

NBER WORKING PAPER SERIES

FAMILY EFFECTS IN YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

Albert Rees

Wayne Gray

Working Paper No. 396

NATIONAL BUREAU OF ECONOMIC RESEARCH
1050 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge MA 02138

October 1979

Family Effects in Youth Employment

ABSTRACT

The authors begin with the hypothesis that parental contacts play a major role in finding jobs for youth. This hypothesis is tested with a model of youth employment that includes characteristics of other family members in addition to a large set of control variables. Particular attention is paid to parental characteristics that might indicate a parent's ability to assist the youth in finding a job, including occupation, industry and education. The effects of such variables are generally not significant and do not support the initial hypothesis. However, the employment probability of a youth is significantly affected by the presence of employed siblings, indicating the presence of some intrafamily effects.

Albert Rees
The Alfred P. Sloan Foundation
630 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10020
212/582-0450

Wayne Gray
National Bureau of Economic Research
1050 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02138
617/868-3909

FAMILY EFFECTS IN YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

Albert Rees and Wayne Gray

National Bureau of Economic Research

I. Introduction

Youth unemployment can be decomposed into two principal components. One of these arises from the high turnover of young people. As Baily and Tobin have written: "Much teenage unemployment, it is often observed, comes from dissatisfaction with the available job options, a gap between expectations or aspirations and the realities of low wages and poor working conditions. One consequence is high turnover. Even when jobs are available, therefore, unemployment is high."¹

The second component arises from the shortage of jobs. As Clark and Summers point out, "The substantial cyclic response to changes in aggregate demand suggests that a shortage of job opportunities characterizes the youth labor market."² This second component is, of course, larger during recessions. The data used in this study, described in the next section, refer to 1975 and the early part of 1976, when unemployment was still quite high. The unemployment rate for the whole civilian labor force was above 7 percent throughout this period and rates for young workers (16 to 19 years old) were above 18 percent. The component representing demand deficiency at current

We are indebted to Richard Freeman and T. Aldrich Finegan for helpful comments and suggestions. The research reported here is part of the NBER's research program in labor studies. Any opinions expressed are those of the authors and not those of the National Bureau of Economic Research. This research was supported by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation.

¹Martin Neil Baily and James Tobin, "Inflation-Unemployment Consequences of Job Creation Policies," in John L. Palmer, ed., Creating Jobs: Public Employment Programs and Wage Subsidies (Washington: Brookings, 1978), p.61

²Kim B. Clark and Lawrence H. Summers, "The Dynamics of Youth Unemployment", NBER Working Paper No. 274, p.52

wage rates, rather than turnover, must therefore have been substantial.

The existence of demand deficiency unemployment of youth has an implication that we seek to test: If there is a shortage of jobs for young workers at prevailing wages, then there must be one or more nonprice rationing mechanisms that determine which young people get the available jobs. Our special hypothesis is that the family of the young person furnishes such a mechanism; those young people get jobs whose parents or siblings have jobs, particularly jobs in which they can influence hiring decisions. Some support for this view can be found in earlier studies of the labor-force participation of young people. Bowen and Finegan, who found that after controlling for other forces the labor-force participation of married women falls with husband's income, were surprised to find that the adjusted labor-force participation rate of males 14 to 17 in school in urban areas in 1960 rose through the range of other family income between \$4,000 and \$11,000. In seeking to explain this, they wrote "We suspect that part of the explanation turns on the comparative advantage that youngsters in these families have in finding part-time jobs. For one thing, their parents are more frequently able to help, mainly as a result of their business and social contacts."³ Robert Lerman found significant effects of parent's occupation on the employment of youth, using dummy variables for broad occupational categories. In particular, he found that having a parent who is a white collar worker, either salaried or self-employed, or a farm manager significantly increases

³William G. Bowen and T. Aldrich Finegan, The Economics of Labor Force Participation, (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1969)p.387.

the probability of employment relative to having one who is a low-level blue collar worker.⁴

It should be noted that giving assistance in finding work is clearly not the only way in which family members can influence the employment prospects of young people. Much education takes place in the home so that youths who have well-educated parents and who have been exposed to books and to serious discussion while growing up may have advantages in finding and holding jobs over other youths with the same amount of formal schooling. Moreover, families have expectations about how their members should behave. Young people whose families expect them to go to work for whatever reason (cultural, religious, or economic) are more likely to be employed than young people whose families do not have this expectation. We shall refer to such expectations as a work ethic.

