Closing the Door, Shrinking the Cradle: Immigration Quotas and Fertility Decline

Rania Gihleb, University of Pittsburgh and IZA
Osea Giuntella, University of Pittsburgh and NBER
Patrick Szurkowski, University of Pittsburgh

April 2024
Preliminary and Incomplete Draft

Abstract

In this paper, we study the impact of immigration on native demographic behavior by exploring the effect of the quotas the United States imposed in the 1920s. Using a difference-in-difference approach and US Census data from 1900 to 1930, we find that the decline in immigration led to a decline in marriage rates and an increase in the share of householders. The quotas led to a decline in fertility, particularly among young women. Conditional on having children, we find that mothers in high-exposure areas had more children on average. However, the extensive margin decline in childbearing outweighed this, resulting in an overall net decline in fertility. Consistent with previous evidence, we observe no significant change in women's labor force participation rates. However, the quotas reduced the proportion of women employed in childcare, particularly among younger workers, leading to an aging childcare workforce. The ratio of children to childcare workers declined for younger workers but increased for older ones, likely raising the cost and reducing the availability of childcare. These labor market changes exacerbated the logistical challenges of childrearing and contributed to the observed fertility decline.

JEL CODES:J12, J13, J15, N32.

Keywords: Immigration quotas, marriage, fertility, Age of Mass Migration.

1 Introduction

Immigration has long shaped the economic, social, and demographic landscape of the United States. During the late 19th and early 20th centuries, the Age of Mass Migration brought more than 30 million Europeans to the U.S., profoundly influencing its cities and communities. However, rising concerns about the cultural and economic impact of immigrants fueled a wave of restrictive immigration policies in the 1920s. The Immigration Acts of 1921 and 1924 introduced quotas that drastically reduced inflows, particularly from Southern and Eastern Europe. These quotas marked a turning point in American immigration policy, shifting from an open-door approach to one that explicitly limited and controlled migration.

Despite extensive research on the economic consequences of immigration, less is known about how such restrictions reshaped the demographic behaviors of native populations. Marriage, fertility, and family formation are key dimensions of demographic change that remain understudied in this context. Were native families insulated from the effects of restrictive immigration policies, or did the declining influx of immigrants alter patterns of marriage and childbearing in the U.S.?

In this paper, we explore these questions by examining how the immigration quotas of the 1920s influenced demographic behavior among native-born Americans. Using a difference-in-differences approach and U.S. Census data from 1900 to 1930, we document a marked decline in marriage rates, household formation, and fertility following the implementation of the quotas. Our analysis reveals that these effects were particularly pronounced among young women, whose likelihood of childbearing decreased substantially. Conditional on having children, however, we observe a compensatory increase in the number of children per mother, suggesting nuanced shifts in family planning at the intensive margin.

We then turn to the analysis of potential mechanisms. Consistent with prior literature, we find no evidence of significant effects on labor force participation. However, our evidence suggests that the quotas reduced the proportion of women employed in childcare, particularly among younger workers, leading to an aging childcare workforce. This led to an overall

increase in the ratio of children to childcare workers. Furthermore, there were significant declines in the probability of entering this labor sector among younger cohorts of native-born and foreign-born workers. This shift combined with the aging of childcare workers likely reduced the availability of childcare and raised its costs, exacerbating the logistical and economic challenges of child-rearing for families.

By examining this period of rapid policy change, our findings shed light on the broader implications of immigration restrictions for family formation and population dynamics. Immigration restrictions are often viewed as a policy targeting population growth, reducing it by shrinking the number of people entering an economy from other countries. Our results suggest that the changes in local economies and population dynamics these policies induce may further impact demographic trends. The quotas not only reshaped the immigrant population but also indirectly influenced the demographic fabric of the U.S.

