

THE ROLE OF THE FAMILY IN DETERMINING YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

by

Sabrina Wulff Pabilonia
University of Washington
<sabrina@u.washington.edu>

November 1999

This paper was prepared to be presented at the NLSY97 Early Results Conference on November 18-19, 1999 at the Bureau of Labor Statistics in Washington, D.C. Financial support for this paper from The Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Joint Center for Poverty Research at Northwestern University and the University of Chicago is gratefully acknowledged. I am grateful to Shelly Lundberg, Elaina Rose, Paul LePore, Jennifer Ward-Batts and participants in the Labor/Development brown bag series at the University of Washington for helpful suggestions. Thanks also to Steve McClaskie and Denise Mehlo at the Center for Human Resource Research at the Ohio State University for excellent NLSY97 user support. All the analyses and opinions expressed herein are my own.

ABSTRACT

Many youths aged twelve to sixteen are working part-time while attending full-time schooling as required by law for youths younger than sixteen. These youths balance schoolwork with employment, family responsibilities, and leisure time. Their early employment decisions may have implications for their human capital acquisition and subsequently future earnings (Michael and Tuma 1984). However, work allows youths to increase their current personal consumption and gain work experience.

Parents provide for much of their children's consumption and many also provide cash transfers, i.e. allowances, so their children can choose some of their own consumption. Youth employment depends upon parents' willingness and ability to provide consumption goods and allowances, the youth's desire for personal freedom, and the youth's desire for work experience. Furthermore, parents may attempt to encourage/discourage work effort given their children's desire to work by decreasing/increasing allowances.

In this paper, I examine whether youth work intensity, measured alternatively by hours worked per year and earned income, and parental allowances are jointly determined. Results suggest that parental allowances negatively affect youth work intensity by either measure but I do not find evidence that parents adjust allowances in response to youths' decisions regarding work intensity. Interestingly, I find that black and Hispanic youths work fewer hours and earn less per year than white youths while receiving greater parental allowances. I also report on a number of other family and individual determinants of youth work intensity and parental allowances.

1. INTRODUCTION

Many youths aged twelve to sixteen are working part-time while attending full-time schooling as required by law for youths younger than sixteen. These youths balance schoolwork with employment, family responsibilities, and leisure time. Their early employment decisions may have implications for their human capital acquisition and subsequently future earnings (Michael and Tuma 1984). However, work allows youths to increase their current personal consumption and gain experience in the labor market.

Previous researchers generally treated youth employment as a school leaving decision and thus ignored youths younger than sixteen. The official U.S. statistics on the labor force obtained from the Current Population Survey currently exclude work done by youths under age sixteen. In addition, most of the previous researchers' data is nearly twenty years old, and they focused on labor force participation as their dependent variable, thus ignoring work intensity. None have examined the employment behavior of youths aged twelve and thirteen.

Parents provide for much of their children's consumption and many also provide cash transfers, i.e. allowances, so their children can choose some of their own consumption. Youth employment depends upon parents' willingness and ability to provide consumption goods and allowances, the youth's desire for personal freedom, and the youth's desire for work experience. Furthermore, parents may attempt to encourage/discourage work effort given their children's desire to work by decreasing/increasing allowances.

The primary purpose of this paper is to answer the following two questions: 1) Are youths' employment decisions negatively affected by parental allowances? 2) Do parents adjust allowances in response to youths' decisions regarding work intensity? In addition, I ask: What family and individual characteristics determine youth work intensity and parental allowances? Results suggest that parental allowances do negatively affect youth work intensity but parents do not adjust allowances in response to youths' decisions regarding work intensity. Youth work intensity is also determined by parental income, parental employment status, youth height, and race/ethnic origin whereas parental allowances are also determined by parental income, family structure, and race/ethnic origin. In section 2, I describe youths' motives for seeking employment and parents' motives for giving allowances. Section 3 of this paper summarizes the results of prior research on the determinants of high school age youth employment.