It follows that a variety of variables measuring different aspects of the family and its members might have some discernable effect on estimates of employment probabilities. In addition to family income, these could include education, occupation, and location. (The work ethic might be stronger in some regions or areas than in others).

We set out to test the hypothesis that parental contacts assist youth in finding jobs. Our results show no significant effects of parental characteristics on youth employment. We do, however, find significant effects of the employment status of siblings, which indicates the presence of some sort of intrafamily interactions.

⁴Robert Lerman, "Analysis of Youth Labor Force Participation, School Activity and Employment Rate", unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1970.

II. The Data Set

The results presented in this paper are from the cross-sectional data set called the "Survey of Income and Education", collected in the spring of 1976 (April through July). The full sample is a national stratified probability sample of households in which 151,000 households were interviewed. This makes the sample roughly three times the size of the Current Population Survey. The interview includes most of the information available from CPS interviews, plus a good deal of additional detail on sources of 1975 income and on education.

We have analyzed data for men and women aged 17 to 20 living in nonfarm households where they are the children of the head. This excludes those young people who have moved out of their parents' household to live by themselves or establish their own families. The group that was 17 to 20 in 1976 was 16 to 19 in 1975, and one of our dependent variables measures work experience in 1975. Using the ages 17 to 20 in 1976 rather than 16 to 19 also gives us a less unequal division of the sample between those in school and those not in school.

The distinction made here between those in school and those not in school is based on whether or not the person had attended school since February, 1976. The alternative of using major activity in the survey reference week is only viable for those observations collected in April and May, since many June and July observations were collected during school vacations.

The regressions presented in the next section are based on a data file we have created that merges observations on the young person with observations on household income and individual data on other members of the household 16 years of age and older. This individual data includes sex, age, schooling status, employment status and relationship to the

young person. Additional data is used on the head of household (one of the youth's parents), including industry, occupation and years of education. These, it was felt, could help to measure the likelihood of the parent having contacts that would help the youth get a job.

III. Regression Results

We have been persuaded by the work of Clark and Summers, among others, that for young people the distinction between being unemployed and being out of the labor force is not always meaningful, since the boundary between these states is so blurred. Accordingly, we use several measures of employment as our dependent variables. The two measures shown here are: (a) estimated total hours worked last year (the product of weeks worked and usual hours per week) and (b) a dichotomous variable taking the value of one if the teenager was employed in the survey reference week. We also used weeks worked last year and a dichotomous variable indicating unemployment in the survey reference week as dependent variables, but the results are not presented here. The regressions using weeks worked give similar results to those using total hours worked but the fits are not quite as good. The regressions using unemployment fit very poorly for in school youth. For out of school youth all significant coefficients in the employment regression have the opposite sign in the unemployment regression, though the fit is again poor.

Each model was estimated separately for males and females in and out of school. We chose to treat the decision to attend school as given, rather than as jointly endogenous with the decision to work, in order to simplify estimation. The means for many variables differ substantially across the subsets, especially for the dependent variables.

The differences are most striking between in and out of school youth, with out of school youth showing stronger ties to the labor force: over one-third more employment and unemployment and twice as many hours worked last year as in school youth. The coefficients obtained in the separate estimations are also quite different for in and out of school youth, ruling out any attempt to capture the effects of school attendance with a dummy variable. The split between male and female shows less conclusive differences, although the effects of some of the control variables (notably marriage) do vary substantially between groups.

Table 1 gives the means and standard deviations of all variables for each of the four subsets used. Table 2 shows our estimates of the determinants of estimated hours worked last year. We used a tobit technique to allow for the presence of people who did not work in 1975 and hence have zero hours observed. Table 3 shows the corresponding estimates of the determinants of employment in the reference week, using a probit technique to allow for the dichotomous nature of the dependent variable. Tables 2A and 3A simply involve rescaling the tobit and probit coefficients to correspond to ordinary least squares coefficients for easier interpretation.

In general, we get significant effects (at the 5 percent level) for variables measuring schooling, race, being in a female-headed household, and being in a poverty area. We also estimate significant effects for the employment status of siblings, but generally not for the employment status of the head.

Schooling

Since we are dealing with people whose schooling has often not been completed, we measure years of school completed relative to the mean for all people of the same age in the main SIE sample. The variable

"Education gap 1" measures the number of years above the overall mean for those who are above. "Education gap 2" measures the number of years below the overall mean for those below. Having less education than the average of one's age group lowers employment significantly in all eight regressions.