Our study contributes to several strands of literature on the economic and demographic effects of immigration. First, it builds on the growing body of work examining the Age of Mass Migration, a period characterized by significant inflows of European immigrants to the United States. Studies such as Lafortune et al. (2019), Pérez (2019), Eriksson (2020), and Abramitzky and Boustan (2022) have documented the profound impacts of immigration on economic development and assimilation during this era. Ager and Hansen (2017), for example, explore the economic benefits of immigration, noting that it led to increased marriage rates among natives. While these studies primarily focus on the positive effects of immigration, our research examines the reverse dynamic: how the immigration quotas of the 1920s—designed to restrict inflows—reshaped native demographic behavior. By analyzing marriage and fertility patterns in response to these restrictive policies, we extend this literature to understand how the absence of immigration can disrupt demographic stability and family formation.

We also complement prior work by exploring the nuanced labor market dynamics that accompanied these demographic shifts. Tabellini (2020) examines how the economic growth

spurred by immigration contributed to political backlash but stops short of delving deeply into the implications for family outcomes. Our study addresses this gap by linking the decline in immigration directly to changes in fertility and marriage patterns, particularly highlighting the critical role of childcare labor markets. Unlike studies that attribute demographic changes to alterations in sex ratios (e.g., Angrist, 2002), we emphasize how declines in the supply of childcare workers—particularly younger ones—exacerbated the economic and logistical challenges of childrearing, leading to a fertility decline.

Additionally, our findings align with research exploring the interplay between labor markets and family dynamics. For example, Autor et al. (2019) study the negative effects of trade-induced employment shocks on marriage and fertility, highlighting how economic downturns can reduce family formation. Our study shows a similar disruption, albeit caused by restrictive immigration policy rather than trade. The contrast between these contexts underscores how changes in labor supply—whether through immigration or trade—can ripple through the economy, affecting demographic outcomes in distinct ways. Furthermore, while recent work has documented how immigration supports childcare availability and facilitates greater female labor force participation (e.g., Furtado and Hock, 2010; Furtado, 2016), we highlight how the loss of immigrant labor creates the opposite effect, disproportionately impacting young families and contributing to fertility declines.

The closest work to our study is Carlana and Tabellini (2023), who use a traditional shift-share design to examine immigration during the Age of Mass Migration (1910–1940), with 1900 population shares as a base year. They demonstrate how immigration boosted native demographic behavior, increasing marriage and fertility by expanding economic opportunities for native men. Building on their insights, we investigate the reverse dynamic: how immigration restrictions, introduced by the Quota Acts of the 1920s, disrupted these patterns. Our empirical design leverages exogenous variation from the quotas, employing a shift-share-inspired approach where the "shift" reflects the degree of constraint on immigrant flows. This approach isolates the causal effects of immigration restrictions on native

demographic and labor market outcomes, particularly the declines in marriage and fertility among young women. Our findings extend the literature by emphasizing how labor market disruptions—such as reductions in childcare availability—amplified the logistical challenges of family formation. Together, this evidence underscores the dual role of immigration as both a driver of demographic and economic stability and a source of disruption when restricted.

By focusing on the demographic consequences of restrictive immigration policy, our study extends the literature beyond the economic impacts of migration to explore the broader social and family-level implications of reduced immigrant inflows. This perspective is particularly relevant for understanding how immigration policy can shape population dynamics and labor market structures, with enduring consequences for societal well-being.

The current debate on immigration policy continues to echo the tensions of the 1920s, as concerns over labor markets, cultural integration, and demographic change shape discussions on restrictive measures. Recent research underscores how immigration plays a vital role in sustaining workforce stability, particularly in sectors like childcare that are critical for family formation. Furtado (2016) and Furtado and Hock (2010) highlight how immigrant labor bolsters childcare availability, facilitating higher female labor force participation and easing fertility constraints. In contrast, policies that restrict immigration risk exacerbating childcare shortages, increasing the cost of childrearing, and potentially contributing to declining birth rates—a pattern with long-term economic and demographic consequences. As nations grapple with aging populations and labor shortages, understanding the unintended effects of immigration restrictions remains crucial for shaping policies that balance economic growth with demographic stability.

