistent with the observation that adoptive

households in 2000 had better socio-economic conditions than biological households (**Table 4**). According to **Table 10**, however, adopted children aged 16-17 have a *higher* rate of labor force participation. In contrast to the 1900-1930 result, however, this effect comes entirely from an increase in the likelihood of "in school and in labor force" (column (8)) without reducing the likelihood of school attendance. Finally, for white adopted children, inter-racial adoption is not significant due largely to its very low frequency (only 0.2% according to **Table 4**).

Turning to white stepchildren, in the first specification in **Table 9**, being a stepchild is negatively associated with all educational outcomes except for primary school attendance. When we control for household characteristics, the coefficient of preschool attendance turns from negative to positive (column (2)) and the magnitude of negative effects on other outcomes becomes smaller, yet notable educational disadvantages remain. For example, stepchildren aged 12-17 are 3.4 percentage points less likely to attend a private school than biological children in comparable households. Moreover, **Table 10** shows that stepchildren aged 16-17 are less likely to attend school and more likely to participate in labor force with greater likelihoods of being the last two categories of "not in school and working" and "neither in school nor working" (columns (14) and (17)).

Tables 11 and 12 report the results for black children. According to **Table 11**, black adopted children have higher rates of attending private primary and secondary school in the first specification, but these positive effects disappear in the second specification that controls for household characteristics. By contrast, the effect on preschool attendance becomes positive and significant in the second specification. In **Table 12**, black adopted children exhibit higher likelihood of being in the first category of "in school and not in labor force" and are less likely to be "not in school and in labor force" or "neither in school nor in labor force" (columns (6), (10), and (13)). These results indicate that black adopted children enjoyed better educational status than biological children in comparable households in 2000. In the third specification, inter-racial adoption is positively associated with preschool attendanc and private secondary school attendance (columns (3) and (9) in **Table 11**). At the same time, inter-racial adoption is associated with much greater labor participation rate at age 16-17 without decreasing school attendance rate (columns (9) and (12) in **Table 12**).

For black stepchildren, the results are not as favorable as adopted children. Although stepchildren show a higher rate of preschool attendance, they are less likely to attend private primary and secondary school even after controlling for household characteristics (columns (2), (6), and (14) in **Table 11**). Black stepchildren are also more likely to participate in labor force at age 16-17 (columns (5) in **Table 12**).

Finally, the results for Asian children are presented in **Tables 13 and 14.** Asian adopted children have substantially higher likelihoods of attending preschool and private primary or secondary school than biological children in the first specification (columns (1), (7), and (12) in **Table 13**), but these advantages are explained away by the differences in their observable household characteristics. Inter-racial adoption has a major impact in increasing preschool attendance, but has no effect on private school attendance (columns (3), (9), and (15) in **Table 13**). Asian adopted children also exhibit a much higher likelihood of labor force participation than biological children of the same race, sex, age, and disability, but once household characteristics are taken into consideration no difference is observed.

For Asian stepchildren, in the first specification, they are less likely to attend private primary school, less likely to attend secondary school, less likely to be in the first best category of "in school and not in labor force," and more likely to be in the second best category of "in school and in labor force" than comparable biological children. When we control for household characteristics, however, these disadvantages are no longer statistically significant, due partly to a small sample size.

7. Concluding Discussion

To compare the results between 1900-1930 and 2000, in **Table 15**, I report the coefficients of adopted children and stepchildren in the regressions that control for observable household characteristics. According to the upper left panel, in 1900-1930, compared to biological children, white adopted children had major educational disadvantages in almost every measure, and black adopted children had substantial disadvantages in literacy and schooling. The lower left panel shows that, by 2000, for both whites and blacks, the earlier disadvantages of being adopted have not only mostly disappeared, but also been reversed in some measures. Most notably, black adopted children have more favorable educational outcomes than their biological counterparts in 2000. White adopted children are still associated

with higher likelihood of labor force participation at age 16-17, but unlike in the earlier period they attend school while working, indicating an important improvement. It must be also noted that a sizable share of white adopted children are adopted stepchildren in 2000, which likely results in a downward bias in measuring the outcomes of adopted children. Asian adopted children in 2000 have effectively the same outcomes as biological children once their household characteristics are controlled for.

With respect to stepchildren, the upper right panel shows that, for both whites and blacks, they had major educational disadvantages in 1900-1930 in almost all measures even after controlling for the unfavorable conditions of their households. In 2000, white and black stepchildren continue to fare worse compared to their biological counterparts in many measures, but there are improvements in the nature and extent of the disadvantages. Moreover, they fare better than biological children in preschool attendance. For black stepchildren, we must also recall that the reference group of black biological children in married two-parent households is highly positively selected (see **Table 1**). For Asian stepchildren, their educational outcomes are not significantly different from biological children in comparable households.

In this paper, I show that, in the early twentieth century, both adopted children and stepchildren in the U.S. experienced substantial educational disadvantages compared to biological children even after controlling for observable child attributes and parental characteristics. My analysis also shows that there was an important heterogeneity among white adopted children where formal or infant adoption was associated with greater parental investment in their education in the early decades. With the transformations of adoption practices from pragmatic to sentimental adoption and the process of stepfamily formation from spousal death to non-fault divorce, the earlier educational disadvantages of non-biological children have been greatly reduced, if not reversed, by the end of the twentieth century. According to my analysis, recent increase in inter-racial adoption of Asian and black children also had a differential impact on the educational status of adopted children.

To derive welfare and policy implications, it is important to understand the reasons for the lower educational outcomes of adopted and step children in the early twentieth century. Parental or social discrimination against non-biological children is a potentially important explanation, but we also expect unobserved child attributes (e.g., health and ability) to be an

important factor for adopted children, while unobserved parental characteristics (e.g., parenting skills and ability) might have been a critical factor for stepchildren. I plan to explore these hypotheses in my future analysis.

References

Ahn, Tom, Peter Arcidiacono, Alvin Murphy, Omari Swinton (2010). "Explaining Cross-racial Differences in Teenage Labor Force Participation: Results from a Two-sided Matching Model," *Journal of Econometrics* 156: 201-211.

Berebitsky, Julie (2000). *Like Our Very Own: Adoption and the Changing Culture of Motherhood, 1851-1950.* Lawrence: University of Kansas Press.

Biblarz, Timothy, and Adrian Raftery (1999). "Family Structure, Educational Attainment, and Socioeconomic Success: Rethinking the Pathology of Matriarchy," *American Journal of Sociology* 105 (2): 321-65.

Bitler, Marianne, and Madeline Zavodny (2002). "Did Abortion Legalization Reduce the Number of Unwanted Children? Evidence from Adoptions," *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health* 34 (1), 25-33.

Brodzinsky, David, Daniel Smith, and Anne Brodzinsky (1998). *Children's Adjustment to Adoption: Developmental and Clinical Issues.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publication.

Case, Ann, I.F. Lin, and Sara McLanahan (2000). "How Hungry is the Selfish Gene?" *Economic Journal* 110: 781-804.

Case, Ann, I.F. Lin, and Sara McLanahan (2001). "Educational Attainment of Siblings in Stepfamilies," *Evolution and Human Behavior* 22: 269-289.

Carp, Wayne, ed. (2002). *Adoption in America: Historical Perspectives*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Feigelman, William (2001). "Comparing Adolescents in Diverging Family Structures: Investigating Whether Adoptees Are More Prone to Problems Than Their Peers," *Adoption Quarterly* 5 (2): 5-37.

Garces, Eliana, Duncan Thomas, and Janet Currie (2002). "Longer-Term Effects of Head Start," *American Economic Review* 92 (4): 999-1012.

Ginther, Donna, and Robert Pollak (2004). "Family Structure and Children's Educational Outcomes: Blended Families, Stylized Facts, and Descriptive Regressions," *Demography* 41 (4): 671-696.

Goldin, Claudia, and Lawrence Katz (2004). "Mass Secondary Schooling and the State," NBER Working Paper No.10075.

Gratton, John, and Jon Moen (2004). "Immigration, Culture, and Child Labor in the United States, 1880-1930," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 34 (3): 355-391.

Gumus, Gulcin, and Jungmin Lee (2012). "Alternative Paths to Parenthood: IVF or Child Adoption?" *Economic Inquiry* 50 (3): 802-820.

Heckman, James, Seong Moon, Rodrigo Pinto, Peter Savelyev, and Adam Yavitz (2010). "The Rate of Return to the HighScope Perry Preschool Program," *Journal of Public Economics* 94: 114-128.

Herman, Ellen (2008). *Kinship by Design: A History of Adoption in the Modern United States*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Holt, Marilyn (1992). *The Orphan Trains: Placing Out in America.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Leahy, Alice (1935). "A Study of Adopted Children as a Method of Investigating Nature-Nurture," *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 30 (189): 281-287.

Marcassa, Stefania (2013). "Divorce Laws and Divorce Rate in the U.S.," *BE Journal of Macroeconomics* 13 (1): 1-39.

McLanahan, Sara, and Gary Sandefur (1994). *Growing Up with a Single Parent: What Hurts, What Helps*. Cambridge, MA; Harvard University Press.

Melosh, Barbara (2002). *Strangers and Kin: The American Way of Adoption*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Moehling, Carolyn (2002). "Broken Homes: The 'Missing' Children of the 1910 Census," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 33 (2): 205-233.

Moehling, Carolyn (2004). "Family Structure, School Attendance, and Child Labor in the American South in 1900 and 1910," *Explorations in Economic History* 41: 73-100.

Moehling, Carolyn (2007). "The American Welfare System and Family Structure: An Historical Perspective," *Journal of Human Resources* 42 (1): 117-155.

Morgan, Philip, Antonio McDaniel, Andrew Miller, and Samuel Preston (1993). "Racial Differences in Household and Family Structure at the Turn of the Century," *American Journal of Sociology* 98 (4): 799-828.

Moriguchi, Chiaki (2009). "From Pragmatic to Sentimental Adoption? Child Adoption in the United States, 1880-1930," unpublished manuscript, Institute of Economic Research, Hitotsubashi University.

Moriguchi, Chiaki (2012). "The Evolution of Child Adoption in the United States, 1950-2010: An Economic Analysis of Historical Trends," *Economic Review* 63 (3): 265-285.

Moriguchi, Chiaki (2014). "Nijyuseiki Amerika no Yoshi to Keishi: Kokusei Chosa ni miru Chokteki Hensen (Adopted Children and Stepchildren in Twentieth-Century America: Long-run Trends in Census Microdata)," *Economic Review* 65 (1): 1-23 (in Japanese).

Parker, Ida (1927). *Fit and Proper? A Study of Legal Adoption in Massachusetts.* Boston: Church Home Society.

Ruggles, Steven, Matthew Sobek, Trent Alexander, Catherine Fitch, Ronald Goeken, Patricia Hall, Miriam King, and Chad Ronnander (2010). *Integrated Public Use Microdata Series: Version 5.0* [Machine-readable database]. Minneapolis, MN: Minnesota Population Center.

Theis, Sophie Van Senden (1924). *How Foster Children Turn Out.* New York; State Charities Aid Association.

U.S. Census Bureau (2003). *Adopted Children and Stepchildren: 2000.* Census 2000 Special Reports CENSR-6RV (Internet Release).

Zelizer, Viviana (1994). *Pricing the Priceless Child: The Changing Social Value of Children*. Princeton, NJ; Princeton University Press.

Table 1: Distribution of Children by Household Head's Marital Status and by Type of Children, 1900-1930 and 2000

Years 1900-1930	Sample Size	Married, Spouse Present	Spouse Absent/ Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Never Married/ Single
White Children						
Biological	1,611,558	92.9%	1.24%	0.34%	5.44%	0.07%
Adopted	4,219	88.7% ***	1.26%	0.61% *	7.25% ***	2.15% ***
Step	20,294	99.1% ***	0.13% ***	0.01% ***	0.71% ***	0.03% ***
Black Children						
Biological	200,754	83.6%	2.95%	0.77%	11.53%	1.13%
Adopted	1,478	80.2% ***	3.41%	0.66%	13.24% *	2.53% ***
Step	6,087	98.6% ***	0.47% ***	0.07% ***	0.71% ***	0.17% ***

Year 2000	Sample Size	Married, Spouse Present	Spouse Absent/ Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Never Married/ Single
White Children						
Biological	2,454,864	79.3%	4.3%	10.4%	1.0%	5.0%
Adopted	58,533	83.5% ***	2.9% ***	7.8% ***	1.9% ***	4.0% ***
Step	140,241	91.4% ***	0.9% ***	3.6% ***	0.2% ***	4.0% ***
Black Children						
Biological	157,502	40.7%	11.4%	13.1%	1.8%	33.0%
Adopted	7,194	54.9% ***	8.1% ***	13.0%	5.8% ***	18.2% ***
Step	15,476	83.3% ***	2.3% ***	4.4% ***	0.5% ***	9.6% ***
Asian Children						
Biological	103,573	87.4%	3.7%	4.5%	1.3%	3.2%
Adopted	5,922	85.4% ***	2.3% ***	5.1% **	1.6%	5.6% ***
Step	2,110	90.1% ***	1.9% ***	2.8% ***	0.6% ***	4.6% ***

Source: IPUMS 1900 2.5% sample, 1910 1.4% sample, 1920 1% sample, 1930 1% sample, and 2000 5% sample.

(1) Alaska, Hawaii, and Oversea military installations are excluded to ensure consistency across all years.

(2) Child is defined as any person under age 18 residing in a household whose relationship to a household head is reported as "child" including adopted child and stepchild.