The three negative signs on "Education gap 1" in Table 2 seem to be an anomaly arising because those people with more education than their age group had a greater than average probability of being in school last year. In Table 3, where the schooling status and dependent variables both refer to the same year, the signs on "Education gap 1" are all positive.

Income

A second set of variables explored measures family income. The one used here, other family income, is the income of the household in 1975 minus the earnings of the young person whose behavior is being measured. This has no significant effect on employment in the reference week. For those in school its effect on total hours worked last year is mixed, while it is significantly positive for those who are not in school. In earlier work we used a number of additional variables indicating whether the household received income in 1975 from various kinds of transfer payments. At some stages of our work, a few of these variables showed significant negative effects on some measures of youth employment. However, they did not remain significant in the presence of the other variables included in the final model.

Geographical variables

A third set of variables deals with various geographic aspects of the labor market. The data set places observations in one of nine regions of the country. We have included a set of eight regional dummy variables in all regressions as control variables, and there are always

some significant differences in youth employment by region. Variables indicating whether or not the household lived in an SMSA or in the central city of an SMSA were not significant. The final model includes a dummy variable taking the value of one if the household lives in an area designated by the Census Bureau as a poverty area. In our sample 12 to 13 percent of youth in school and 17 to 18 percent of youth not in school lived in such areas. This variable has an effect that is consistently negative and usually clearly significant. For youths in school of both sexes, living in a poverty area reduces the probability of employment by 10 percent, other things equal. Since other family income and race appear in the regressions, this should probably be interpreted as measuring the availability of job opportunities in the locality.⁵

We also tried using a variable measuring the total unemployment rate in the SMSA for SMSA's that could be identified in the data set. The unemployment rate was taken from a published external source (Department of Labor estimates for May, 1976) and merged into the data set. Only about one-third of our observations were in areas for which we could use this information. The variable did not have a significant effect even in regressions confined to observations for which the variable could be used. We might have gotten better results by generating unemployment rates by area for spring 1976 from our own data set. However, this would have required processing data on all households; we have used only households including youth.

Race

We have used two variables to identify youth by race, dummy variables identifying blacks and Hispanics. Both are consistently

⁵An alternative explanation for this result lies in environmental characteristics common to poverty areas other than lack of jobs, such as low quality education and limited motivation.

negative and usually significant with the effect of being black being generally substantially larger than that of being Hispanic. For regressions whose dependent variable is "employed last week", being black lowers the probability of employment by 17 to 25 percent even after controlling for schooling, other family income, and location in a poverty area. For youth not in school, in Table 2, negative coefficients on the variable identifying blacks are about one-half the size of the mean of the dependent variable. With other measured variables equal, we estimate that black youth not in school worked half as many hours in 1975 as white youth. We also duplicated our analysis with regressions run using only observations on blacks. The results (not reported here) tend to be similar, with less consistency of coefficients between subsamples and lower significance levels, probably due to the large reduction in sample size.

We have tried using a variable measuring whether or not the principal language spoken in the household is English; this is less successful than the variable identifying Hispanics.

Family influences

When we started our research, we expected to find powerful influences of the position of the head of the household on the employment status of youth living at home. The effects we find are much weaker than we expected. Living in a household with a female head has a negative effect in seven of eight regressions, and a significant one in four. Living in a household with a self-employed male head generally has a positive effect, but this is significant only once at the 5 percent level and twice at the 10 percent level for employment and hours worked last year. The effect on unemployment is consistently negative and generally significant.

Sets of dummy variables identifying male heads who were not employed and the major industry or occupation of the employed male heads performed very poorly. So did an index of three-digit occupations scaled by median income in the occupation in 1969. Education of the male head was tried and entered with a negative sign -- that is, it acted like an index of permanent income rather than a measure of access to jobs.

Our second set of variables measuring family effects identifies the employment status of siblings between the ages of 16 and 24 who are in the household, using a set of eight dummy variables. Within this large set, there are four subsets, for older brother, older sister, younger brother, and younger sister.⁶ In each of these subsets, there are two dummy variables, e.g. "older brother not employed" and "older brother employed;" the base or omitted variable of the subset is "no older brother living at home." If the person to whom the independent variable refers has more than one sibling between the ages of 16 and 24 living at home, there may be entries of 1 rather than 0 in more than one of these dummy categories. For a person with two older brothers, for example, one employed and one not employed, both dummies in the older brother subset take the value 1.