In section 4, I discuss the NLSY97 data set and variables used in the analyses. Section 5 describes how two samples from the NLSY97 data set were selected to analyze whether allowances and employment are jointly determined. Section 6 describes the characteristics of the NLSY97 youths. Section 7 describes the econometric models. Section 8 reviews the results of the estimations and Section 9 concludes this paper.

2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Youths may have several motives for seeking employment. Intuition and previous research suggest that the primary reason youths work is to fund personal consumption over and above what parents are willing to give youths through allowances and in-kind transfers. Yeatts (1995) found that the majority of youths in the High School and Beyond survey were spending some of their earnings on car expenditures. Both earnings from work and having the use of a

car increase youths' personal freedom and set the stage for youths' eventual independence from their parents. The desire for a car may be a big impetus for youths near the age of sixteen to find consistent employment. Only 44% of youths in the High School and Beyond survey reported saving a portion of their earnings for higher education.

Youths may also work in order to gain work experience. This may be particularly true for older youths who plan to join the labor force full-time immediately following high school.

Parents usually provide for the majority of their children's consumption, such as food, clothing, and shelter, through in-kind transfers. In addition to these in-kind transfers, some studies indicate that half of all parents in the U.S. provide their children with allowances (Dickinson 1999). Many parenting experts suggest parents give their children an allowance to teach financial responsibility. They argue that youths can learn to spend and save responsibly under the guidance of their parents. Some parents tie an allowance to household chores or tasks that they may otherwise pay an outside laborer to perform. The amount of an allowance and whether a youth receives an allowance would conceivably depend upon parental income and how many children this income must be divided among. Parental background, as measured by education, employment, and marital status, may also influence parents' attitudes toward giving youths allowances.

Parents may attempt to encourage/discourage the work effort of their children after weighing the perceived costs and benefits of their children working. From a policy and parental perspective, the youth's cost of employment is generally viewed as the loss in educational investments in human capital while the benefits include the skills and work ethics acquired through work experience. These costs and benefits may vary by the child's ability, the type of job experience, and the number of hours worked (Ruhm 1997, Schill, McCartin, and Meyer 1985). Additionally, parents may include the child's reduced time to perform household chores and care for younger siblings in the costs of their children working outside the household. Again, parental background, including education, employment, and income, is likely to determine parents' attitudes toward the costs and benefits of their children working.

A financial means by which parents may discourage work effort is through allowances. Given youths' desire to obtain more goods, youths may be bribed not to work or to reduce hours at work through higher parental allowances. On the contrary, if parents believe that the benefits of working outweigh the costs of working, then they may decrease or cut off allowances in the hopes of spurring their children (who are in search of greater consumption) into the labor force. Given that their children decide to work, some parents may feel that it is unnecessary to give an allowance if their children earn enough money to achieve the freedom to spend independently. The foregoing description of youths' motives for seeking employment and parents' motives for giving allowances suggests that youth employment and parental allowances are interdependent and are also likely to be determined by a number of family background variables including parental education, parental employment status, family structure and size, and parental income.

3. LITERATURE

This section includes a review of the determinants of high school age youth employment found by previous researchers.

Rees and Gray (1982) tested whether the family of a youth was important in assisting youths in finding jobs, although they treated school enrollment as exogenous. They found no significant effects of parental variables on youth employment but did find some significant effects of the employment status of the youth's siblings.

Goldfarb and Yezer (1983) proposed a model of labor supply where the family is viewed as placing time constraints on teens that vary with age, gender, and whether the teen lives with the family, and that each teen maximizes his or her own utility. Using mean characteristics of teens aged sixteen to twenty in each SMSA from the 1970 Census 1% Public Use Sample, they ran separate regressions on the average weeks worked for each age-sex-family type. They found non-labor income to negatively affect weeks worked by the oldest teens. Unlike the results of other studies, family income is significant and positive for the younger teens.