2 Data

We used data drawn from the IPUMS Full Count data from the 1900, 1910, 1920, and 1930 decennial censuses to calculate all demographic and socioeconomic characteristics, treatment

values, and marriage- and fertility-related outcomes used. Analysis is based on a balanced panel of counties in the United States with an existing immigrant population in 1900. Marriage, household status, and fertility outcomes are constructed using survey questions and information about household structure available in each census.

Across counties, there is significant variation in the size of the populations of interest. The main populations of interest, men aged 20-35 and women aged 18-33, range from just 27 women and 61 men in Weston County, Wyoming to 176,830 women and 166,294 men in Cook County, Illinois, in 1900. Nationally, these cohorts of women are more likely to have ever been married than men, 58% versus 52%, and live with their parents, 35% versus 31%. A significant percentage of these men are heads of independent households, 47%, and a slightly smaller fraction are homeowners as well, 39%. Interestingly, women are slightly more likely than men to be homeowners, 43%, so, though they are less likely to reside outside of their parents' household, they appear to be in a more secure position when doing so. These patterns highlight the significance of housing availability in marriage and household formation decision-making.

To better understand fertility patterns in this setting and changes driven by policy exposure, decennial census data is used to identify parents in the population of interest and their children. As in Carlana and Tabellini (2024), our analysis examines changes in the rates of parenthood, the ratio of children to parents, and the ratio of children to all adults. Across these measures, we observe slightly higher rates of fertility than they do (this is due to the incorporation of rural areas in our analysis with the proceeding paper focusing on cities). Women are more likely to have a child than men, 43% versus 34%. The ratio of children to parents is higher women among than men, 2.34 to 2.10. The ratio of children (of members of the population of interest) to adults is higher among women than men (1.03 to 0.74) as well.

To understand how childcare availability might have played a role in fertility changes, decennial census data is used to examine changes in private household employment over

time. Female labor force participants make up a minority of the population among women aged 18-33 and women aged 34 or older, 27% and 16%. Among women working, private household employment is a common occupation. Among female workers aged 18-33, 27% were in employed in private household positions in 1900. While 20% of workers older than 34 work in these positions. There is virtually no difference between the rates at which native-born or foreign-born women aged 34 or older are employed in private household work. Among those aged 18-33, foreign-born workers are almost 50% more likely to be employed in this work than their native-born peers. 38% of foreign-born workers and 26% of native-born female workers aged 18-33 are employed in this sector. The ratio of children to childcare workers is lower among younger workers than older (74.3 children to worker aged 18-33 versus 171.5 children to worker aged ≥ 34).

The treatment variable, quota exposure, is calculated by combining the initial shares of each national origin within the foreign-born community with nation-specific quota exposures calculated by Abramitzky et al (2023). In its simplest form, each nation-specific exposure is calculated as a dummy variable indicating whether immigration from a country was constrained by the 1924 quotas. The treatment is the sum of the shares of each origin multiplied by the exposure measure.

$$QE_c = \sum_o \frac{Foreign\ Pop._{1900,o}}{Total\ Foreign\ Pop._{1900}} \times \mathbf{1}\{Constrained_o\}$$

where c indexes the county, o indexes the origin country, and $\mathbf{1}\{Constrained_o\}$ is an indicator for whether immigration flows from country o faced a binding constraint after the 1920s policy changes. The quota exposure treatment of this form is referred to as $QE1$ hereafter. This quota exposure measure can be interpreted as indicating what percentage of the foreign-born community in an area were of national origins facing binding constraints.

Alternative treatment variables are based off of Abramitzky et al. (2023)'s definitions

and are termed $QE2$ and $QE3$ moving forward. The preferred treatment measure is $QE3$. In these measures, the indicator variable is replaced with a value representing the percentage of immigration flows constrained under varying counterfactual assumptions, $QI_{o,2}$ and $QI_{o,3}$. $QE2$ assumes that immigration in the period from 1922 to 1929 would have been the same as 1902 to 1909. $QE3$ calculates counterfactual flows in the 1920s based off of separate time trend regression for each national origin. For a specific origin country, this is calculated as the difference between projected counterfactual flows and quota slots assigned in the 1920s, normalized by counterfactual flows; this sets quota intensity equal to zero if the quota slots given are greater than projected flows and the measure increases to one as greater shares of the projected flows are constrained from entry.