(3) Significantly different from the value of biological children of the same race at 1% level ***, at 5% level **, at 10% level *; robust standard errors are used.

Table 2: Characteristics of Children and Their Parents in Married Two-Parent Households in 1900

Year 1900	% Child Male	No. of Obs.	Age of Child	No. of Obs.	Age of Father	No. of Obs.	Age of Mother	No. of Obs.	% Child Native Born	No. of Obs.	% Both Parents Native Born	No. of Obs.
White Biological Children	50.9%	534,250	7.6	534,250	40.9	534,250	36.1	534,250	97.4%	534,250	67.5%	534,250
White Adopted Children	47.2% ***	1,424	9.5 ***	1,424	46.7 ***	1,424	42.5 ***	1,424	95.7% ***	1,424	70.9% ***	1,424
White Step Children	51.9% *	6,361	11.2 ***	6,361	41.5 ***	6,361	37.2 ***	6,360	95.8% ***	6,360	71.6% ***	6,360
Black Biological Children	50.2%	62,670	7.3	62,670	40.8	62,670	34.7	62,670	100.0%	62,670	99.7%	62,670
Black Adopted Children	42.2% ***	365	8.9 ***	365	45.8 ***	365	39.0 ***	365	99.7%	365	98.6% *	365
Black Step Children	49.5%	2,118	10.3 ***	2,118	39.6 ***	2,118	34.5	2,118	100.0% ***	2,118	100.0% ***	2,118

Year 1900	% Same Race with Both Parents	No. of Obs.	% Same Surname with Both Parents	No. of Obs.	Duration of Parents' Marriage	No. of Obs.	No. of Children in HH	No. of Obs.	No. of Bio. Children in HH	No. of Obs.	No. of Children Born to Mother	No. of Obs.
White Biological Children	100.0%	534,250	99.9%	534,250	15.3	534,250	3.87	534,250	3.86	534,250	6.50	534,250
White Adopted Children	99.9%	1,424	56.5% ***	1,424	18.5 ***	1,424	1.80 ***	1,424	0.57 ***	1,424	3.20 ***	1,424
White Step Children	99.8% ***	6,361	13.2% ***	6,360	6.3 ***	6,360	3.22 ***	6,361	0.95 ***	6,361	6.03 ***	6,360
Black Biological Children	99.7%	62,670	99.9%	62,670	15.2	62,670	4.47	62,670	4.43	62,670	8.01	62,670
Black Adopted Children	98.4% **	365	42.5% ***	365	16.7 ***	365	2.20 ***	365	0.76 ***	365	3.82 ***	365
Black Step Children	99.7%	2,118	18.0% ***	2,118	5.6 ***	2,118	3.42 ***	2,118	1.00 ***	2,118	6.91 ***	2,118

Year 1900	% Father Working	No. of Obs.	Father's SEI If Working	No. of Obs.	% Mother Working	No. of Obs.	% House Ownership	No. of Obs.	% Have Domestic Employee	No. of Obs.	% Live in Metropolitan Area	No. of Obs.
White Biological Children	98.2%	534,250	22.7	524,632	1.7%	534,250	49.4%	533,592	5.5%	534,250	29.2%	534,250
White Adopted Children	97.0% ***	1,424	23.9 **	1,381	1.9%	1,424	64.5% ***	1,418	9.8% ***	1,424	21.1% ***	1,424
White Step Children	98.0%	6,361	21.5 ***	6,232	3.1% ***	6,361	47.8% **	6,352	3.3% ***	6,361	26.4% ***	6,361
Black Biological Children	98.5%	62,670	13.4	61,760	18.3%	62,670	25.1%	62,661	1.0%	62,670	8.7%	62,670
Black Adopted Children	96.7% **	365	14.6 **	353	21.4%	365	34.1% ***	364	3.3% **	365	14.0% ***	365
Black Step Children	98.9%	2,118	12.6 ***	2,095	22.8% ***	2,118	20.3% ***	2,117	1.3%	2,118	9.4%	2,118

Year 1900	% Live in Farming HH	No. of Obs.	% Father Literate	No. of Obs.	% Mother Literate	No. of Obs.	% Child Age 10-15 Literate	No. of Obs.	% Child Age 10-15 in School	No. of Obs.	% Child Age 10-15 Working	No. of Obs.
White Biological Children	44.1%	534,250	92.0%	534,250	90.4%	534,250	94.3%	154,422	83.5%	154,422	12.5%	154,422
White Adopted Children	48.3% ***	1,424	92.0%	1,424	91.6% *	1,424	93.6%	625	74.9% ***	625	10.7%	625
White Step Children	40.8% ***	6,361	90.0% ***	6,361	89.4% ***	6,361	91.8% ***	3,278	78.6% ***	3,278	16.7% ***	3,278
Black Biological Children	61.5%	62,670	49.4%	62,670	41.5%	62,670	53.6%	17,480	66.2%	17,480	37.2%	17,480
Black Adopted Children	51.0% ***	365	47.4%	365	42.5%	365	52.6%	133	57.9% *	133	24.8% ***	133
Black Step Children	56.1% ***	2,118	44.6% ***	2,118	36.7% ***	2,118	49.8% **	983	59.1% ***	983	40.7% **	983

Source: IPUMS 1900 2.5% Sample.
(1) Child is defined as any person under age 18 residing in a household whose relationship to a household head is reported as "child" including adopted child and stepchild.
(2) Only children in a household with two married parents are included. Children with ambiguously identified mother or father are excluded.
(3) Alaska, Hawaii, and Oversea military installations are excluded to ensure consistency across all years.
(4) Significantly different from the mean of biological children of the same race at 10% level *; at 5% level **; at 1% level ***.

Table 3: Characteristics of Children and Their Parents in Married Two-Parent Households in 1930

Year 1930	% Child Male	No. of Obs.	Age of Child	No. of Obs.	Age of Father	No. of Obs.	Age of Mother	No. of Obs.	% Child Native Born	No. of Obs.	% Both Parents Native Born	No. of Obs.
White Biological Children	50.9%	317,566	8.2	317,566	40.6	317,566	36.1	317,566	98.5%	317,566	73.3%	317,566
White Adopted Children	48.0% *	830	9.2 ***	830	45.2 ***	830	41.6 ***	830	97.0% **	830	84.3% ***	830
White Step Children	52.7% ***	5,110	11.7 ***	5,110	41.4 ***	5,110	36.9 ***	5,110	97.6% ***	5,110	74.7% **	5,110
Black Biological Children	50.0%	29,315	7.9	29,315	40.4	29,315	34.6	29,315	99.9%	29,315	98.6%	29,315
Black Adopted Children	47.7%	285	9.5 ***	285	47.4 ***	285	42.0 ***	285	99.6%	285	99.3%	285
Black Step Children	51.5%	1,094	10.8 ***	1,094	41.7 ***	1,094	34.9	1,094	99.5%	1,094	98.5%	1,094

Year 1930	% Same Race with Both Parents	No. of Obs.	% Same Surname with Both Parents	No. of Obs.	Duration of Parents' Marriage	No. of Obs.	No. of Children in HH	No. of Obs.	No. of Bio. Children in HH	No. of Obs.	No. of Children Born to Mother	No. of Obs.
White Biological Children	100.0%	317,566	99.9%	317,566	N.A.		3.50	317,566	3.48	317,566	N.A.	
White Adopted Children	99.8%	830	75.9% ***	830			1.82 ***	830	0.52 ***	830		
White Step Children	99.9% **	5,110	10.6% ***	5,110			3.14 ***	5,110	1.00 ***	5,110		
Black Biological Children	99.7%	29,315	99.9%	29,315			4.37	29,315	4.34	29,315		
Black Adopted Children	100.0% ***	285	44.9% ***	285			2.04 ***	285	0.62 ***	285		
Black Step Children	99.8%	1,094	7.9% ***	1,094			3.26 ***	1,094	0.77 ***	1,094		

Year 1930	% Father Working	No. of Obs.	Father's SEI If Working	No. of Obs.	% Mother Working	No. of Obs.	% House Ownership	No. of Obs.	% Have Domestic Employee	No. of Obs.	% Live in Metropolitan Area	No. of Obs.
White Biological Children	98.9%	317,566	27.3	314,017	4.6%	317,566	46.5%	317,444	1.8%	317,566	46.3%	317,566
White Adopted Children	96.4% ***	830	31.7 ***	800	8.3% ***	830	59.3% ***	828	3.6% ***	830	40.8% ***	830
White Step Children	98.8%	5,110	24.6 ***	5,047	10.3% ***	5,110	42.9% ***	5,101	1.1% ***	5,110	48.3% ***	5,110
Black Biological Children	99.3%	29,315	13.9	29,108	20.9%	29,315	22.7%	29,313	0.1%	29,315	26.7%	29,315
Black Adopted Children	98.6%	285	14.1	281	26.7% **	285	37.9% ***	285	0.4%	285	26.0%	285
Black Step Children	99.4%	1,094	13.4 *	1,087	30.7% ***	1,094	16.5% ***	1,094	0.4%	1,094	29.3% *	1,094

Year 1930	% Live in Farming HH	No. of Obs.	% Father Literate	No. of Obs.	% Mother Literate	No. of Obs.	% Child Age 10-15 Literate	No. of Obs.	% Child Age 10-15 in School	No. of Obs.	% Child Age 10-15 Working	No. of Obs.
White Biological Children	29.7%	317,566	94.9%	317,566	94.9%	317,566	99.0%	102,432	94.5%	102,432	3.1%	102,432
White Adopted Children	27.6%	830	96.1% *	830	95.9%	830	99.4%	327	91.4% **	327	3.4%	327
White Step Children	24.1% ***	5,110	92.6% ***	5,110	93.6% ***	5,110	98.8% *	2,678	93.4% **	2,678	3.9% **	2,678
Black Biological Children	54.5%	29,315	77.8%	29,315	85.5%	29,315	88.6%	8,803	86.8%	8,803	14.9%	8,803
Black Adopted Children	60.0% *	285	71.6% **	285	74.0% ***	285	88.4%	112	88.4%	112	17.0%	112
Black Step Children	49.3% ***	1,094	73.5% ***	1,094	84.1%	1,094	88.4%	508	84.8%	508	19.1% **	508

Source: IPUMS 1930 1% Sample.
Notes: See the notes in Table 2. "N.A." means data are not available.

Table 4: Characteristics of Children and Their Parents in Married Two-Parent Households in 2000

Year 2000	No. of Obs.	% Child Male	Age of Child	Age of Father	Age of Mother	% Child Native Born	% Both Parents Native Born	% Race Diff. from Both Parents
White Biological Children	1,939,561	51.5%	8.3	39.1	36.7	95.8	79.8%	0.1%
White Adopted Children	48,739	48.4% ***	9.5 ***	42.8 ***	40.5 ***	91.2 ***	87.2% ***	0.2% ***
White Step Children	123,623	50.0% ***	11.5 ***	38.1 ***	35.5 ***	95.9	87.3% ***	0.2% ***
Black Biological Children	157,502	51.0%	8.5	38.9	36.1	95.6	80.8%	1.3%
Black Adopted Children	7,194	50.5%	9.0 ***	45.2 ***	42.6 ***	95.9	88.1% ***	24.2% ***
Black Step Children	14,571	49.4% ***	11.2 ***	37.5 ***	34.6 ***	96.3 ***	89.1% ***	5.1% ***
Asian Biological Children	90,215	51.7%	8.5	41.5	38.1	75.9	5.7%	1.0%
Asian Adopted Children	5,042	37.7% ***	8.7 **	45.3 ***	43.2 ***	22.4 ***	67.0% ***	66.1% ***
Asian Step Children	1,825	49.9%	11.6 ***	40.7 ***	37.4 ***	64.1 ***	20.6% ***	10.5% ***

Year 2000	No. of Children in HH	No. of Bio. Children in HH	% Father Working	Father's SEI If Working	% Mother Working	Mother's SEI If Working	% House Ownership	Total Parental Income
White Biological Children	2.39	2.32	89.6%	44.5	61.0%	47.6	79.3%	73,469
White Adopted Children	2.24 ***	0.73 ***	89.0% ***	47.6 ***	61.2%	49.4 ***	85.5% ***	82,138 ***
White Step Children	2.47 ***	0.77 ***	89.5%	39.1 ***	66.9% ***	43.1 ***	72.4% ***	62,669 ***
Black Biological Children	2.45	2.35	80.6%	36.3	68.8%	43.2	61.3%	55,820
Black Adopted Children	2.46	0.70 ***	77.4% ***	41.4 ***	60.9% ***	46.2 ***	76.7% ***	62,981 ***
Black Step Children	2.63 ***	0.84 ***	81.7% ***	33.6 ***	70.8% ***	40.6 ***	56.5% ***	51,323 ***
Asian Biological Children	2.38	2.35	82.2%	48.9	55.5%	45.2	63.9%	71,985
Asian Adopted Children	2.10 ***	0.56 ***	90.1% ***	56.3 ***	66.4% ***	54.1 ***	86.7% ***	99,729 ***
Asian Step Children	2.47 *	0.87 ***	83.9% *	43.4 ***	66.9% ***	42.6 ***	63.7%	69,142 *

Year 2000	% Poverty	% Live in Metropolitan Area	% Live in Farming HH	% Father with College Degree	% Mother with College Degree	% Child Age 5-17 with Disability	% Child Age 12-17 in Private School	% Child Age 16-17 in Labor Force
White Biological Children	7.5%	73.1%	2.1%	30.8%	28.0%	3.7%	12.2%	39.7%
White Adopted Children	5.6% ***	69.6% ***	2.4% ***	35.6% ***	30.4% ***	10.5% ***	14.1% ***	41.0% *
White Step Children	7.2% ***	61.1% ***	1.5% ***	17.1% ***	11.9% ***	6.4% ***	6.1% ***	47.4% ***
Black Biological Children	11.5%	84.1%	0.4%	18.3%	19.5%	3.9%	6.5%	30.9%
Black Adopted Children	11.0%	82.1% ***	0.7% ***	26.9% ***	25.7% ***	12.1% ***	9.4% ***	27.3% *
Black Step Children	11.0%	78.1% ***	0.6% ***	11.9% ***	10.8% ***	5.1% ***	4.4% ***	34.6% ***
Asian Biological Children	12.4%	96.1%	0.3%	46.5%	40.0%	2.0%	8.9%	22.6%
Asian Adopted Children	4.4% ***	86.3% ***	1.5% ***	57.2% ***	52.2% ***	6.1% ***	14.1% ***	37.6% ***
Asian Step Children	7.9%	89.7% ***	0.2%	30.3% ***	24.5% ***	2.8% ***	7.3% *	29.4% **

Source: IPUMS 2000 5% Sample.
(1) Child is defined as any person under age 18 residing in a household whose relationship to a household head is reported as "natural-born," "adopted," or "stepchild"
In 2000, adopted stepchild is explicitly instructed to be reported as "adopted" child.
(2) Only children in a household with two married parents are included. Children with ambiguously identified mother or father are excluded.
(3) Alaska, Hawaii, and Oversea military installations are excluded to ensure consistency across all years.
(4) Significantly different from the mean of biological children of the same race at 10% level *; at 5% level **; at 1% level ***.