The only empirically tested labor supply study including teens aged fourteen and fifteen was performed by Michael and Tuma (1984). Using data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youths 1979, they ran a linear probability regression on labor force participation. They found that a black-white differential not accounted for by differences in family background exists, even at this young age.

Using a sample of students from Washington State only, Schill, McCartin, and Meyer (1985) found that employed youths have on average higher GPAs, come from higher socioeconomic families, and have a parent employed in a high-status occupation. Their research indicates that youths do not work to provide subsistence level consumption for themselves or their families. They also found evidence that youths from households with two biological parents have a greater likelihood of being employed.

Using data from the UK Family Expenditure Survey 1968-91, Micklewright, Rajah, and Smith (1994) analyzed the relationship between part-time work performed by sixteen- to eighteen-year olds still attending school full-time and their family circumstances. They found that the effect of family income on the probability of labor force participation is insignificant, while parental employment and high-status occupation significantly increase the probability of participation. They also found that participation probability is lower if there are no other youths in the family or if there are many.

Dustmann, Micklewright, and Rajah (1996) looked at the labor force participation of sixteen-year olds in compulsory schooling in conjunction with cash transfers from their parents, using 1974 data from the British National Child Development Study. In the only serious attempt to model the relationship between youth employment and parental transfers, they described a Becker-style theoretical model of an altruistic parent and selfish child and proposed three models to solve the family's problem of determining the child's leisure, parental transfers, and consumption. These included a Patriarchal model, a Stackelberg model with the parent as the leader, and a Stackelberg model with the child as the leader. Using a simultaneous equations model, they found that labor force participation and cash transfers depend upon each other negatively (hours worked and pocket money, *i.e.* cash transfers, were both reported categorically in the data). In addition, parental income does not directly affect participation but

does have a small positive effect upon transfers. Transfers are inelastic with respect to parental income. They also found gender differences in the determinants of participation and cash transfers.

Also using the 1974 British National Child Development Study, Dustmann, Rajah, and Smith (1997) looked at the relationship between part-time work and truancy, and at the determinants of wages for sixteen-year olds in compulsory schooling. Again, as in Dustmann, Micklewright, and Rajah (1996), the data for hours worked was reported categorically. Truancy is a dichotomous variable reported as whether the youth had missed school at all during the year. They estimated a reduced-form labor supply equation and truancy equation simultaneously by maximum likelihood. They found that when part-time work is endogenized, it significantly increases the probability of truancy by females. In addition, they found that parental income does not significantly affect participation. They also estimated participation and wage equations simultaneously. They found that wages and ability are negatively correlated.

Ransom (1996) used data from the March Current Population Survey collected in the years 1980, 1985, and 1989 to analyze the labor force participation, hours of work, and school attendance of sixteen- and seventeen-year olds. He ran separate regressions by sex and family type but used a dummy for age. He found that teens from middle income families participate more often and work more hours than those from lower income families and the highest income families. As an explanation, he suggested that parental income increases both the reservation wage and the market wage. Using a Tobit regression model, he also found that white teens in dual-parent families work more hours than do black teens.

O'Regan and Quigley (1998) investigated the effects of employment access and neighborhood composition on the probability of youth employment. Employment access was based upon travel time to the average job by the average worker. Neighborhood composition variables included aggregate census tract level characteristics such as racial composition, percent poor, and percent unemployed. They found both employment access and neighborhood composition to be significant in addition to household and individual-level characteristics. With the inclusion of these spatial factors, the coefficients on the household and individual-level characteristics decreased in magnitude and significance suggesting omitted variable bias in others' work. They also found lower employment probabilities for black youths, for youths from households with higher incomes, and for youths with single mothers.

Using the 1988 National Educational Longitudinal Study, Warren, LePore, and Mare (1998) used a simultaneous equations model to test the relationship between grades and employment in high school. They found that senior year grades and grades in the ninth grade negatively affect hours worked per week in the senior year. They also found that being a non-Hispanic white and coming from a high socioeconomic status family increases hours worked.