Employment decisions within the household are presumably made simultaneously, and our single equation model does not permit us to analyze the simultaneity. If we have an observation on a youth named John who is employed and he has an older brother named Fred who is also employed, we detect the associations, but we cannot tell whether John found Fred a job, Fred found John a job, or both were subject to some common parental or environmental influence that increased the

⁶This scheme of classifying siblings by sex and birth-order was suggested by the work of Claudia Goldin on the employment of youth in Philadelphia in 1880.

probability of their being employed. It should also be noted that if both of them are between 17 and 20, observations for both will appear somewhere in our regressions with many (though not all) of the independent variables being identical. However, the scheme should permit us to separate the effects of job contacts and the family's work ethic from income effects by examining the signs of the coefficients. The income effect of Fred's working on the probability that John will work is presumably negative.

As shown in Tables 2 and 3, the positive association of employment status among siblings is very strong. For males in school, having an employed sibling significantly increases the dependent variable in seven of eight cases in the two tables. Having a sibling not employed significantly decreases the dependent variable in all eight cases. For females and males not in school the effects are not always significant, though the signs are almost always the same. Some of the effects for females are also quite large. For example, other measured variables held constant, having a younger brother employed increases the chances of a female in school being employed by 15 percent, or increases her estimated hours worked last year by .87 relative to a mean of 400.

The differences in coefficients for siblings of different sexes may support the interpretation that the sibling variables reflect information networks in the labor market, rather than local job availability or parental influence. Because many occupations or industries still employ workers predominantly of one sex, a youth may be better able to help a sibling of the same sex find work. The differences in coefficients may also arise from stronger demonstration effects or closer personal relationships between siblings of the same sex.

The pattern of differences in coefficients is clearest for youth not in school in Table 2. For a female in school, the

sister employed increases estimated hours last year by 173 hours, but the effect of a younger brother employed is only 21. For a male, having a younger brother employed increases estimated hours last year by 178, but the effect of a younger sister employed is only 80. In both cases the larger figure is clearly significant at the 5 percent level and the smaller is not.

One further refinement of the sibling dummies was used, splitting each dummy into two dummies for the sibling being in and out of school. Besides giving an unwieldy number of coefficients to interpret, the expanded set of dummies showed few differences in coefficients based on school status. Thus we chose to use only those sibling dummies presented here in the final model.

As mentioned above, these results can only be viewed as suggestive because the family's work ethic is not distinguishable from its job contacts. One possible area for future research would involve comparing the detailed occupation and industry of each youth with those of his parents or siblings. A high correlation could indicate the presence of helpful contacts made by relatives on the job. Another approach could be to examine some other data sets to check for consistency of the basic results and to add further explanatory variables, such as the presence of reading materials during childhood, that could capture more of the unobserved part of family background. In this regard one could consult data sets that ask how the respondent found his job (or why he in particular was hired after applying).

One final alternate approach requires a different estimation technique, presented by Gray Chamberlain.⁷ This would use analysis of covariance, with each set of siblings representing a different group for comparing the within-group to the between-group variation. Some complications result from the different numbers of observations across groups and the need to use non-linear estimation, but it would allow one to control for

⁷Gary Chamberlain, "Analysis of Covariance with Qualitative Data", National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper no. 325, March 1979.

unobserved family characteristics.

Any of these approaches would shed more light on what role, if any, a family plays in the employment of its youth.

Table 1

Characteristics of the Population

Youth 17-20

<u>Independent Variables</u>	<u>Means and Standard Deviations of Variables</u>			
	<u>In School</u>		<u>Not in School</u>	
	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
Education gap 1	.689 (.738)	.800 (.771)	.240 (.452)	.332 (.517)
Education gap 2	.253 (.807)	.194 (.790)	.752 (1.365)	.571 (1.273)
Other family income x 10 ⁴	2.088 (1.281)	2.117 (1.299)	1.677 (1.032)	1.704 (1.023)
Black	.092 (.290)	.098 (.297)	.106 (.308)	.126 (.332)
Spanish	.032 (.175)	.035 (.185)	.045 (.207)	.040 (.196)
Female head	.132 (.339)	.142 (.349)	.177 (.382)	.181 (.385)
Male head self-employed	.101 (.302)	.103 (.305)	.090 (.287)	.082 (.275)
Poverty area	.127 (.333)	.123 (.329)	.183 (.387)	.171 (.377)
Older brother not employed	.093 (.291)	.093 (.291)	.065 (.247)	.060 (.237)
Older brother employed	.160 (.366)	.162 (.369)	.140 (.347)	.154 (.361)
Older sister not employed	.077 (.267)	.073 (.260)	.048 (.213)	.046 (.209)
Older sister employed	.119 (.324)	.121 (.326)	.081 (.272)	.113 (.317)
Younger brother not employed	.107 (.309)	.098 (.297)	.152 (.359)	.156 (.362)
Younger brother employed	.091 (.288)	.086 (.280)	.143 (.350)	.126 (.332)

continued...