Table 5: OLS Analysis of Educational Outcomes of White Children in 1900-1930: Literacy and School Attendance

Dependent Variable	I[Literate]						I[In School]					
	Boy (Age 10-17)			Girl (Age 10-17)			Primary (Age 6-11)			Secondary (Age 12-17)		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
I[Adopted]	-0.0081	-0.0151***	-0.0496***	-0.0029	-0.0038	0.0056	-0.0384***	-0.0383***	-0.0537**	-0.0239**	-0.0506***	-0.0434*
	[-1.49]	[-2.83]	[-3.08]	[-0.46]	[-0.65]	[0.40]	[-3.98]	[-3.97]	[-2.34]	[-2.17]	[-4.65]	[-1.86]
I[Adopted] x I[Same Surname]			0.0362***			0.0064			0.0277			0.0447**
			[2.78]			[0.50]			[1.28]			[1.98]
I[Step]	-0.0114***	-0.0075***	-0.0075***	-0.0183***	-0.0144***	-0.0144***	-0.0111***	-0.0033	-0.0033	-0.0705***	-0.0699***	-0.0699***
	[-5.35]	[-3.69]	[-3.69]	[-7.52]	[-6.15]	[-6.14]	[-2.84]	[-0.85]	[-0.85]	[-18.13]	[-18.16]	[-18.16]
I[Female]							-0.0035***	-0.0035***	-0.0034***	-0.0239***	-0.0245***	-0.0245***
							[-3.78]	[-3.72]	[-3.71]	[-20.91]	[-21.90]	[-21.88]
Birth Order		-0.0001	-0.0001		-0.0012**	-0.0012**		0.0005	0.0005		0.0190***	0.0190***
		[-0.25]	[-0.24]		[-2.33]	[-2.34]		[0.77]	[0.77]		[20.56]	[20.56]
No. of Siblings		-0.0005***	-0.0005***		-0.0009***	-0.0009***		0.0021***	0.0021***		-0.0116***	-0.0116***
		[-2.76]	[-2.76]		[-4.67]	[-4.69]		[5.55]	[5.54]		[-31.86]	[-31.88]
No. of Siblings Under 5		-0.0155	-0.0155		0.0297**	0.0297**		-0.3519	-0.3520		-0.1933***	-0.1933***
		[-1.51]	[-1.51]		[1.98]	[1.98]		[-1.29]	[-1.29]		[-7.76]	[-7.76]
I[Father Literate]		0.0705***	0.0705***		0.1023***	0.1023***		0.0472***	0.0472***		0.0592***	0.0592***
		[28.92]	[28.92]		[37.89]	[37.89]		[19.65]	[19.65]		[20.92]	[20.91]
I[Mother Literate]		0.1051***	0.1051***		0.1166***	0.1166***		0.0523***	0.0523***		0.0582***	0.0582***
		[45.18]	[45.18]		[46.60]	[46.60]		[22.78]	[22.78]		[21.80]	[21.80]
Father's SEI		0.0003***	0.0003***		0.0008***	0.0008***		0.0041***	0.0041***		0.0174***	0.0174***
		[3.09]	[3.08]		[6.38]	[6.37]		[16.70]	[16.69]		[58.22]	[58.19]
Mother's SEI		0.0038***	0.0038***		0.0047***	0.0047***		0.0051***	0.0051***		0.0097***	0.0097***
		[6.13]	[6.13]		[6.67]	[6.67]		[4.53]	[4.53]		[7.41]	[7.40]
I[Father Working]		0.0006	0.0006		-0.0028	-0.0027		0.0162***	0.0162***		-0.0391***	-0.0390***
		[0.28]	[0.27]		[-1.15]	[-1.13]		[3.63]	[3.64]		[-8.78]	[-8.76]
I[Mother Working]		-0.0198***	-0.0198***		-0.0259***	-0.0259***		-0.0201***	-0.0201***		-0.0365***	-0.0365***
		[-6.85]	[-6.85]		[-7.79]	[-7.79]		[-4.97]	[-4.97]		[-7.65]	[-7.65]
I[House Ownership]		0.0135***	0.0135***		0.0176***	0.0176***		0.0219***	0.0219***		0.0516***	0.0516***
		[23.44]	[23.44]		[26.56]	[26.55]		[22.07]	[22.06]		[42.48]	[42.47]
I[Domestic Servant]		0.0054***	0.0054***		0.0086***	0.0086***		0.0068**	0.0068**		0.0635***	0.0635***
		[4.77]	[4.80]		[6.75]	[6.75]		[2.43]	[2.43]		[20.04]	[20.07]
I[Metropolitan Area]		0.0023***	0.0022***		0.0032***	0.0032***		0.0145***	0.0145***		-0.0382***	-0.0381***
		[4.38]	[4.24]		[5.46]	[5.49]		[11.19]	[11.18]		[-23.12]	[-23.05]
I[Urban Area]		0.0080***	0.0080***		0.0118***	0.0118***		0.0196***	0.0196***		-0.0108***	-0.0108***
		[12.37]	[12.37]		[16.04]	[16.04]		[14.62]	[14.62]		[-6.43]	[-6.43]
I[Live on Farm]		-0.0017*	-0.0018**		-0.0041***	-0.0040***		-0.0085***	-0.0085***		0.0345***	0.0348***
		[-1.92]	[-1.97]		[-4.03]	[-3.95]		[-5.96]	[-5.93]		[20.36]	[20.50]
Mean Probability	0.9756			0.9649			0.8333			0.7777		
No. of Observations	286,848	286,511	286,511	298,421	298,125	298,125	518,823	518,321	518,321	432,289	422,814	422,814
R-squared	0.0816	0.1526	0.1527	0.1028	0.1815	0.1815	0.1861	0.1937	0.1937	0.1993	0.2327	0.2327

Notes: The sample consists of white children residing in married two-parent households in IPUMS 1900 2.5%, 1910 1.4%, 1920 1%, and 1930 1% samples.
In (1), (4), (7), and (10), in addition to the variables shown above, independent variables consist of the age of the child (in quadratic form), state-year fixed effects, and a constant.
In the rest of the specifications, independent variables include the age of the child, the number of adults and nonadults (respectively for related and unrelated) in the household, the age of father and mother (in quadratic form), the race and nativity of father and mother, a female-headed household indicator, state-year fixed effects, and a constant.
Standard errors are clustered at household level and t-values are reported in parentheses. * significant at 10%, ** significant at 5%, *** significant at 1%.

Table 6: OLS Analysis of Educational Outcomes of White Children in 1900-1930: School Attendance and Labor Force Participation

Dependent Variable	I[In School] (Age 10-17)			I[In Labor Force] (Age 10-17)			I[In School & Not in LF]			I[In School & In LF]			I[Not in School & In LF]			I[Not in School & Not in LF]		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)
I[Adopted]	-0.0345***	-0.0518***	-0.0537***	-0.0209	0.0183***	-0.0039	-0.0283***	-0.0504***	-0.0499**	-0.0063	-0.0014	-0.0038	0.0002	0.0198***	-0.0001	0.0344***	0.0320***	0.0538***
	[-3.91]	[-5.93]	[-2.77]	[-1.20]	[2.58]	[-0.26]	[-3.02]	[-5.47]	[-2.45]	[-1.24]	[-0.28]	[-0.38]	[0.03]	[3.35]	[-0.01]	[4.60]	[4.29]	[3.13]
I[Adopted] x I[Same Surname]			0.0466**			0.0312**			0.0273			0.0193*			0.0119			-0.0585***
			[2.53]			[2.11]			[1.41]			[1.83]			[0.98]			[-3.63]
I[Step]	-0.0576***	-0.0563***	-0.0563***	0.0201***	0.0435***	0.0435***	-0.0585***	-0.0601***	-0.0601***	0.0008	0.0037*	0.0037*	0.0406***	0.0398***	0.0398***	0.0170***	0.0166***	0.0166***
	[-17.96]	[-17.70]	[-17.69]	[2.70]	[14.25]	[14.25]	[-17.09]	[-17.76]	[-17.76]	[0.39]	[1.77]	[1.77]	[15.28]	[15.06]	[15.05]	[6.71]	[6.53]	[6.52]
I[Female]	-0.0181***	-0.0186***	-0.0185***	0.1609***	0.1383***	0.1383***	-0.0910***	-0.0905***	-0.0905***	0.0729***	0.0719***	0.0720***	0.0660***	0.0664***	0.0664***	-0.0479***	-0.0478***	-0.0479***
	[-20.45]	[-21.23]	[-21.20]	[47.43]	[168.39]	[168.38]	[-93.54]	[-94.80]	[-94.78]	[122.59]	[122.78]	[122.80]	[96.88]	[98.90]	[98.88]	[-67.68]	[-67.81]	[-67.83]
Birth Order		0.0155***	0.0155***		-0.0133***	-0.0133***		0.0198***	0.0198***		-0.0043***	-0.0043***		-0.0091***	-0.0091***		-0.0064***	-0.0064***
		[24.90]	[24.90]		[-22.96]	[-22.95]		[28.17]	[28.17]		[-9.63]	[-9.63]		[-20.76]	[-20.74]		[-12.51]	[-12.52]
No. of Siblings		-0.0088***	-0.0088***		0.0124***	0.0124***		-0.0129***	-0.0129***		0.0041***	0.0041***		0.0083***	0.0083***		0.0005*	0.0005*
		[-28.86]	[-28.88]		[43.14]	[43.14]		[-39.65]	[-39.66]		[20.22]	[20.21]		[34.06]	[34.08]		[1.84]	[1.85]
No. of Siblings Under 5		-0.1963***	-0.1963***		-0.1038***	-0.1038***		-0.1688***	-0.1688***		-0.0275***	-0.0275***		-0.0762***	-0.0762***		0.2725***	0.2725***
		[-7.92]	[-7.92]		[-5.84]	[-5.84]		[-6.86]	[-6.86]		[-3.16]	[-3.16]		[-4.72]	[-4.72]		[10.26]	[10.26]
I[Father Literate]		0.0543***	0.0543***		-0.0361***	-0.0361***		0.0642***	0.0642***		-0.0099***	-0.0100***		-0.0262***	-0.0262***		-0.0281***	-0.0281***
		[23.86]	[23.85]		[-16.67]	[-16.67]		[26.78]	[26.78]		[-6.00]	[-6.01]		[-14.43]	[-14.43]		[-15.15]	[-15.14]
I[Mother Literate]		0.0546***	0.0546***		-0.0388***	-0.0388***		0.0632***	0.0632***		-0.0086***	-0.0086***		-0.0303***	-0.0303***		-0.0244***	-0.0244***
		[25.38]	[25.38]		[-19.05]	[-19.05]		[28.08]	[28.08]		[-5.65]	[-5.65]		[-17.36]	[-17.36]		[-14.05]	[-14.05]
Father's SEI		0.0130***	0.0130***		-0.0121***	-0.0121***		0.0156***	0.0156***		-0.0026***	-0.0026***		-0.0095***	-0.0095***		-0.0035***	-0.0035***
		[56.14]	[56.11]		[-58.68]	[-58.68]		[63.01]	[62.99]		[-20.45]	[-20.48]		[-53.26]	[-53.24]		[-19.01]	[-18.98]
Mother's SEI		0.0080***	0.0080***		-0.0247***	-0.0247***		0.0241***	0.0241***		-0.0162***	-0.0162***		-0.0085***	-0.0085***		0.0005	0.0005
		[7.66]	[7.66]		[-23.46]	[-23.47]		[20.59]	[20.59]		[-19.92]	[-19.92]		[-10.18]	[-10.18]		[0.69]	[0.70]
I[Father Working]		-0.0206***	-0.0205***		0.0477***	0.0477***		-0.0395***	-0.0395***		0.0190***	0.0190***		0.0288***	0.0287***		-0.0082***	-0.0082***
		[-5.54]	[-5.52]		[14.87]	[14.87]		[-10.26]	[-10.24]		[10.00]	[10.02]		[9.99]	[9.98]		[-2.65]	[-2.66]
I[Mother Working]		-0.0313***	-0.0313***		0.1540***	0.1540***		-0.1409***	-0.1409***		0.1096***	0.1096***		0.0444***	0.0444***		-0.0131***	-0.0131***
		[-8.27]	[-8.27]		[37.57]	[37.57]		[-32.86]	[-32.86]		[31.97]	[31.98]		[13.71]	[13.71]		[-4.85]	[-4.85]
I[House Ownership]		0.0423***	0.0423***		-0.0269***	-0.0269***		0.0432***	0.0432***		-0.0009	-0.0009		-0.0259***	-0.0259***		-0.0164***	-0.0163***
		[44.79]	[44.78]		[-30.16]	[-30.16]		[42.13]	[42.12]		[-1.46]	[-1.47]		[-35.29]	[-35.29]		[-21.69]	[-21.68]
I[Domestic Servant]		0.0456***	0.0456***		-0.0514***	-0.0514***		0.0608***	0.0608***		-0.0152***	-0.0152***		-0.0362***	-0.0362***		-0.0094***	-0.0094***
		[18.67]	[18.68]		[-24.87]	[-24.87]		[22.36]	[22.37]		[-10.31]	[-10.31]		[-22.96]	[-22.96]		[-4.68]	[-4.69]
I[Metropolitan Area]		-0.0260***	-0.0259***		0.0316***	0.0316***		-0.0291***	-0.0291***		0.0032***	0.0032***		0.0284***	0.0284***		-0.0025**	-0.0025**
		[-20.44]	[-20.38]		[27.59]	[27.58]		[-21.80]	[-21.74]		[4.77]	[4.77]		[27.85]	[27.83]		[-2.40]	[-2.46]
I[Urban Area]		-0.0062***	-0.0061***		0.0267***	0.0267***		-0.0117***	-0.0116***		0.0055***	0.0055***		0.0212***	0.0212***		-0.0150***	-0.0150***
		[-4.75]	[-4.74]		[23.50]	[23.49]		[-8.57]	[-8.57]		[8.39]	[8.39]		[20.92]	[20.91]		[-14.24]	[-14.25]
I[Live on Farm]		0.0235***	0.0238***		0.0407***	0.0407***		-0.0384***	-0.0383***		0.0619***	0.0620***		-0.0212***	-0.0213***		-0.0023**	-0.0024**
		[17.82]	[17.97]		[34.69]	[34.62]		[-27.05]	[-26.93]		[74.63]	[74.62]		[-21.95]	[-22.04]		[-2.09]	[-2.19]
Mean Probability	0.8234			0.1572			0.7592			0.0642			0.0930			0.0836		
No. of Observations	585,269	584,636	584,636	585,269	584,636	584,636	585,269	584,636	584,636	585,269	584,636	584,636	585,269	584,636	584,636	585,269	584,636	584,636
R-squared	0.2172	0.2418	0.2418	0.2403	0.2689	0.2689	0.1093	0.1281	0.1282	0.1825	0.2053	0.2053	0.0558	0.0624	0.0625	0.0271	0.0453	0.0453