To summarize, previous researchers arrived at different conclusions about the role of family/parental income in youths' employment decisions. With the exception of O'Regan and Quigley (1998), they found no effect when using participation as the dependent variable. Goldfarb (1983) found a positive effect on the weeks worked, using market level data rather than microdata. There is evidence that both parental occupational status and employment status may be more important in determining youth employment than parental income. Being black or non-white was found to significantly reduce employment. Schill, McCartin, and Meyer (1985)

and O'Regan and Quigley (1998) found contradictory results of the effects of family structure upon labor force participation. The relationship between youth employment and parental transfers deserves a second look, since Dustmann, Micklewright, and Rajah (1996) had categorical data and only looked at labor force participation and not hours worked. A more recent data set allows a look at an even younger cohort of youths as they first enter the labor force.

4. DATA: THE NATIONAL LONGITUDINAL SURVEY OF YOUTH 1997

This paper uses data primarily from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1997(NLSY97), Round 1. The NLSY97 cohort is representative of the non-institutionalized United States population born during 1980 through 1984. These youths were aged twelve to sixteen as of December 31, 1996. They were first interviewed for Round 1 from January to October, 1997 and March to May, 1998. The NLSY97 cohort numbers 8,984 after dropping 38 observations due to incorrect eligibility. The cohort consists of two samples: a cross-sectional sample of 6,748 youths and an oversample of 2,236 black and Hispanic youths. Each sample is a multi-stage stratified random sample designed to maximize the statistical efficiency of the samples. Black and Hispanic youths were chosen with a probability based on size measures for these groups. Sample means and proportions in this paper have been weighted to correct for oversampling. Some households have more than one eligible NLSY97 youth. Consequently, there are 6,813 eligible households in the NLSY97 cohort.

Several survey instruments were used in Round 1 of the survey. For the purposes of this paper, the following three instruments were used. The Screener, Household Roster, and Non-Resident Roster Questionnaire were administered to a household resident aged eighteen or older and used to identify household residents and eligible youths. Henceforth, I shall refer to this Questionnaire as the "Screener". The Youth Questionnaire was administered to all eligible youths in the household. The Parent Questionnaire was answered by one of each eligible youth's parents as determined by the pre-ordered list in Fig 1. In the majority of cases, the responding parent was the biological mother. Of the 8,984 youths in the sample, 1,051 youth respondents have no information available from a parent interview either because the youth did not live with a parent-type figure listed in Figure 1 or the parent refused to take the interview.

Figure 1. Priority for Choosing Responding Parent (NLSY97 User's Guide 1998)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1 | Biological mother |
| 2 | Biological father |
| 3 | Adoptive mother |
| 4 | Adoptive father |
| 5 | Stepmother |
| 6 | Stepfather |
| 7 | Guardian related to youth |
| 8 | Non-relative guardian (e.g., foster mother or foster father the youth lived with for 2 + years) |
| 9 | Mother figure, relative |
| 10 | Father figure, relative |
| 11 | Mother figure, non-relative youth lived with for 2+ years |
| 12 | Father figure, non-relative youth lived with for 2 + years |

A Computer-Assisted Personal Interview was used to collect the data and create symbols to maintain the most current information provided by the respondent. This method of

data collection also helps to reduce measurement error since it checks for illegal values and inconsistencies in the data. In addition, a series of created variables are provided on the NLSY97 CD-ROM.

The dependent variables used in this paper are allowances, hours worked, and earned income in 1996. All youths were asked if they received “an allowance from your family at any time during 1996”, and “In total, how much allowance did you receive during 1996?” Allowances were constructed from these two questions from the Youth Questionnaire. Allowances are the only measure of parental transfers to youths available in the NLSY97. Unfortunately, there is no information on how youths spend their allowances, if parents expect youths to use part of their allowances for basic clothing expenditures¹, or if allowances are tied to performing household duties. Since my hypothesis is that allowances and employment outcomes are jointly determined, it is necessary to construct a contemporaneous measure of employment.