Table 1 continued.

	In School		Not in School	
	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
Younger sister not employed	.117 (.321)	.114 (.318)	.157 (.364)	.153 (.360)
Younger sister employed	.071 (.257)	.079 (.270)	.103 (.304)	.094 (.293)
<u>Dependent Variables</u>				
•Employment last week	.539 (.498)	.481 (.500)	.710 (.454)	.672 (.470)
Total hours worked last year	511.9 (542.5)	400.0 (465.3)	1064.2 (856.6)	925.8 (790.8)
Unemployment last week	.101 (.301)	.106 (.307)	.178 (.383)	.139 (.346)
Number of observations	9196	8385	3534	2604

Table 2

Determinants of Total Hours Worked Last Year

Youth 17-20

<u>Independent Variables</u>	<u>Coefficients and t-ratios</u>			
	<u>In School</u>		<u>Not in School</u>	
	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
Education gap 1	-22.9 (-2.20)	14.0 (1.46)	-165.2 (-4.44)	-81.4 (-2.17)
Education gap 2	-127.2 (-11.99)	-90.5 (-9.22)	-85.6 (-7.40)	-122.8 (-9.66)
Other family income x 10 ⁻⁴	-13. (-2.00)	8. (1.22)	46. (2.64)	61. (2.95)
Black	-243.7 (-8.98)	-226.7 (-8.70)	-471.6 (-8.28)	-583.5 (-9.62)
Spanish	-97.9 (-2.47)	-96.8 (-2.66)	-272.7 (-3.44)	-232.8 (-2.66)
Female head	-47.6 (-2.14)	1.9 (0.10)	-82.5 (-1.85)	35.1 (0.72)
Male head self-employed	36.9 (1.69)	-4.3 (-0.19)	54.2 (1.01)	68.1 (1.05)
Poverty area	-111.3 (-4.76)	-98.5 (-4.19)	-38.8 (-0.83)	-198.7 (-3.71)
Older brother not employed	-129.3 (-5.27)	-64.1 (-2.57)	-207.5 (-3.36)	-42.9 (-0.60)
Older brother employed	35.0 (1.88)	19.7 (1.08)	123.1 (2.54)	-58.9 (-1.18)
Older sister not employed	-87.9 (-3.32)	-59.4 (-2.19)	-148.4 (-2.10)	-144.7 (-1.72)
Older sister employed	43.3 (2.00)	17.6 (0.82)	-5.4 (-0.09)	115.1 (1.95)
Younger brother not employed	-53.8 (-2.39)	-8.6 (-0.37)	-197.2 (-4.5)	-77.0 (-1.58)
Younger brother employed	168.6 (7.03)	128.0 (5.45)	207.8 (4.33)	24.9 (0.46)

continued...

Table 2 continued.

	In School		Not in School	
	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
Younger sister not employed	-49.9 (-2.32)	-65.0 (-2.99)	-107.5 (-2.52)	-33.1 (-0.68)
Younger sister employed	177.2 (6.65)	192.0 (7.32)	82.8 (1.54)	209.6 (3.00)
<hr/>				
Controls for:				
Single years of age	3	3	3	3
Health status	2	2	2	2
Marriage	1	1	1	1
Region	8	8	8	8
<hr/>				
Number of observations	9196	8385	3534	2604
Number of uncensored observations	7036	5806	2925	2032
<hr/>				
Log likelihood	-57101.3	-47217.9	-24670.9	-17088.3
Estimated Sigma	623.6	578.7	910.0	855.8
Mean of dependent variable (for uncensored observations)	669.0	577.7	1285.7	1186.5