Notes: The sample consists of white children residing in married two-parent households in IPUMS 1900 2.5%, 1910 1.4%, 1920 1%, and 1930 1% samples.
In (1), (4), (7), (10), (13) and (16), in addition to the variables shown above, independent variables consist of the age of the child (in quadratic form), state-year fixed effects, and a constant.
In the rest of the specifications, independent variables include the age of the child, the number of adults and nonadults (respectively for related and unrelated) in the household,
the age of father and mother (in quadratic form), the race and nativity of father and mother, a female-headed household indicator, state-year fixed effects, and a constant.
Standard errors are clustered at household level and t-values are reported in parentheses. * significant at 10%, ** significant at 5%, *** significant at 1%.

Table 7: OLS Analysis of Educational Outcomes of Black Children in 1900-1930: Literacy and School Attendance

Dependent Variable	I[Literate]						I[In School]					
	Boy (Age 10-17)			Girl (Age 10-17)			Primary (Age 6-11)			Secondary (Age 12-17)		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
I[Adopted]	-0.0031	-0.0575***	-0.0993**	-0.0514*	-0.0790***	-0.0519	-0.0105	-0.0265	0.0068	-0.0059	-0.0232	-0.0491
	[-0.14]	[-2.66]	[-2.31]	[-1.89]	[-3.14]	[-0.94]	[-0.51]	[-1.30]	[0.16]	[-0.27]	[-1.08]	[-1.19]
I[Adopted] x I[Same Surname]			0.0530			0.0058			-0.0139			0.0142
			[1.25]			[0.12]			[-0.35]			[0.33]
I[Step]	-0.0112	-0.0136	-0.0136	-0.0513***	-0.0533***	-0.0531***	-0.0042	-0.0010	-0.0010	-0.0631***	-0.0593***	-0.0593***
	[-1.17]	[-1.46]	[-1.45]	[-4.93]	[-5.36]	[-5.35]	[-0.45]	[-0.11]	[-0.10]	[-7.03]	[-6.53]	[-6.53]
I[Female]							-0.0146***	-0.0132***	-0.0132***	-0.0749***	-0.0751***	-0.0751***
							[-4.07]	[-3.73]	[-3.73]	[-17.96]	[-18.18]	[-18.19]
Birth Order		-0.0061*	-0.0062*		0.0017	0.0016		0.0015	0.0015		0.0013	0.0013
		[-1.94]	[-1.94]		[0.51]	[0.49]		[0.74]	[0.73]		[0.39]	[0.39]
No. of Siblings		-0.0086***	-0.0086***		-0.0100***	-0.0100***		-0.0038***	-0.0038***		-0.0016	-0.0016
		[-7.62]	[-7.62]		[-8.29]	[-8.28]		[-2.97]	[-2.97]		[-1.52]	[-1.51]
No. of Siblings Under 5		-0.0461	-0.0460		-0.1258	-0.1259		0.0122	0.0121		-0.1400***	-0.1399***
		[-1.60]	[-1.59]		[-1.06]	[-1.06]		[0.29]	[0.29]		[-4.16]	[-4.16]
I[Father Literate]		0.0955***	0.0956***		0.1274***	0.1275***		0.0431***	0.0431***		0.0501***	0.0502***
		[17.82]	[17.83]		[22.00]	[22.01]		[9.96]	[9.96]		[10.03]	[10.03]
I[Mother Literate]		0.1663***	0.1664***		0.1895***	0.1894***		0.0722***	0.0722***		0.0572***	0.0572***
		[29.12]	[29.14]		[30.52]	[30.51]		[15.56]	[15.56]		[10.70]	[10.70]
Father's SEI		0.0069***	0.0069***		0.0054***	0.0054***		0.0102***	0.0102***		0.0126***	0.0126***
		[4.38]	[4.37]		[2.83]	[2.83]		[5.76]	[5.75]		[6.02]	[6.02]
Mother's SEI		0.0084**	0.0084**		0.0094**	0.0094**		0.0242***	0.0243***		0.0287***	0.0287***
		[2.29]	[2.29]		[2.30]	[2.31]		[6.66]	[6.67]		[7.04]	[7.04]
I[Father Working]		0.0092	0.0094		-0.0180	-0.0180		0.0433**	0.0433**		0.0006	0.0006
		[0.47]	[0.48]		[-0.84]	[-0.83]		[2.32]	[2.31]		[0.03]	[0.03]
I[Mother Working]		-0.0287***	-0.0286***		-0.0334***	-0.0334***		-0.0279***	-0.0279***		-0.0581***	-0.0582***
		[-3.95]	[-3.94]		[-4.36]	[-4.37]		[-4.44]	[-4.45]		[-7.99]	[-8.00]
I[House Ownership]		0.0769***	0.0769***		0.0800***	0.0800***		0.0513***	0.0513***		0.0709***	0.0709***
		[16.64]	[16.63]		[15.64]	[15.63]		[12.21]	[12.20]		[15.25]	[15.25]
I[Domestic Servant]		0.0372	0.0377		0.0556*	0.0559*		-0.0576**	-0.0575**		-0.0412	-0.0412
		[1.17]	[1.18]		[1.68]	[1.69]		[-2.29]	[-2.28]		[-1.30]	[-1.30]
I[Metropolitan Area]		0.0300***	0.0286***		0.0284***	0.0280***		0.0356***	0.0360***		0.0242***	0.0240***
		[4.76]	[4.52]		[4.01]	[3.94]		[5.63]	[5.67]		[3.16]	[3.11]
I[Urban Area]		0.0745***	0.0744***		0.1176***	0.1176***		0.0687***	0.0686***		0.0334***	0.0334***
		[11.47]	[11.46]		[16.37]	[16.38]		[11.18]	[11.16]		[4.55]	[4.56]
I[Live on Farm]		-0.0260***	-0.0260***		-0.0347***	-0.0343***		-0.0085*	-0.0082*		0.0271***	0.0269***
		[-4.27]	[-4.25]		[-5.35]	[-5.28]		[-1.72]	[-1.65]		[4.60]	[4.55]
Mean Probability	0.7487			0.6699			0.6280			0.6586		
No. of Observations	31,712	31,703	31,703	31,897	31,891	31,891	60,080	60,065	60,065	45,667	45,656	45,656
R-squared	0.1827	0.2644	0.2645	0.1817	0.2826	0.2826	0.1889	0.2088	0.2088	0.1332	0.1526	0.1526

Notes: The sample consists of black children residing in married two-parent households in IPUMS 1900 2.5%, 1910 1.4%, 1920 1%, and 1930 1% samples.
In (1), (4), (7), and (10), in addition to the variables shown above, independent variables consist of the age of the child (in quadratic form), state-year fixed effects, and a constant.
In the rest of the specifications, independent variables include the age of the child, the number of adults and nonadults (respectively for related and unrelated) in the household, the age of father and mother (in quadratic form), the race and nativity of father and mother, a female-headed household indicator, state-year fixed effects, and a constant.
Standard errors are clustered at household level and t-values are reported in parentheses. * significant at 10%, ** significant at 5%, *** significant at 1%.

Table 8: OLS Analysis of Educational Outcomes of Black Children in 1900-1930: School Attendance and Labor Force Participation