3 Empirical Specification

This paper follows the identification strategy of Abramitzky et al. (2019) and Ager et al. (2024) to analyze the impact of quota policies on fertility outcomes. We, first, examine the effect of exposure to these policies on fertility rates among the working-age population, followed by an exploration of sub-populations and subsets of counties to better understand variations across demographic groups. Additionally, alternative fertility-related outcomes are examined.

The analysis employs a difference-in-differences (DiD) framework, with counties observed at ten-year intervals during the decennial census. The estimating equation is as follows:

$$Y_{ct} = \alpha_c + \delta_t + PT_t \times QE_c\beta + PT_t \times X'_{c,t=1900}\lambda + \epsilon_{ct}, \tag{1}$$

where: Y_{ct} is the dependent variable, representing fertility rates in county c at time t; α_c and δ_t are county and year fixed effects, respectively; QE_c is the quota exposure calculated for county c; $X'_{c,t=1900}$ is a vector of pre-treatment controls for county c from the year 1900; PT_t is a dummy variable indicating the post-treatment period; ϵ_{ct} represents the residuals.

The dependent variable, Y_{ct}, is the differenced outcome for women aged 18-33 and men aged 20-35 across counties. Pre-treatment controls, including the share of the foreign-born population in 1900, are interacted with the post-treatment dummy to allow for non-constant trends over time. Fixed effects for counties and years are included. With a differenced outcome, these fixed effects demean the outcome by the average change in that location over the whole time period. Results use heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors clustered at the county level, and observations are weighted by their 1900 population.

4 Results

Table 1 presents the coefficients estimating the effect of quota policy exposure on changes in marriage rates for men and women. We find that the introduction of quotas induced a 4% decline in the marriage rate among men and a 10% decline among women. When breaking down the results by age, our findings reveal that quota exposure significantly reduced marriage rates, among younger cohorts of women. Examining the impact on household structure, we find that the policy increased homeownership by 15% (Table 2), but also the likelihood of living in a multi-generational household.

Table 3 examines the impact of quota exposure on fertility outcomes, including changes in parenthood status and child-to-parent and child-to-adult ratios. The results provide nuanced insights into how immigration restrictions influenced demographic behavior through fertility. The policy exposure significantly reduced the likelihood of parenthood for women (-7%). Interestingly, for men the effects are less pronounced, with no statistically significant change in parenthood status across any age group.

The child-to-parent and child-to-adult ratios reveal additional dynamics. Policy exposure, if anything, increased the child-to-parent ratio for both men and women, suggesting that while fewer individuals became parents, those who did had more children on average. While this finding is not precisely estimated in the overall sample, it is significant when examining

older parents. There is instead a decline in the child-adult ratio among women (-15%), largely driven by the decline in fertility among women younger than 25 years old.

To examine the mechanisms through which the policy may affect fertility, we looked at female labor force participation and childcare availability. The results indicate no significant effects on female labor force participation (Table 4), suggesting that the policy did not substantially alter women's engagement in the workforce. However, a notable finding was a significant decline in childcare availability, measured by an 80% increase in the ratio of children to individuals employed in childcare occupations (Table 5). This sharp increase suggests that the policy may have strained the childcare sector, reducing the capacity to meet growing demands. The reduced availability of childcare could create additional barriers for parents, particularly mothers, in balancing work and caregiving responsibilities, potentially influencing fertility decisions by making childcare access more challenging and costly. Table 6 illustrates the decline in the share of childcare employment. Interestingly, this is driven by younger workers. The aging of the childcare workforce may have further contributed to the increase in the cost of childcare.