Table 2A

Determinants of Total Hours Worked Last Year

Youth 17 - 20

<u>Independent Variables</u>	<u>Standardized coefficients ("DY/DX")</u>			
	<u>In School</u>		<u>Not In School</u>	
	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
Education gap 1	-17.1	9.5	-141.6	-67.2
Education gap 2	-94.9	-61.6	-73.4	-101.3
Other family income x 10 ⁻⁴	-9.	5.	40.	50.
Black	-181.8	-154.3	-404.1	-481.1
Spanish	-73.0	-65.9	-233.6	-192.0
Female head	-35.5	1.3	-70.7	28.9
Male head self-employed	27.5	-2.9	46.5	56.2
Poverty area	-83.0	-67.1	-33.2	-163.8
Older brother not employed	-96.4	-43.6	-177.8	-35.4
Older brother employed	26.1	13.4	105.5	-48.6
Older sister not employed	-65.5	-40.5	-127.1	-119.3
Older sister employed	32.3	12.0	-4.6	94.9
Younger brother not employed	-40.1	-5.9	-168.9	-63.5
Younger brother employed	125.7	87.1	178.1	20.5
Younger sister not employed	-37.2	-44.3	-92.1	-27.3
Younger sister employed	132.1	130.7	70.9	172.9

Table 3

Determinants of Employment Last Week

Youth 17-20

Independent VariablesCoefficients and t-ratios

	In School		Not in School	
	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
Education gap 1	.057 (2.52)	.019 (0.80)	.046 (1.72)	.335 (12.67)
Education gap 2	-.128 (-7.50)	-0.88 (-5.94)	-.110 (-5.85)	-.160 (-7.21)
Other family income x 10 ⁻⁴	-.047 (-0.02)	-.013 (-0.01)	.023 (0.01)	-.002 (-0.001)
Black	-.606 (-63.68)	-.492 (-37.19)	-.487 (-33.39)	-.686 (-32.37)
Spanish	-.318 (-16.28)	-.231 (-10.30)	-.022 (-0.60)	-.210 (-4.83)
Female head	-.189 (-7.67)	-.043 (-1.74)	-.166 (-3.83)	-.185 (-3.75)
Male head self-employed	.004 (0.08)	.015 (0.32)	.156 (1.83)	.250 (2.30)
Poverty area	-.244 (-16.22)	-.250 (-16.24)	-.067 (-2.35)	-.353 (-9.74)
Older brother not employed	-.384 (-85.98)	-.187 (-42.79)	-.215 (-23.51)	-.179 (-21.00)
Older brother employed	.100 (16.70)	.047 (11.31)	.074 (5.95)	.084 (3.37)
Older sister not employed	-.214 (-41.95)	-.285 (-123.14)	-.199 (-8.69)	-.161 (-14.60)
Older sister employed	.107 (22.65)	.133 (29.82)	.131 (6.89)	.131 (7.84)
Younger brother not employed	-.220 (-9.91)	-.145 (-7.06)	-.220 (-7.84)	-.057 (-1.83)
Younger brother employed	.334 (16.22)	.385 (19.28)	.217 (7.71)	.152 (4.37)

continued...

Table 3 continued.

	In School		Not in School	
	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
Younger sister not employed	-.148 (-8.38)	-.204 (-10.36)	-.031 (-1.16)	.004 (0.12)
Younger sister employed	.238 (11.47)	.340 (16.61)	.152 (6.56)	.438 (16.04)
Controls: Same as in Table 1				
Number of observations	9196	8385	3534	2604
Log likelihood	874.7	624.8	372.7	606.5
Mean of dependent variable	.539	.481	.710	.672

Table 3A

Determinants of Employment Last Week

Youth 17-20

<u>Independent Variables</u>	<u>Standardized coefficients ("DY/DX")</u>			
	<u>In School</u>		<u>Not In School</u>	
	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
Education gap 1	0.023	0.008	0.016	0.121
Education gap 2	-0.051	-0.035	-0.038	-0.058
Other family income x 10 ⁻⁴	-0.019	-0.005	0.008	-0.001
Black	-0.241	-0.196	-0.167	-0.248
Spanish	-0.126	-0.092	-0.008	-0.076
Female head	-0.075	-0.017	-0.057	-0.067
Male head self-employed	0.002	0.006	0.053	0.091
Poverty area	-0.096	-0.100	-0.023	-0.128
Older brother not employed	-0.152	-0.074	-0.074	-0.065
Older brother employed	0.040	0.019	0.025	0.030
Older sister not employed	-0.085	-0.114	-0.068	-0.058
Older sister employed	0.042	0.053	0.045	0.047
Younger brother not employed	-0.087	-0.058	-0.075	-0.021
Younger brother employed	0.133	0.154	0.074	0.055
Younger sister not employed	-0.059	-0.081	-0.011	0.001
Younger sister employed	0.094	0.136	0.052	0.159