Dependent Variable	I[In School] (Age 10-17)			I[In Labor Force] (Age 10-17)			I[In School & Not in LF]			I[In School & In LF]			I[Not in School & In LF]			I[Not in School & Not in LF]		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)
I[Adopted]	-0.0120	-0.0257	-0.0524	-0.0061	0.0097	-0.0178	-0.0003	-0.0345*	-0.0147	-0.0117	0.0089	-0.0376*	-0.0092	0.0008	0.0199	0.0212	0.0249*	0.0325
	[-0.67]	[-1.41]	[-1.48]	[-0.85]	[0.60]	[-0.59]	[-0.01]	[-1.90]	[-0.40]	[-0.78]	[0.62]	[-1.77]	[-0.65]	[0.06]	[0.75]	[1.43]	[1.67]	[1.09]
I[Adopted] x I[Same Surname]			0.0233			-0.0316			0.0202			0.0031			-0.0347			0.0115
			[0.65]			[-1.00]			[0.56]			[0.11]			[-1.26]			[0.39]
I[Step]	-0.0536***	-0.0503***	-0.0503***	0.0414***	0.0350***	0.0350***	-0.0311***	-0.0458***	-0.0457***	-0.0225***	-0.0045	-0.0046	0.0426***	0.0396***	0.0395***	0.0111*	0.0107*	0.0107*
	[-7.02]	[-6.52]	[-6.52]	[13.45]	[4.86]	[4.86]	[-4.11]	[-6.16]	[-6.15]	[-3.56]	[-0.73]	[-0.73]	[6.44]	[5.94]	[5.93]	[1.92]	[1.84]	[1.85]
I[Female]	-0.0586***	-0.0586***	-0.0586***	0.1389***	0.1589***	0.1589***	-0.1190***	-0.1171***	-0.1171***	0.0604***	0.0585***	0.0585***	0.1004***	0.1004***	0.1004***	-0.0418***	-0.0418***	-0.0418***
	[-17.10]	[-17.27]	[-17.27]	[166.18]	[49.37]	[49.35]	[-33.41]	[-34.12]	[-34.11]	[20.51]	[20.50]	[20.49]	[35.53]	[35.97]	[35.95]	[-16.07]	[-16.18]	[-16.18]
Birth Order		-0.0013	-0.0013		-0.0036	-0.0035		0.0004	0.0004		-0.0017	-0.0017		-0.0018	-0.0018		0.0032*	0.0032*
		[-0.56]	[-0.56]		[-1.57]	[-1.56]		[0.15]	[0.15]		[-0.84]	[-0.84]		[-1.02]	[-1.01]		[1.67]	[1.67]
No. of Siblings		-0.0014	-0.0014		0.0083***	0.0083***		-0.0072***	-0.0072***		0.0058***	0.0058***		0.0025***	0.0025***		-0.0011	-0.0011
		[-1.50]	[-1.49]		[9.34]	[9.34]		[-7.76]	[-7.76]		[7.33]	[7.34]		[3.15]	[3.14]		[-1.55]	[-1.55]
No. of Siblings Under 5		-0.1347***	-0.1347***		-0.0451	-0.0451		-0.0823***	-0.0824***		-0.0523***	-0.0523***		0.0072	0.0072		0.1275***	0.1275***
		[-4.12]	[-4.12]		[-1.30]	[-1.30]		[-2.59]	[-2.59]		[-2.64]	[-2.64]		[0.22]	[0.22]		[3.59]	[3.59]
I[Father Literate]		0.0518***	0.0519***		-0.0104***	-0.0104***		0.0351***	0.0351***		0.0167***	0.0167***		-0.0271***	-0.0271***		-0.0247***	-0.0247***
		[12.52]	[12.52]		[-2.68]	[-2.68]		[8.50]	[8.50]		[4.76]	[4.77]		[-7.99]	[-8.00]		[-7.87]	[-7.86]
I[Mother Literate]		0.0592***	0.0592***		-0.0346***	-0.0346***		0.0647***	0.0647***		-0.0056	-0.0055		-0.0291***	-0.0291***		-0.0301***	-0.0301***
		[13.37]	[13.37]		[-8.40]	[-8.39]		[14.60]	[14.60]		[-1.51]	[-1.50]		[-8.07]	[-8.07]		[-8.97]	[-8.97]
Father's SEI		0.0095***	0.0095***		-0.0094***	-0.0093***		0.0141***	0.0141***		-0.0046***	-0.0046***		-0.0047***	-0.0047***		-0.0048***	-0.0048***
		[5.65]	[5.64]		[-6.25]	[-6.24]		[7.85]	[7.84]		[-4.48]	[-4.47]		[-3.81]	[-3.80]		[-3.47]	[-3.48]
Mother's SEI		0.0258***	0.0258***		-0.0163***	-0.0163***		0.0150***	0.0150***		0.0108***	0.0108***		-0.0270***	-0.0271***		0.0012	0.0012
		[7.78]	[7.79]		[-4.60]	[-4.61]		[4.06]	[4.06]		[3.12]	[3.13]		[-9.15]	[-9.16]		[0.61]	[0.61]
I[Father Working]		0.0185	0.0186		0.0906***	0.0905***		-0.0171	-0.0171		0.0356***	0.0356***		0.0549***	0.0549***		-0.0735***	-0.0734***
		[1.11]	[1.12]		[6.06]	[6.06]		[-0.97]	[-0.97]		[3.29]	[3.29]		[4.56]	[4.56]		[-4.78]	[-4.78]
I[Mother Working]		-0.0504***	-0.0505***		0.2560***	0.2560***		-0.1801***	-0.1801***		0.1297***	0.1297***		0.1263***	0.1263***		-0.0759***	-0.0759***
		[-8.43]	[-8.44]		[43.69]	[43.69]		[-29.97]	[-29.97]		[22.85]	[22.85]		[23.40]	[23.40]		[-20.01]	[-20.01]
I[House Ownership]		0.0635***	0.0635***		-0.0438***	-0.0438***		0.0634***	0.0633***		0.0001	0.0002		-0.0439***	-0.0439***		-0.0196***	-0.0196***
		[16.53]	[16.53]		[-11.87]	[-11.87]		[15.91]	[15.90]		[0.04]	[0.05]		[-14.21]	[-14.20]		[-6.66]	[-6.66]
I[Domestic Servant]		-0.0487*	-0.0485*		0.0046	0.0044		-0.0304	-0.0302		-0.0184	-0.0183		0.0230	0.0227		0.0258	0.0259
		[-1.88]	[-1.87]		[0.18]	[0.17]		[-1.16]	[-1.16]		[-0.84]	[-0.84]		[1.03]	[1.02]		[1.30]	[1.30]
I[Metropolitan Area]		0.0247***	0.0242***		-0.0030	-0.0036		0.0272***	0.0276***		-0.0025	-0.0034		-0.0005	-0.0002		-0.0242***	-0.0240***
		[4.01]	[3.91]		[-0.54]	[-0.64]		[4.22]	[4.27]		[-0.66]	[-0.90]		[-0.11]	[-0.04]		[-4.86]	[-4.81]
I[Urban Area]		0.0432***	0.0432***		-0.0766***	-0.0765***		0.1024***	0.1023***		-0.0593***	-0.0591***		-0.0174***	-0.0174***		-0.0258***	-0.0258***
		[7.29]	[7.29]		[-14.42]	[-14.39]		[16.68]	[16.66]		[-16.70]	[-16.66]		[-3.72]	[-3.72]		[-5.28]	[-5.29]
I[Live on Farm]		0.0195***	0.0193***		0.1613***	0.1607***		-0.1222***	-0.1219***		0.1417***	0.1412***		0.0196***	0.0195***		-0.0390***	-0.0389***
		[4.00]	[3.96]		[36.40]	[36.17]		[-24.88]	[-24.74]		[40.39]	[40.10]		[5.05]	[5.02]		[-9.80]	[-9.73]
Mean Probability	0.6940			0.3708			0.5044			0.1896			0.1812			0.1248		
No. of Observations	63,609	63,594	63,594	63,609	63,594	63,594	63,609	63,594	63,594	63,609	63,594	63,594	63,609	63,594	63,594	63,609	63,594	63,594
R-squared	0.1322	0.1516	0.1516	0.2247	0.3049	0.3049	0.2071	0.2679	0.2679	0.1001	0.1575	0.1576	0.1525	0.1742	0.1742	0.0271	0.0453	0.0453

Notes: The sample consists of black children residing in married two-parent households in IPUMS 1900 2.5%, 1910 1.4%, 1920 1%, and 1930 1% samples.
In (1), (4), (7), (10), (13) and (16), in addition to the variables shown above, independent variables consist of the age of the child (in quadratic form), state-year fixed effects, and a constant.
In the rest of the specifications, independent variables include the age of the child, the number of adults and nonadults (respectively for related and unrelated) in the household,
the age of father and mother (in quadratic form), the race and nativity of father and mother, a female-headed household indicator, state-year fixed effects, and a constant.
Standard errors are clustered at household level and t-values are reported in parentheses. * significant at 10%, ** significant at 5%, *** significant at 1%.

Table 9: OLS Analysis of Educational Outcomes of WHITE Children in 2000: School Attendance

Dependent Variable	I[In Preschool] Age 3-5			I[In Primary School] Age 6-11			I[In Private Primary School] Age 6-11			I[In Secondary School] Age 12-17			I[In Private Secondary School] Age 12-17		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)
I[Adopted]	0.0497***	0.0216***	0.0214***	-0.0010	0.0007	0.0008	0.0262***	0.0058*	0.0059*	-0.0002	-0.0004	-0.0004	0.0217***	0.0089***	0.0088***
	[7.84]	[3.46]	[3.42]	[-0.96]	[0.71]	[0.75]	[7.49]	[1.69]	[1.71]	[-0.22]	[-0.33]	[-0.32]	[6.77]	[2.82]	[2.77]
I[Adopted]xI[Race Different]			0.1033			-0.0285			-0.0602			-0.0047			0.0842
			[1.18]			[-0.65]			[-0.71]			[-0.14]			[0.79]
I[Step]	-0.0377***	0.0286***	0.0286***	0.0031***	0.0041***	0.0041***	-0.0770***	-0.0418***	-0.0418***	-0.0022***	-0.0019***	-0.0019***	-0.0578***	-0.0335***	-0.0335***
	[-6.58]	[4.97]	[4.97]	[5.97]	[7.57]	[7.57]	[-48.33]	[-25.40]	[-25.40]	[-3.26]	[-2.65]	[-2.65]	[-43.94]	[-24.13]	[-24.12]
I[Disability]	0.0372***	0.0670***	0.0670***	-0.0051***	-0.0045***	-0.0045***	-0.0547***	-0.0405***	-0.0405***	-0.0123***	-0.0091***	-0.0091***	-0.0313***	-0.0207***	-0.0207***
	[5.37]	[9.24]	[9.24]	[-6.10]	[-5.32]	[-5.32]	[-27.15]	[-20.12]	[-20.12]	[-11.13]	[-8.29]	[-8.28]	[-16.18]	[-10.73]	[-10.75]
I[Female]	-0.0054***	-0.0060***	-0.0060***	-0.0006**	-0.0005*	-0.0005*	-0.0051***	-0.0056***	-0.0056***	-0.0021***	-0.0024***	-0.0024***	-0.0025***	-0.0022**	-0.0022**
	[-3.15]	[-3.58]	[-3.58]	[-2.15]	[-1.66]	[-1.66]	[-5.42]	[-6.11]	[-6.11]	[-5.81]	[-6.69]	[-6.69]	[-2.83]	[-2.51]	[-2.51]
Birth Order		-0.0169***	-0.0169***		0.0028***	0.0028***		-0.0261***	-0.0261***		0.0025***	0.0025***		-0.0180***	-0.0180***
		[-10.55]	[-10.55]		[10.45]	[10.45]		[-32.38]	[-32.38]		[7.08]	[7.08]		[-18.18]	[-18.18]
No. of Siblings		-0.0142***	-0.0143***		-0.0021***	-0.0021***		0.0313***	0.0313***		-0.0026***	-0.0026***		0.0237***	0.0237***
		[-9.48]	[-9.48]		[-7.76]	[-7.75]		[38.24]	[38.25]		[-8.67]	[-8.67]		[35.81]	[35.82]
No. of Siblings Under 5					-0.0189	-0.0189		-0.0560***	-0.0560***		-0.0681***	-0.0681***		0.0075	0.0076
					[-0.65]	[-0.65]		[-3.84]	[-3.84]		[-9.80]	[-9.80]		[1.35]	[1.35]
I[Father College]		0.0376***	0.0376***		-0.0003	-0.0003		0.0386***	0.0386***		0.0026***	0.0026***		0.0329***	0.0329***
		[14.84]	[14.84]		[-0.62]	[-0.63]		[20.69]	[20.69]		[5.59]	[5.59]		[19.92]	[19.92]
I[Mother College]		0.0471***	0.0471***		-0.0006	-0.0006		0.0460***	0.0460***		0.0008*	0.0008*		0.0360***	0.0360***
		[19.64]	[19.64]		[-1.45]	[-1.45]		[25.15]	[25.15]		[1.73]	[1.73]		[21.31]	[21.30]
Father's SEI		0.0062***	0.0062***		-0.0001	-0.0001		0.0059***	0.0059***		0.0003***	0.0003***		0.0053***	0.0053***
		[13.66]	[13.65]		[-0.88]	[-0.88]		[20.03]	[20.03]		[3.39]	[3.39]		[19.88]	[19.89]
Mother's SEI		0.0064***	0.0064***		0.0002***	0.0002***		-0.0012***	-0.0012***		0.0006***	0.0006***		-0.0019***	-0.0019***
		[16.34]	[16.34]		[3.28]	[3.28]		[-4.44]	[-4.44]		[6.82]	[6.82]		[-7.22]	[-7.23]
I[Father Working]		-0.0178***	-0.0178***		0.0009	0.0009		0.0093***	0.0093***		-0.0015*	-0.0015*		0.0075***	0.0075***
		[-5.66]	[-5.66]		[1.53]	[1.53]		[5.66]	[5.66]		[-1.95]	[-1.95]		[4.84]	[4.84]
I[Mother Working]		0.0299***	0.0299***		0.0043***	0.0043***		-0.0255***	-0.0255***		0.0045***	0.0045***		-0.0357***	-0.0357***
		[14.74]	[14.74]		[11.02]	[11.03]		[-19.02]	[-19.02]		[8.30]	[8.30]		[-26.68]	[-26.68]
Parental Income		0.0441***	0.0441***		0.0018***	0.0018***		0.0243***	0.0243***		0.0030***	0.0030***		0.0246***	0.0246***
		[30.02]	[30.02]		[6.79]	[6.79]		[23.77]	[23.77]		[8.29]	[8.29]		[25.98]	[25.97]
I[House Ownership]		0.0195***	0.0195***		0.0017***	0.0017***		0.0097***	0.0097***		0.0081***	0.0081***		0.0004	0.0004
		[8.27]	[8.27]		[3.60]	[3.61]		[7.10]	[7.10]		[11.29]	[11.29]		[0.31]	[0.30]
Mean Probability	0.6018			0.9885			0.1353			0.9817			0.1099		
No. of Observations	344,711	339,315	339,315	732,280	720,520	720,520	732,280	720,520	720,520	701,436	689,843	689,843	701,436	689,843	689,843
R-squared	0.1820	0.2333	0.2333	0.0018	0.0039	0.0040	0.0198	0.0713	0.0713	0.0124	0.2570	0.2570	0.0184	0.0641	0.0641

The sample consists of white children aged 16-17 residing in married two-parent households in IPUMS 2000 5% sample.

In (1), (4), (7), (10), and (13), in addition to the variables shown above, independent variables consist of the age of the child (in quadratic form), state fixed effects, and a constant. In the rest of the specifications, independent variables include the age of the child (in quadratic form), the number of foster children, the number of adults and nonadults (respectively for related and unrelated) in the household, the age of mother and mother (in quadratic form), the race, nativity, and high school completion of father and mother, a metropolitan residence indicator, a female-headed household indicator, state fixed effects, and a constant. Standard errors are clustered at household level and t-values are reported in parentheses. * significant at 10%, ** significant at 5%, *** significant at 1%.