5 Conclusion

This study provides novel evidence on how restrictive immigration policies can shape demographic behavior beyond direct labor market effects. By analyzing the U.S. immigration quotas of the 1920s, we demonstrate that these policies significantly reduced marriage and fertility rates among native-born Americans, particularly young women. Our findings suggest that the decline in immigration disrupted traditional patterns of family formation, leading to an overall net decline in fertility despite a compensatory increase in children per mother among those who did have children.

One key mechanism behind these demographic shifts was the impact of immigration restrictions on the childcare labor market. The quotas led to a decline in the availability

of younger childcare workers, increasing the child-to-caregiver ratio and likely raising the cost and logistical challenges of childrearing. These changes compounded existing barriers to family formation, further depressing fertility rates among young women.

Our results contribute to the broader literature on the economic and demographic consequences of immigration by highlighting how restrictive policies can indirectly shape native population dynamics. While prior work has emphasized the positive effects of immigration on economic growth and workforce stability, our study underscores the reverse: the absence of immigration can create demographic and labor market disruptions with lasting societal consequences.

As modern immigration debates continue to mirror those of the early 20th century, our findings provide important insights into the unintended consequences of restrictive policies. In the context of aging populations and labor shortages in critical sectors like childcare, understanding the demographic ripple effects of immigration policy remains crucial for informing future policymaking.

Table 1: Quota Exposure and Marriage

	Men (aged 20-35)	Women (aged 18-33)
	Dep. Var.: Δ Married %	
Policy Exposure$\times$	-0.028^{***}	-0.061^{***}
$(1920 - 1930)$	(0.010)	(0.008)
Mean of DV	0.52	0.58
Std. dev. of DV	0.100	0.089
Adjusted R^2	0.23	0.29
County FE	Yes	Yes
Controls	Yes	Yes
N	5,264	5,282

Notes: This table presents the coefficients from regressions following the empirical specification described. The dependent variable is the change in the marriage rate of the indicated demographic group over the following decade. The sample consists of a balanced set of counties with an immigrant population in 1900. Every county is observed twice, once from from 1900 to 1910 and then from 1920 to 1930. Observations are population-weighted. In parentheses, heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors, clustered by county, are reported. Significance levels: 90%, ** 95%, *** 99%.

Table 2: Quota Exposure and Living Arrangements

	Men (aged 20-35)			Women (aged 18-33)	
	Homeowner %	Own HH %	Parents' HH	Homeowner %	Parents' HH
Policy Exposure ×	0.060***	0.014	0.035**	0.073***	0.068***
(1920 − 1930)	(0.008)	(0.012)	(0.014)	(0.012)	(0.013)
Mean of dep. var.	0.392	0.467	0.307	0.43	0.35
Std. dev. of dep. var.	0.144	0.096	0.082	0.145	0.074
Adjusted R^2	0.28	0.17	0.30	0.27	0.32
County FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
N	5,264	5,264	5,264	5,282	5,282

Notes: This table presents the coefficients from regressions following the empirical specification described. The dependent variables examined are calculated as the percentage of 18-33 year old women and 20-35 year old men who live with their parents, are head of a household, or are a homeowner. The sample consists of a balanced set of counties with an immigrant population in 1900. Every county is observed twice, once from from 1900 to 1910 and then from 1920 to 1930. Observations are population-weighted. In parentheses, heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors, clustered by county, are reported. Significance levels: 90%, ** 95%, *** 99%.