The Youth Questionnaire section on employment distinguishes between employee-type jobs, *i.e.* those jobs where the respondent has an on-going relationship with a specific employer, and freelance-type jobs, *i.e.* youths do a task for several people or run their own business. A separate set of questions is asked for each type of job, and there are some age restrictions. Freelance-type job questions are unique to this cohort of the NLSY. A work history for each youth was created. Youths aged fourteen and older as of the interview date were asked a set of questions on employee-type jobs worked since their fourteenth birthday. In addition, they were asked a separate set of questions regarding freelance-type jobs held since their fourteenth birthdays. Youths aged twelve and thirteen were asked only freelance-type job questions about their employment experience since their twelfth birthdays. The full date was given for the start and stop dates for employee-type jobs while only the month and year were recorded for the start and stop dates for freelance-type jobs. The NLSY97 Release 1.1 of the CD-ROM includes a created variable of the hours worked during 1996 at all employee-type jobs. Hours worked in 1996 at all employee-type jobs were calculated using the hours currently working per week or at the end of the employee-type jobs if both starting and ending hours were given (Center for Human Resource Research 1999). In order to have a measure of the total hours worked in 1996, a variable was constructed measuring the hours worked during 1996 at all freelance-type jobs and then added to the before-mentioned created variable measuring the hours worked at employee-type jobs. I averaged the hours worked per week at the start and stop dates of the job and then multiplied the hours worked per week by the number of weeks worked in 1996 at each freelance-type job including all weeks in the start and stop months. With either employee-type jobs or freelance-type jobs, it was assumed that the youth worked a constant number of hours per week at each job.

Given the structuring of the questions and age restrictions, the data on the hours worked in 1996 by twelve-year olds may be incomplete, as they were only asked about jobs held since

¹ Dustmann, Micklewright, and Rajah (1996) include a variable in their model indicating whether part of the youth’s cash transfer is meant to cover expenses which other youths may be provided through in-kind transfers.

their twelfth birthdays; however, some start dates and hours worked prior to their twelfth birthdays are available. In addition, a 1996 work history for some twelve- and thirteen-year olds was unavailable. If a twelve- or thirteen-year old on December 31, 1996 had reached the age of fourteen by the time of his or her interview, which took place in 1997 or 1998, then the youth was questioned only about work history since turning age fourteen. Twenty-three twelve-year olds and more than thirty-five percent of thirteen-year olds in the initial sample² had reached their fourteenth birthdays by the times of their interviews. Therefore, these youths were excluded from any of the analyses using hours worked in 1996. I do not analyze the hours worked by fourteen-year olds since these youths turned fourteen at various points during 1996. Many thirteen-year olds work, and therefore, these fourteen-year olds are likely to have an incomplete work history for 1996. Fifteen- and sixteen-year olds were questioned about their entire 1996 work history.

Since the hours worked variable was not measured precisely as described above and it was necessary to exclude a large number of thirteen-year olds and all fourteen-year olds from the hours worked analyses, I also used earned income in my analyses to provide an alternative measure of youths' work intensity. Earned income in 1996 is the gross earned income as obtained from the Youth Questionnaire. All youths were asked "During 1996, did you receive any income from a job such as wages, salary, commissions, or tips? Please include any income you received from doing odd jobs, temporary or seasonal work and service in the military, the military reserves or the National Guard." If the youth responded affirmatively, then they were asked, "During 1996, how much income did you receive from wages, salary, commissions, or tips from all jobs, before deductions for taxes or anything else?" It is possible to look at the relationship between earned income and allowances for youths in each age category.