Table 10: OLS Analysis of Educational Outcomes of WHITE Children in 2000: School Attendance and Labor Force Participation

Dependent Variable	I[In School] (Age 16-17)			I[In Labor Force] (Age 16-17)			I[In School & Not in LF]			I[In School & In LF]			I[Not in School & In LF]			I[Not in School & Not in LF]		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)
I[Adopted]	0.0011	0.0013	0.0014	0.0155**	0.0251***	0.0251***	-0.0150**	-0.0246***	-0.0245***	0.0160**	0.0257***	0.0257***	-0.0006	-0.0007	-0.0006	-0.0005	-0.0005	-0.0006
	[0.37]	[0.47]	[0.51]	[2.08]	[3.35]	[3.35]	[-2.00]	[-3.28]	[-3.26]	[2.16]	[3.45]	[3.44]	[-0.27]	[-0.32]	[-0.30]	[-0.25]	[-0.23]	[-0.32]
I[Adopted]xI[Race Different]			-0.0395			-0.0082			-0.0489			0.0090			-0.0173			0.0571
			[-0.44]			[-0.06]			[-0.34]			[0.06]			[-1.33]			[0.65]
I[Step]	-0.0114***	-0.0090***	-0.0090***	0.0764***	0.0519***	0.0519***	-0.0791***	-0.0537***	-0.0537***	0.0676***	0.0447***	0.0447***	0.0088***	0.0071***	0.0071***	0.0027**	0.0019*	0.0019*
	[-6.55]	[-5.07]	[-5.07]	[19.00]	[12.36]	[12.36]	[-19.68]	[-12.79]	[-12.79]	[16.82]	[10.66]	[10.66]	[6.33]	[5.01]	[5.01]	[2.43]	[1.67]	[1.68]
I[Disability]	-0.0255***	-0.0179***	-0.0179***	-0.0596***	-0.0604***	-0.0604***	0.0417***	0.0466***	0.0466***	-0.0672***	-0.0645***	-0.0646***	0.0076***	0.0041**	0.0041**	0.0179***	0.0139***	0.0138***
	[-8.91]	[-6.37]	[-6.36]	[-10.31]	[-10.36]	[-10.35]	[7.12]	[7.88]	[7.88]	[-11.79]	[-11.22]	[-11.22]	[3.77]	[2.04]	[2.04]	[8.50]	[6.76]	[6.74]
I[Female]	-0.0071***	-0.0072***	-0.0072***	-0.0071***	-0.0072***	-0.0072***	0.0071***	0.0068***	0.0068***	-0.0141***	-0.0140***	-0.0140***	0.0070***	0.0068***	0.0068***	0.0001	0.0004	0.0004
	[-7.88]	[-8.32]	[-8.33]	[-3.05]	[-3.09]	[-3.09]	[3.01]	[2.91]	[2.91]	[-6.08]	[-6.04]	[-6.04]	[10.35]	[10.21]	[10.20]	[0.09]	[0.69]	[0.69]
Birth Order		0.0033	0.0033		-0.0125**	-0.0125**		0.0141**	0.0141**		-0.0107*	-0.0108*		-0.0018	-0.0018		-0.0015	-0.0016
		[1.61]	[1.62]		[-2.02]	[-2.02]		[2.25]	[2.25]		[-1.75]	[-1.75]		[-1.15]	[-1.14]		[-1.06]	[-1.07]
No. of Siblings		-0.0043***	-0.0043***		0.0011	0.0011		-0.0027**	-0.0027**		-0.0016	-0.0016		0.0028***	0.0028***		0.0015***	0.0015***
		[-6.75]	[-6.75]		[0.93]	[0.93]		[-2.17]	[-2.17]		[-1.35]	[-1.35]		[5.72]	[5.72]		[3.72]	[3.72]
No. of Siblings Under 5		-0.0810***	-0.0810***		0.0120	0.0120		-0.0522***	-0.0522***		-0.0288**	-0.0288**		0.0408***	0.0408***		0.0401***	0.0402***
		[-8.01]	[-8.01]		[0.87]	[0.87]		[-3.74]	[-3.74]		[-2.16]	[-2.16]		[5.25]	[5.25]		[5.61]	[5.62]
I[Father College]		0.0062***	0.0062***		-0.0412***	-0.0412***		0.0428***	0.0428***		-0.0366***	-0.0366***		-0.0047***	-0.0047***		-0.0015**	-0.0016**
		[6.00]	[6.01]		[-11.97]	[-11.97]		[12.39]	[12.40]		[-10.65]	[-10.65]		[-5.84]	[-5.84]		[-2.32]	[-2.33]
I[Mother College]		0.0036***	0.0036***		-0.0587***	-0.0587***		0.0591***	0.0591***		-0.0556***	-0.0556***		-0.0032***	-0.0032***		-0.0004	-0.0004
		[3.59]	[3.60]		[-17.38]	[-17.38]		[17.44]	[17.44]		[-16.49]	[-16.49]		[-4.30]	[-4.30]		[-0.59]	[-0.60]
Father's SEI		0.0008***	0.0008***		-0.0019***	-0.0019***		0.0022***	0.0022***		-0.0014**	-0.0014**		-0.0006***	-0.0006***		-0.0003*	-0.0002*
		[3.61]	[3.61]		[-3.23]	[-3.23]		[3.63]	[3.63]		[-2.30]	[-2.30]		[-3.31]	[-3.31]		[-1.66]	[-1.65]
Mother's SEI		0.0013***	0.0013***		0.0015***	0.0015***		-0.0008	-0.0008		0.0021***	0.0021***		-0.0007***	-0.0007***		-0.0007***	-0.0007***
		[5.98]	[5.98]		[2.59]	[2.59]		[-1.41]	[-1.41]		[3.76]	[3.76]		[-3.78]	[-3.78]		[-4.67]	[-4.67]
I[Father Working]		-0.0026	-0.0026		0.0576***	0.0576***		-0.0532***	-0.0532***		0.0506***	0.0506***		0.0070***	0.0070***		-0.0044***	-0.0044***
		[-1.34]	[-1.34]		[14.18]	[14.18]		[-12.89]	[-12.89]		[12.67]	[12.67]		[5.00]	[5.00]		[-3.15]	[-3.15]
I[Mother Working]		0.0060***	0.0060***		0.0796***	0.0796***		-0.0738***	-0.0738***		0.0798***	0.0798***		-0.0002	-0.0002		-0.0058***	-0.0058***
		[4.46]	[4.46]		[25.42]	[25.42]		[-23.40]	[-23.40]		[25.79]	[25.79]		[-0.17]	[-0.17]		[-6.58]	[-6.58]
Parental Income		0.0057***	0.0057***		-0.0066***	-0.0066***		0.0099***	0.0099***		-0.0042**	-0.0042**		-0.0024***	-0.0024***		-0.0033***	-0.0033***
		[6.65]	[6.65]		[-3.46]	[-3.46]		[5.10]	[5.10]		[-2.24]	[-2.24]		[-3.91]	[-3.91]		[-5.43]	[-5.43]
I[House Ownership]		0.0231***	0.0232***		0.0309***	0.0309***		-0.0200***	-0.0200***		0.0431***	0.0431***		-0.0123***	-0.0123***		-0.0109***	-0.0109***
		[12.31]	[12.31]		[8.33]	[8.33]		[-5.33]	[-5.33]		[11.81]	[11.81]		[-8.55]	[-8.55]		[-8.52]	[-8.52]
Mean Probability	0.9636			0.3978			0.5858			0.3778			0.0201			0.0164		
No. of Observations	224,130	220,292	220,292	224,130	220,292	220,292	224,130	220,292	220,292	224,130	220,292	220,292	224,130	220,292	220,292	224,130	220,292	220,292
R-squared	0.0090	0.0459	0.0459	0.0476	0.0665	0.0665	0.0481	0.0661	0.0661	0.0429	0.0633	0.0633	0.0069	0.0246	0.0246	0.0035	0.0233	0.0233

The sample consists of white children aged 16-17 residing in married two-parent households in IPUMS 2000 5% sample.

In (1), (4), (7), (10), (13) and (16), in addition to the variables shown above, independent variables consist of the age of the child (in quadratic form), state fixed effects, and a constant.

In the rest of the specifications, independent variables include the age of the child (in quadratic form), the number of foster children, the number of adults and nonadults (respectively for related and unrelated) in the household, the age of father and mother (in quadratic form), the race, nativity, and high school completion of father and mother, a metropolitan residence indicator, a female-headed household indicator, state fixed effects, and a constant.

Standard errors are clustered at household level and t-values are reported in parentheses. * significant at 10%, ** significant at 5%, *** significant at 1%.

Table 11: OLS Analysis of Educational Outcomes of BLACK Children in 2000: School Attendance

Dependent Variable	I[In Preschool] Age 3-5			I[In Primary School] Age 6-11			I[In Private Primary School] Age 6-11			I[In Secondary School] Age 12-17			I[In Private Secondary School] Age 12-17		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)
I[Adopted]	0.0178	0.0284*	0.0133	-0.0028	0.0011	0.0026	0.0358***	0.0125	-0.0018	0.0013	0.0027	0.0014	0.0245***	0.0060	0.0053
	[1.16]	[1.72]	[0.72]	[-0.94]	[0.34]	[0.69]	[4.17]	[1.45]	[-0.21]	[0.44]	[0.83]	[0.39]	[3.38]	[0.81]	[0.69]
I[Adopted]xI[Race Different]			0.0610			-0.0076			0.0733***			0.0094			0.0055
			[1.63]			[-1.06]			[2.88]			[1.37]			[0.22]
I[Step]	-0.0058	0.0357**	0.0366**	0.0037**	0.0037**	0.0036**	-0.0390***	-0.0195***	-0.0189***	0.0018	0.0009	0.0010	-0.0172***	-0.0067**	-0.0067**
	[-0.39]	[2.33]	[2.39]	[2.48]	[2.34]	[2.30]	[-10.57]	[-5.03]	[-4.86]	[1.05]	[0.49]	[0.52]	[-5.57]	[-2.01]	[-2.00]
I[Disability]	-0.0408	-0.0158	-0.0159	-0.0063**	-0.0046	-0.0045	-0.0295***	-0.0145***	-0.0153***	-0.0075**	-0.0042	-0.0042	-0.0111**	-0.0047	-0.0047
	[-1.59]	[-0.61]	[-0.61]	[-2.11]	[-1.54]	[-1.51]	[-5.35]	[-2.62]	[-2.76]	[-2.40]	[-1.36]	[-1.38]	[-2.20]	[-0.94]	[-0.95]
I[Female]	-0.0102*	-0.0094*	-0.0094*	-0.0002	-0.0003	-0.0003	-0.0044*	-0.0045*	-0.0046*	-0.0014	-0.0017	-0.0017	-0.0019	-0.0031	-0.0031
	[-1.78]	[-1.67]	[-1.67]	[-0.16]	[-0.27]	[-0.26]	[-1.67]	[-1.74]	[-1.76]	[-1.17]	[-1.42]	[-1.42]	[-0.83]	[-1.39]	[-1.39]
Birth Order		0.0068	0.0068		0.0020***	0.0020***		-0.0211***	-0.0212***		0.0008	0.0008		-0.0127***	-0.0127***
		[1.29]	[1.28]		[2.70]	[2.71]		[-10.70]	[-10.76]		[0.72]	[0.73]		[-5.85]	[-5.85]
No. of Siblings		-0.0259***	-0.0261***		0.0012**	0.0012**		0.0011	0.0009		0.0007	0.0006		0.0001	0.0001
		[-5.34]	[-5.38]		[2.00]	[2.03]		[0.68]	[0.56]		[1.08]	[1.06]		[0.11]	[0.10]
No. of Siblings Under 5					0.0124***	0.0124***		0.0284	0.0279		-0.0242***	-0.0243***		-0.0161***	-0.0161***
					[4.05]	[4.09]		[0.48]	[0.47]		[-2.86]	[-2.87]		[-2.83]	[-2.84]
I[Father College]		0.0239***	0.0235***		0.0011	0.0011		0.0336***	0.0330***		-0.0016	-0.0016		0.0271***	0.0270***
		[2.69]	[2.65]		[0.65]	[0.69]		[5.82]	[5.71]		[-0.91]	[-0.93]		[5.63]	[5.63]
I[Mother College]		0.0424***	0.0423***		-0.0012	-0.0012		0.0618***	0.0616***		0.0017	0.0017		0.0335***	0.0335***
		[5.04]	[5.03]		[-0.77]	[-0.76]		[11.01]	[10.99]		[1.13]	[1.12]		[7.10]	[7.10]
Father's SEI		0.0020	0.0019		-0.0001	-0.0001		0.0036***	0.0036***		0.0006**	0.0006**		0.0033***	0.0033***
		[1.32]	[1.30]		[-0.32]	[-0.30]		[4.75]	[4.70]		[2.12]	[2.11]		[4.98]	[4.98]
Mother's SEI		0.0064***	0.0064***		0.0006**	0.0006**		0.0025***	0.0026***		0.0011***	0.0011***		0.0022***	0.0022***
		[4.39]	[4.41]		[2.24]	[2.22]		[3.47]	[3.53]		[3.47]	[3.48]		[3.48]	[3.49]
I[Father Working]		-0.0239***	-0.0240***		0.0001	0.0001		-0.0022	-0.0024		0.0017	0.0017		-0.0034	-0.0034
		[-2.85]	[-2.86]		[0.07]	[0.08]		[-0.61]	[-0.66]		[0.93]	[0.93]		[-1.11]	[-1.11]
I[Mother Working]		0.0629***	0.0630***		0.0048***	0.0048***		-0.0044	-0.0043		0.0018	0.0018		-0.0041	-0.0040
		[8.74]	[8.75]		[3.47]	[3.47]		[-1.30]	[-1.30]		[1.09]	[1.10]		[-1.42]	[-1.42]
Parental Income		0.0191***	0.0191***		0.0010	0.0010		0.0174***	0.0173***		0.0025**	0.0025**		0.0102***	0.0102***
		[4.01]	[4.01]		[1.10]	[1.11]		[7.59]	[7.58]		[2.22]	[2.22]		[5.09]	[5.09]
I[House Ownership]		0.0092	0.0092		0.0005	0.0005		0.0263***	0.0263***		0.0058***	0.0058***		0.0085***	0.0085***
		[1.37]	[1.36]		[0.42]	[0.42]		[8.51]	[8.50]		[3.80]	[3.79]		[3.04]	[3.04]
Mean Probability	0.6905			0.9871			0.0898			0.9820			0.0606		
No. of Observations	28,022	27,596	27,596	64,206	63,205	63,205	64,206	63,205	63,205	61,036	60,028	60,028	61,036	60,028	60,028
R-squared	0.1431	0.1733	0.1734	0.0023	0.0056	0.0056	0.0253	0.0780	0.0780	0.0116	0.0165	0.0165	0.0222	0.0514	0.0514

The sample consists of African American children aged 16-17 residing in married two-parent households in IPUMS 2000 5% sample.