Table 3: Quota Exposure and Fertility

	Men (aged 20-35)	Women (aged 18-33)
	Dep. Var.: Δ Mother/Father %	
Policy Exposure×	−0.002	−0.028***
(1920 − 1930)	(0.010)	(0.008)
Mean of DV	0.34	0.43
Std. dev. of DV	0.093	0.086
Adjusted R^2	0.13	0.10
	Dep. Var.: Δ Child-Parent Ratio	
Policy Exposure×	0.041	0.034
(1920 − 1930)	(0.026)	(0.024)
Mean of DV	2.10	2.34
Std. dev. of DV	0.263	0.302
Adjusted R^2	0.17	0.28
	Dep. Var.: Δ Child-Adult Ratio	
Policy Exposure×	0.003	−0.048**
(1920 − 1930)	(0.024)	(0.032)
Mean of DV	0.74	1.03
Std. dev. of DV	0.293	0.335
Adjusted R^2	0.12	0.17
County FE	Yes	Yes
Controls	Yes	Yes
N	5,264	5,282

Notes: This table presents the coefficients from regressions following the empirical specification described. The dependent variable in Panel A is the change in percentage of women aged 18-33 (men aged 20-33) who are mothers (fathers). The dependent variable in Panel B is calculated as the change in ratio of children of women aged 18-33 (men aged 20-33) divided by the number of mothers aged 18-33 (fathers aged 20-33) . The depended variable in Panel C is the change in ratio of children of women aged 18-33 (men aged 20-33) divided by the number of women aged 18-33 (men aged 20-33). The sample consists of a balanced set of counties with an immigrant population in 1900. Every county is observed from 1900 to 1910 and 1920 to 1930. Observations are population-weighted. In parentheses, robust standard errors, clustered by county, are reported. Significance levels: 90%, ** 95%, *** 99%.

Table 4: Quota Exposure and Women's LFPR

Dep. Var.: ΔWomen's LFPR		
	Aged 18-33	Aged ≥ 34
Policy Exposure×	0.017	−0.009
(1920 − 1930)	(0.018)	(0.015)
Mean of DV	0.27	0.16
Std. dev. of DV	0.103	0.090
Adjusted R^2	0.16	0.24
County FE	Yes	Yes
Controls	Yes	Yes
N	2,318	2,318

Notes: This table presents the coefficients from regressions following the empirical specification described. The dependent variable is the change in the labor force participation rate of the sample population. The sample consists of a balanced set of counties with an immigrant population in 1900. Every county is observed twice, once from from 1900 to 1910 and then from 1920 to 1930. Observations are population-weighted. In parentheses, heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors, clustered by county, are reported. Significance levels: 90%, ** 95%, *** 99%.

Table 5: Quota Exposure and Childcare Availability

Dep. Var.: ΔChild-childcare worker ratio		
	Aged 18-33	Aged ≥ 34
Policy Exposure×	28.67***	−4.56
(1920 − 1930)	(9.97)	(26.94)
Mean of DV	74.3	171.5
Std. dev. of DV	199.0	400.4
Adjusted R^2	0.06	0.17
County FE	Yes	Yes
Controls	Yes	Yes
N	2,318	2,318

Notes: This table presents the coefficients from regressions following the empirical specification described. The dependent variable is the change the number of children in a county divided by the number of childcare workers observed in the census. The sample consists of a balanced set of counties with an immigrant population in 1900. Every county is observed twice, once from from 1900 to 1910 and then from 1920 to 1930. Observations are population-weighted. In parentheses, heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors, clustered by county, are reported. Significance levels: 90%, ** 95%, *** 99%.

Table 6: Quota Exposure and Childcare Sector Employment

	All		Native-born		Foreign-born	
	Aged 18-33	Aged $\geq$ 34	Aged 18-33	Aged $\geq$ 34	Aged 18-33	Aged $\geq$ 34
	Dep. Var.: Δ Childcare employment share					
Policy Exposure$\times$	-0.125^{***}	-0.060^{***}	-0.091^{***}	-0.053^{***}	-0.091^{*}	0.018
$(1920 - 1930)$	(0.022)	(0.020)	(0.022)	(0.027)	(0.050)	(0.042)
Mean of DV	0.27	0.20	0.26	0.20	0.38	0.20
Std. dev. of DV	0.136	0.110	0.136	0.116	0.270	0.191
Adjusted R^2	0.31	0.35	0.15	0.26	0.13	0.39
County FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
N	2,318	2,318	2,318	2,318	2,318	2,318

Notes: This table presents the coefficients from regressions following the empirical specification described. The dependent variable is the change change in the share of each sample population's labor force participants employed in private household work. The sample consists of a balanced set of counties with an immigrant population in 1900. Every county is observed twice, once from from 1900 to 1910 and then from 1920 to 1930. Observations are population-weighted. In parentheses, heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors, clustered by county, are reported. Significance levels: 90%, ** 95%, *** 99%.