In (1), (4), (7), (10), and (13), in addition to the variables shown above, independent variables consist of the age of the child (in quadratic form), state fixed effects, and a constant. In the rest of the specifications, independent variables include the age of the child (in quadratic form), the number of foster children, the number of adults and nonadults (respectively for related and unrelated) in the household, the age of mother and mother (in quadratic form), the race, nativity, and high school completion of father and mother, a metropolitan residence indicator, a female-headed household indicator, state fixed effects, and a constant. Standard errors are clustered at household level and t-values are reported in parentheses. * significant at 10%, ** significant at 5%, *** significant at 1%.

Table 12: OLS Analysis of Educational Outcomes of BLACK Children in 2000: School Attendance and Labor Force Participation

Dependent Variable	I[In School] (Age 16-17)			I[In Labor Force] (Age 16-17)			I[In School & Not in LF]			I[In School & In LF]			I[Not in School & In LF]			I[Not in School & Not in LF]		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)
I[Adopted]	0.0150** [2.45]	0.0175*** [2.80]	0.0167*** [2.60]	-0.0296 [-1.40]	-0.0250 [-1.19]	-0.0504** [-2.52]	0.0371* [1.73]	0.0350* [1.65]	0.0597*** [2.91]	-0.0221 [-1.04]	-0.0177 [-0.85]	-0.0431** [-2.17]	-0.0075** [-2.47]	-0.0074** [-2.13]	-0.0074** [-2.01]	-0.0075 [-1.41]	-0.0099* [-1.90]	-0.0092* [-1.73]
I[Adopted]xI[Race Different]			0.0066 [0.31]			0.2273*** [2.76]			-0.2209*** [-2.69]			0.2274*** [2.75]			-0.0001 [-0.01]			-0.0064 [-0.33]
I[Step]	-0.0032 [-0.68]	-0.0058 [-1.17]	-0.0057 [-1.16]	0.0345*** [2.99]	0.0211* [1.74]	0.0221* [1.82]	-0.0352*** [-3.03]	-0.0229* [-1.87]	-0.0239* [-1.95]	0.0320*** [2.80]	0.0171 [1.42]	0.0181 [1.50]	0.0025 [0.77]	0.0040 [1.16]	0.0040 [1.16]	0.0007 [0.20]	0.0018 [0.50]	0.0018 [0.49]
I[Disability]	-0.0190** [-2.10]	-0.0102 [-1.20]	-0.0103 [-1.20]	-0.0890*** [-5.23]	-0.0835*** [-4.90]	-0.0859*** [-5.02]	0.0632*** [3.46]	0.0645*** [3.56]	0.0668*** [3.67]	-0.0822*** [-4.89]	-0.0747*** [-4.43]	-0.0771*** [-4.55]	-0.0068** [-2.12]	-0.0088*** [-2.59]	-0.0088*** [-2.59]	0.0258*** [3.05]	0.0190** [2.40]	0.0191** [2.40]
I[Female]	-0.0049* [-1.68]	-0.0059** [-2.02]	-0.0060** [-2.03]	-0.0054 [-0.72]	-0.0079 [-1.06]	-0.0084 [-1.12]	0.0048 [0.63]	0.0067 [0.87]	0.0071 [0.93]	-0.0097 [-1.31]	-0.0126* [-1.70]	-0.0131* [-1.76]	0.0043** [2.27]	0.0047** [2.39]	0.0047** [2.39]	0.0006 [0.26]	0.0013 [0.56]	0.0013 [0.56]
Birth Order		-0.0062 [-0.73]	-0.0062 [-0.74]		-0.0084 [-0.47]	-0.0096 [-0.55]		-0.0004 [-0.02]	0.0008 [0.04]		-0.0058 [-0.34]	-0.0071 [-0.41]		-0.0025 [-0.70]	-0.0025 [-0.70]		0.0087 [1.15]	0.0088 [1.16]
No. of Siblings		0.0003 [0.19]	0.0003 [0.18]		0.0073* [1.92]	0.0069* [1.82]		-0.0059 [-1.52]	-0.0055 [-1.43]		0.0062* [1.65]	0.0058 [1.55]		0.0011 [1.14]	0.0011 [1.14]		-0.0014 [-1.20]	-0.0014 [-1.19]
No. of Siblings Under 5		-0.0368*** [-2.73]	-0.0368*** [-2.73]		0.0009 [0.04]	-0.0005 [-0.02]		-0.0184 [-0.76]	-0.0170 [-0.70]		-0.0183 [-0.82]	-0.0198 [-0.88]		0.0192** [2.04]	0.0192** [2.04]		0.0175* [1.79]	0.0175* [1.79]
I[Father College]		-0.0006 [-0.15]	-0.0006 [-0.15]		-0.0231* [-1.88]	-0.0242** [-1.97]		0.0189 [1.52]	0.0200 [1.61]		-0.0194 [-1.59]	-0.0206* [-1.68]		-0.0036* [-1.66]	-0.0036* [-1.66]		0.0042 [1.41]	0.0042 [1.41]
I[Mother College]		0.0047 [1.31]	0.0047 [1.30]		-0.0161 [-1.37]	-0.0169 [-1.44]		0.0183 [1.54]	0.0191 [1.62]		-0.0136 [-1.16]	-0.0144 [-1.24]		-0.0025 [-1.04]	-0.0025 [-1.05]		-0.0023 [-0.83]	-0.0022 [-0.82]
Father's SEI		0.0013* [1.96]	0.0013* [1.96]		-0.0026 [-1.33]	-0.0026 [-1.35]		0.0037* [1.85]	0.0037* [1.87]		-0.0023 [-1.21]	-0.0024 [-1.23]		-0.0003 [-0.59]	-0.0003 [-0.59]		-0.0011** [-2.05]	-0.0011** [-2.04]
Mother's SEI		0.0020*** [2.72]	0.0020*** [2.72]		0.0009 [0.46]	0.0011 [0.59]		0.0004 [0.22]	0.0002 [0.11]		0.0016 [0.84]	0.0018 [0.97]		-0.0007 [-1.51]	-0.0007 [-1.50]		-0.0013** [-2.27]	-0.0013** [-2.27]
I[Father Working]		-0.0006 [-0.16]	-0.0006 [-0.16]		0.0416*** [4.15]	0.0415*** [4.14]		-0.0413*** [-4.04]	-0.0411*** [-4.03]		0.0406*** [4.10]	0.0405*** [4.09]		0.0010 [0.39]	0.0010 [0.39]		-0.0003 [-0.10]	-0.0003 [-0.10]
I[Mother Working]		0.0051 [1.30]	0.0052 [1.31]		0.0662*** [6.94]	0.0667*** [7.01]		-0.0613*** [-6.31]	-0.0618*** [-6.38]		0.0665*** [7.07]	0.0670*** [7.15]		-0.0003 [-0.10]	-0.0003 [-0.10]		-0.0049 [-1.62]	-0.0049 [-1.62]
Parental Income		0.0059** [2.18]	0.0059** [2.18]		0.0123** [2.08]	0.0120** [2.03]		-0.0075 [-1.23]	-0.0073 [-1.19]		0.0134** [2.30]	0.0131** [2.26]		-0.0011 [-0.63]	-0.0011 [-0.63]		-0.0048** [-2.28]	-0.0048** [-2.28]
I[House Ownership]		0.0164*** [4.03]	0.0164*** [4.02]		0.0139 [1.52]	0.0137 [1.50]		-0.0065 [-0.69]	-0.0063 [-0.67]		0.0229** [2.54]	0.0227** [2.52]		-0.0090*** [-3.18]	-0.0090*** [-3.18]		-0.0074** [-2.47]	-0.0074** [-2.47]
Mean Probability	0.9654			0.3072			0.6723			0.2931			0.0140			0.0206		
No. of Observations	19,497	19,186	19,186	19,497	19,186	19,186	19,497	19,186	19,186	19,497	19,186	19,186	19,497	19,186	19,186	19,497	19,186	19,186
R-squared	0.0086	0.0234	0.0235	0.0343	0.0486	0.0494	0.0340	0.0462	0.0470	0.0312	0.0463	0.0471	0.0067	0.0130	0.0130	0.0061	0.0171	0.0171

The sample consists of African American children aged 16-17 residing in married two-parent households in IPUMS 2000 5% sample.
In (1), (4), (7), (10), (13) and (16), in addition to the variables shown above, independent variables consist of the age of the child (in quadratic form), state fixed effects, and a constant.
In the rest of the specifications, independent variables include the age of the child (in quadratic form), the number of foster children, the number of adults and nonadults (respectively for related and unrelated) in the household,
the age of father and mother (in quadratic form), the race, nativity, and high school completion of father and mother, a metropolitan residence indicator, a female-headed household indicator, state fixed effects, and a constant.
Standard errors are clustered at household level and t-values are reported in parentheses. * significant at 10%, ** significant at 5%, *** significant at 1%.

Table 13: OLS Analysis of Educational Outcomes of ASIAN Children in 2000: School Attendance

Dependent Variable	I[In Preschool] Age 3-5			I[In Primary School] Age 6-11			I[In Private Primary School] Age 6-11			I[In Secondary School] Age 12-17			I[In Private Secondary School] Age 12-17		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)
I[Adopted]	0.0842***	0.0189	-0.0211	0.0018	0.0080**	0.0042	0.0856***	0.0122	0.0055	0.0007	-0.0048	-0.0097	0.0584***	-0.0019	-0.0107
	[4.94]	[0.80]	[-0.67]	[0.63]	[1.97]	[0.90]	[6.66]	[0.85]	[0.33]	[0.23]	[-0.97]	[-1.45]	[5.81]	[-0.17]	[-0.83]
I[Adopted]xI[Race Different]			0.0864**			0.0088			0.0156			0.0112			0.0204
			[1.99]			[1.13]			[0.55]			[1.29]			[0.91]
I[Step]	-0.0491	-0.0016	0.0028	-0.0029	0.0037	0.0041	-0.0281**	-0.0146	-0.0138	-0.0122*	-0.0019	-0.0013	-0.0111	-0.0093	-0.0082
	[-1.07]	[-0.03]	[0.06]	[-0.58]	[0.68]	[0.76]	[-2.28]	[-1.06]	[-1.00]	[-1.74]	[-0.31]	[-0.21]	[-1.12]	[-0.83]	[-0.73]
I[Disability]	-0.0331	-0.0052	-0.0049	-0.0144**	-0.0138**	-0.0139**	-0.0350***	-0.0295**	-0.0295**	-0.0077	-0.0105	-0.0106	-0.0292***	-0.0201	-0.0203
	[-0.82]	[-0.12]	[-0.11]	[-2.47]	[-2.18]	[-2.19]	[-3.03]	[-2.34]	[-2.34]	[-1.27]	[-1.52]	[-1.54]	[-2.77]	[-1.63]	[-1.64]
I[Female]	-0.0013	0.0013	0.0016	0.0020	0.0026*	0.0026*	-0.0005	0.0020	0.0020	-0.0008	-0.0012	-0.0012	0.0031	0.0025	0.0026
	[-0.16]	[0.17]	[0.21]	[1.45]	[1.91]	[1.90]	[-0.14]	[0.50]	[0.50]	[-0.53]	[-0.84]	[-0.81]	[0.92]	[0.70]	[0.71]
Birth Order		-0.0190**	-0.0187**		0.0019	0.0019		-0.0201***	-0.0200***		-0.0027*	-0.0026*		-0.0176***	-0.0175***
		[-2.55]	[-2.52]		[1.50]	[1.51]		[-6.35]	[-6.34]		[-1.71]	[-1.68]		[-4.60]	[-4.57]
No. of Siblings		-0.0135**	-0.0136**		0.0001	0.0001		0.0053*	0.0053*		0.0028***	0.0027***		0.0041*	0.0041*
		[-1.99]	[-2.01]		[0.11]	[0.09]		[1.86]	[1.85]		[2.96]	[2.93]		[1.91]	[1.88]
No. of Siblings Under 5					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		-0.0186	-0.0186		0.0258	0.0259
					[.]	[.]		[.]	[.]		[-0.84]	[-0.84]		[0.62]	[0.62]
I[Father College]		0.0455***	0.0449***		0.0009	0.0009		0.0033	0.0032		0.0020	0.0020		0.0157***	0.0156***
		[4.11]	[4.05]		[0.46]	[0.44]		[0.50]	[0.50]		[0.95]	[0.93]		[2.64]	[2.64]
I[Mother College]		0.0412***	0.0403***		0.0005	0.0004		0.0390***	0.0389***		-0.0046**	-0.0047**		0.0279***	0.0278***
		[4.08]	[3.99]		[0.24]	[0.23]		[6.29]	[6.28]		[-2.22]	[-2.25]		[4.67]	[4.64]
Father's SEI		0.0097***	0.0097***		0.0002	0.0002		0.0022*	0.0022*		0.0007*	0.0007*		0.0018*	0.0018*
		[4.86]	[4.86]		[0.44]	[0.44]		[1.94]	[1.94]		[1.77]	[1.78]		[1.77]	[1.78]
Mother's SEI		0.0043**	0.0044***		-0.0003	-0.0003		0.0048***	0.0048***		0.0006	0.0006		0.0027***	0.0027***
		[2.57]	[2.59]		[-0.92]	[-0.92]		[4.53]	[4.52]		[1.54]	[1.54]		[2.61]	[2.61]
I[Father Working]		-0.0174	-0.0176		0.0011	0.0011		-0.0112*	-0.0112*		-0.0004	-0.0005		-0.0001	-0.0003
		[-1.45]	[-1.47]		[0.48]	[0.48]		[-1.76]	[-1.76]		[-0.15]	[-0.18]		[-0.03]	[-0.05]
I[Mother Working]		-0.0026	-0.0027		0.0054***	0.0054***		0.0038	0.0037		0.0035	0.0035		-0.0156***	-0.0156***
		[-0.27]	[-0.28]		[2.96]	[2.95]		[0.70]	[0.70]		[1.52]	[1.53]		[-3.12]	[-3.11]
Parental Income		0.0279***	0.0277***		0.0006	0.0006		0.0348***	0.0348***		0.0013	0.0013		0.0344***	0.0345***
		[4.65]	[4.62]		[0.70]	[0.71]		[10.25]	[10.25]		[1.06]	[1.07]		[10.78]	[10.79]
I[House Ownership]		0.0129	0.0129		0.0035*	0.0035*		0.0295***	0.0295***		0.0026	0.0026		0.0213***	0.0213***
		[1.37]	[1.37]		[1.88]	[1.88]		[5.72]	[5.72]		[1.27]	[1.25]		[4.80]	[4.80]
Mean Probability	0.6257			0.9873			0.1202			0.9861			0.0922		
No. of Observations	16,240	15,382	15,382	32,820	30,430	30,430	32,820	30,430	30,430	32,627	29,500	29,500	32,627	29,500	29,500
R-squared	0.1824	0.2221	0.2224	0.0038	0.0085	0.0086	0.0151	0.0574	0.0574	0.0074	0.0124	0.0124	0.0128	0.0516	0.0517

The sample consists of Asian children aged 16-17 residing in married two-parent households in IPUMS 2000 5% sample.

In (1), (4), (7), (10), and (13), in addition to the variables shown above, independent variables consist of the age of the child (in quadratic form), state fixed effects, and a constant. In the rest of the specifications, independent variables include the age of the child (in quadratic form), the number of foster children, the number of adults and nonadults (respectively for related and unrelated) in the household, the age of mother and mother (in quadratic form), the race, nativity, and high school completion of father and mother, a metropolitan residence indicator, a female-headed household indicator, state fixed effects, and a constant. Standard errors are clustered at household level and t-values are reported in parentheses. * significant at 10%, ** significant at 5%, *** significant at 1%.

Table 14: OLS Analysis of Educational Outcomes of ASIAN Children in 2000: School Attendance and Labor Force Participation

Dependent Variable	I[In School] (Age 16-17)			I[In Labor Force] (Age 16-17)			I[In School & Not in LF]			I[In School & In LF]			I[Not in School & In LF]			I[Not in School & Not in LF]		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)
I[Adopted]	0.0004	-0.0068	-0.0117	0.1196***	-0.0018	-0.0216	-0.1165***	-0.0032	0.0130	0.1169***	-0.0035	-0.0247	0.0028	0.0015	0.0029	-0.0032	0.0053	0.0088
	[0.05]	[-0.63]	[-0.82]	[5.15]	[-0.06]	[-0.64]	[-4.95]	[-0.11]	[0.37]	[5.03]	[-0.13]	[-0.74]	[0.45]	[0.22]	[0.35]	[-0.59]	[0.61]	[0.75]
I[Adopted]xI[Race Different]			0.0115			0.0470			-0.0384			0.0500			-0.0033			-0.0083
			[0.62]			[0.88]			[-0.71]			[0.94]			[-0.25]			[-0.63]
I[Step]	-0.0205	0.0076	0.0081	0.0681**	0.0158	0.0177	-0.0800***	-0.0156	-0.0171	0.0594**	0.0232	0.0252	0.0086	-0.0072	-0.0073	0.0119	-0.0004	-0.0007
	[-1.34]	[0.76]	[0.79]	[2.41]	[0.54]	[0.60]	[-2.80]	[-0.52]	[-0.57]	[2.20]	[0.80]	[0.87]	[0.71]	[-1.42]	[-1.43]	[1.20]	[-0.05]	[-0.08]
I[Disability]	-0.0115	-0.0161	-0.0161	-0.0809***	-0.0836***	-0.0835***	0.0647**	0.0635*	0.0634*	-0.0762***	-0.0795***	-0.0794***	-0.0047	-0.0043	-0.0043	0.0162	0.0203	0.0203
	[-0.96]	[-1.17]	[-1.17]	[-2.70]	[-2.71]	[-2.70]	[2.06]	[1.95]	[1.94]	[-2.58]	[-2.61]	[-2.60]	[-0.89]	[-0.81]	[-0.81]	[1.58]	[1.58]	[1.57]
I[Female]	0.0004	-0.0005	-0.0005	-0.0164*	-0.0165*	-0.0162*	0.0164*	0.0168*	0.0165*	-0.0160*	-0.0173*	-0.0170*	-0.0004	0.0008	0.0007	0.0000	-0.0002	-0.0003
	[0.13]	[-0.17]	[-0.14]	[-1.80]	[-1.75]	[-1.72]	[1.76]	[1.75]	[1.72]	[-1.77]	[-1.85]	[-1.81]	[-0.20]	[0.40]	[0.39]	[0.00]	[-0.09]	[-0.11]
Birth Order		0.0020	0.0020		-0.0005	-0.0005		0.0022	0.0022		-0.0003	-0.0003		0.0000	0.0000		-0.0019	-0.0019
		[0.38]	[0.38]		[-0.02]	[-0.02]		[0.10]	[0.09]		[-0.01]	[-0.01]		[0.01]	[0.01]		[-0.48]	[-0.48]
No. of Siblings		0.0023	0.0023		0.0098*	0.0097*		-0.0079	-0.0078		0.0101*	0.0100*		-0.0003	-0.0003		-0.0020	-0.0019
		[1.22]	[1.21]		[1.86]	[1.84]		[-1.47]	[-1.45]		[1.93]	[1.90]		[-0.32]	[-0.31]		[-1.31]	[-1.30]
No. of Siblings Under 5		-0.0193	-0.0195		0.1371*	0.1364*		-0.1398*	-0.1393*		0.1199	0.1192		0.0190	0.0191		0.0009	0.0010
		[-0.64]	[-0.64]		[1.75]	[1.74]		[-1.79]	[-1.79]		[1.51]	[1.50]		[0.75]	[0.75]		[0.05]	[0.06]
I[Father College]		0.0044	0.0044		-0.0396***	-0.0397***		0.0414***	0.0415***		-0.0370***	-0.0372***		-0.0025	-0.0025		-0.0019	-0.0018
		[1.07]	[1.06]		[-3.06]	[-3.07]		[3.16]	[3.17]		[-2.90]	[-2.91]		[-0.96]	[-0.96]		[-0.58]	[-0.58]
I[Mother College]		-0.0095**	-0.0096**		0.0146	0.0143		-0.0209	-0.0206*		0.0113	0.0110		0.0033	0.0033		0.0062**	0.0063**
		[-2.43]	[-2.45]		[1.19]	[1.16]		[-1.68]	[-1.65]		[0.93]	[0.90]		[1.32]	[1.34]		[2.03]	[2.05]
Father's SEI		0.0006	0.0006		-0.0071***	-0.0071***		0.0072***	0.0072***		-0.0066***	-0.0066***		-0.0005	-0.0005		-0.0001	-0.0001
		[0.75]	[0.76]		[-3.12]	[-3.10]		[3.10]	[3.08]		[-2.92]	[-2.91]		[-1.06]	[-1.07]		[-0.12]	[-0.13]
Mother's SEI		0.0024***	0.0024***		0.0033	0.0033		-0.0022	-0.0022		0.0046**	0.0046**		-0.0013***	-0.0013***		-0.0011*	-0.0011*
		[3.16]	[3.15]		[1.47]	[1.46]		[-0.95]	[-0.94]		[2.05]	[2.03]		[-3.12]	[-3.10]		[-1.76]	[-1.75]
I[Father Working]		0.0036	0.0035		0.0040	0.0038		0.0015	0.0017		0.0021	0.0019		0.0019	0.0019		-0.0055	-0.0054
		[0.62]	[0.61]		[0.30]	[0.28]		[0.11]	[0.12]		[0.15]	[0.14]		[0.62]	[0.62]		[-1.11]	[-1.10]
I[Mother Working]		-0.0016	-0.0016		0.0391***	0.0392***		-0.0376***	-0.0376***		0.0360***	0.0360***		0.0032	0.0032		-0.0015	-0.0016
		[-0.35]	[-0.35]		[3.24]	[3.24]		[-3.04]	[-3.04]		[3.00]	[3.00]		[1.34]	[1.33]		[-0.40]	[-0.40]
Parental Income		0.0010	0.0010		-0.0058	-0.0056		0.0067	0.0065		-0.0057	-0.0055		-0.0001	-0.0001		-0.0009	-0.0009
		[0.44]	[0.46]		[-0.84]	[-0.81]		[0.96]	[0.94]		[-0.84]	[-0.81]		[-0.09]	[-0.10]		[-0.49]	[-0.50]
I[House Ownership]		0.0068	0.0067		0.0105	0.0104		-0.0079	-0.0078		0.0146	0.0144		-0.0039	-0.0039		-0.0028	-0.0027
		[1.58]	[1.58]		[0.86]	[0.85]		[-0.64]	[-0.63]		[1.21]	[1.20]		[-1.46]	[-1.46]		[-0.83]	[-0.82]
Mean Probability	0.9786			0.2305			0.7566			0.2220			0.0085			0.0128		
No. of Observations	10,762	9,699	9,699	10,762	9,699	9,699	10,762	9,699	9,699	10,762	9,699	9,699	10,762	9,699	9,699	10,762	9,699	9,699
R-squared	0.0139	0.0258	0.0259	0.0446	0.0712	0.0713	0.0439	0.0713	0.0714	0.0413	0.0662	0.0663	0.0151	0.0237	0.0237	0.0090	0.0175	0.0176

The sample consists of Asian children aged 16-17 residing in married two-parent households in IPUMS 2000 5% sample.
In (1), (4), (7), (10), (13) and (16), in addition to the variables shown above, independent variables consist of the age of the child (in quadratic form), state fixed effects, and a constant.
In the rest of the specifications, independent variables include the age of the child (in quadratic form), the number of foster children, the number of adults and nonadults (respectively for related and unrelated) in the household,
the age of father and mother (in quadratic form), the race, nativity, and high school completion of father and mother, a metropolitan residence indicator, a female-headed household indicator, state fixed effects, and a constant.
Standard errors are clustered at household level and t-values are reported in parentheses. * significant at 10%, ** significant at 5%, *** significant at 1%.

Table 15: Summary of Educational Status of Non-biological Children by Year and Race

	Adopted Children			Stepchildren		
	White	Black	Asian	White	Black	Asian
In 1900-1930						
Literacy: Boys (age 10-17)	-0.015***	-0.058***		-0.008***	0.014	
Literacy: Girls (age 10-17)	-0.004	-0.079***		-0.014***	-0.053***	
Primary School (age 6-11)	-0.038***	-0.027		-0.003	-0.001	
Secondary School (age 12-17)	-0.051***	-0.023		-0.070***	-0.059***	
In School (age 10-17)	-0.052***	-0.026	N.A.	-0.056***	-0.050***	N.A.
In Labor Force (age 10-17)	0.018***	0.001		0.044***	0.035***	
In School & Not in LF	-0.050***	-0.035*		-0.060***	-0.046***	
In School & In LF	0.001	0.009		0.004*	-0.005	
Not in School & In LF	0.020***	0.001		0.040***	0.040***	
Neither in School nor in LF	0.032***	0.025*		0.017***	0.011*	
In 2000						
Preschool (age 3-5)	0.022***	0.028*	0.019	0.029***	0.036***	-0.002
Private Primary School (age 6-11))	0.006*	0.013	0.012	-0.042***	-0.020***	-0.015
Private Second. School (age 12-17)	0.009***	0.006	-0.002	-0.034***	-0.007***	-0.009
In School (age 16-17)	0.001	0.018***	-0.007	-0.009***	-0.006	0.008
In Labor Force (age 16-17)	0.025***	-0.025	-0.002	0.052***	0.021*	0.016
In School & Not in LF	-0.025***	0.035*	-0.003	-0.054***	-0.023*	-0.016
In School & In LF	0.026***	-0.018	-0.004	0.045***	0.017	0.023
Not in School & In LF	-0.001	-0.007**	0.002	0.007***	0.004	-0.007
Neither in School nor in LF	-0.001	-0.010*	0.005	0.002*	0.002	0.000

The coefficients of I[Adopted] and I[Step] after controlling for household characteristics in Tables 5-14 are reported; * significant at 10%, ** significant at 5%, *** significant at 1%.