Appendix

Table A.1: Quota Exposure and Marriage, by Age

	Men			Women		
	Aged $20-27$	Aged $28-35$	Aged >36	Aged $18-25$	Aged $26-33$	Aged >34
	Dep. Var.: Δ Married %					
Policy Exposure$\times(1920-1930)$	-0.018^{**}	-0.009	-0.026^{***}	-0.070^{***}	-0.025^{***}	-0.019^{***}
	(0.008)	(0.012)	(0.008)	(0.010)	(0.007)	(0.004)
Mean of dep. var.	0.278	0.660	0.875	0.495	0.832	0.931
Std. dev. of dep. var.	0.105	0.114	0.077	0.110	0.071	0.040
County FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
N	5,264	5,264	5,264	5,282	5,282	5,282

Notes: This table presents the coefficients from regressions following the empirical specification described. The dependent variable is the change in the marriage rate of the indicated demographic group over the following decade. The sample consists of a balanced set of counties with an immigrant population in 1900. Every county is observed from 1900 to 1910 and 1920 to 1930. Observations are population-weighted. In parentheses, robust standard errors, clustered by county, are reported. Significance levels: 90%, ** 95%, *** 99%.

Table A.2: Quota Exposure and Fertility, by Age

	Men			Women		
	Aged $20-27$	Aged $28-35$	Aged >36	Aged $18-25$	Aged $26-33$	Aged >34
	Dep. Var.: Δ Mother/Father %					
Policy Exposure$\times(1920-1930)$	-0.002	0.019	-0.013	-0.028^{***}	-0.002	-0.022^{***}
	(0.006)	(0.012)	(0.010)	(0.008)	(0.010)	(0.006)
Mean of dep. var.	0.152	0.493	0.710	0.343	0.705	0.770
Std. dev. of dep. var.	0.072	0.122	0.112	0.095	0.095	0.078
	Dep. Var.: Δ Child-Parent Ratio					
Policy Exposure$\times(1920-1930)$	0.024	0.061^{**}	0.129^{***}	0.012	0.064^{**}	0.081^{***}
	(0.032)	(0.027)	(0.028)	(0.023)	(0.028)	(0.031)
Mean of dep. var.	1.56	2.33	3.53	1.87	2.97	3.46
Std. dev. of dep. var.	0.234	0.324	0.611	0.212	0.472	0.568
	Dep. Var.: Δ Child-Adult Ratio					
Policy Exposure$\times(1920-1930)$	-0.007	0.065^{**}	0.049	-0.046^{***}	0.035	0.000
	(0.010)	(0.027)	(0.032)	(0.015)	(0.032)	(0.029)
Mean of dep. var.	0.24	1.17	2.55	0.655	2.13	2.69
Std. dev. of dep. var.	0.135	0.423	0.747	0.234	0.567	0.641
County FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
N	5,264	5,264	5,264	5,282	5,282	5,282

Notes: This table presents the coefficients from regressions following the empirical specification described. The dependent variable in Panel A is the change in percentage of women (men) who are mothers (fathers). The dependent variable in Panel B is calculated as the change in ratio of children of women (men) divided by the number of mothers (fathers) . The depended variable in Panel C is the change in ratio of children of women (men) divided by the number of women (men). The sample consists of a balanced set of counties with an immigrant population in 1900. Every county is observed from 1900 to 1910 and 1920 to 1930. Observations are population-weighted. In parentheses, robust standard errors, clustered by county, are reported. Significance levels: 90%, ** 95%, *** 99%.