The following independent variables are hypothesized to influence either youth work intensity or parental allowances: the highest grade completed by parental figures; dummy variables indicating whether each parental figure was employed in 1996; a dummy variable indicating whether the father figure was self-employed in 1996; grades from the eighth grade; family structure dummy variables; parental figures' 1996 combined earned and unearned income; the number of household members aged six through seventeen besides the youth respondent; a dummy variable indicating whether any household members were under the age of six; height; race/Hispanic origin dummy variables; an urban vs. rural dummy variable; dummy variables for the quarter each youth was born; 1996 annual county unemployment rates. With the exception of county unemployment rates, all the independent variables were obtained directly from the NLSY97 CD-ROM. Unless specified above, all variables were measured as of the interview date.

Parental education level may influence the parents' attitudes toward raising their children. The highest grade completed by the mother figure and father figure was obtained from information in the Screener and Parent Questionnaire. The highest grade completed by each household member came from the Screener and was linked to the parents through the

² See description of initial sample in section 5.

responding parent's identification number. In cases where there is no mother or father figure present, this variable has been set to equal zero.

The employment status of parents may influence youth employment through providing youths increased access to jobs and general attitudes toward working. Dummy variables indicating whether the mother and father figures earned income in 1996 come from the income section of the Parent Questionnaire. The dummy variable for the parent figure earned income was set equal to one if the parent earned wage income and zero if there was no earned income. Again, if the mother or father figure was missing from the household, the dummy variable was set equal to zero. In addition, a dummy variable was included indicating whether the father figure was self-employed.

Former grade point averages can be an indicator of a youth's ability or achievements — both characteristics that may transfer over to ability or effort in the labor market. The variable describing the grades the youths received in eighth grade is unfortunately only available for those having completed the eighth grade; thus, I only included it in the analyses on fifteen- and sixteen-year olds. A few fifteen- and sixteen-year olds have not completed the eighth grade, and therefore this information is missing. Information on grades comes from answers to cards asking youths to choose overall letter grades they received in the eighth grade. I recoded these qualitative answers to a 4.0 scale. Since this variable measures achievement and perhaps gives us some clue as to the youth's ability and/or ambitions, those youths who have not finished the eighth grade have been recorded as failing or zero. In addition, I recoded those who were ungraded or didn't know as a zero. Those who skipped the eighth grade were assigned a 4.0. A dummy variable was created equaling one when the grades in eighth grade had been assigned a zero because they were unknown as opposed to the youth failing to complete the eighth grade.

Seven family structure variables are included in the analysis to look at the effects of family structure on youth employment and parental allowances. It was hypothesized above that family connections can increase a youth's job opportunities. Youths with two parental figures versus a single parent may have a greater advantage in the job market because of greater personal connections. Biological parents may have a greater inherent interest in their children and thus are more willing to impart cash and in-kind transfers. The family structure dummy variables equal one if the following are true about the relationship of the parent figures in the household to the youth as of the survey date: both biological parents, two parents with biological mother, two parents with biological father, biological mother only, biological father only, adoptive parents, and guardians. The dummy variable for both biological parents is omitted from the analyses. The information on family structure comes from a Center for Human Resource Research (CHRR) variable created based upon answers to the Screener.

Parental income is an indicator of the family's socioeconomic status and, like employment status, may influence parents' attitudes toward youth employment. In addition, parental income is necessary to provide children with allowances and is thus hypothesized to positively influence allowances. Parental income for 1996 is the sum of the mother and father figures' 1996 earned and unearned income and is calculated from answers to questions from the Parent Questionnaire. For each income question, the top two percent of the respondents were assigned the average income value of those respondents. Questions on earned income included

the amount of income the responding parent or spouse earned by working for someone else or as a business owner. The latter was allowed to be negative if the respondent lost money after paying for expenses. Questions on unearned income included interest and dividend payments, income from AFDC or ADC, income from food stamps, income from SSI, child support payments, and from all other sources including relatives. If the responding parent refused to answer, or did not know the exact amount of income earned on a particular question, they were given a hand card with income listed categorically and asked to estimate the income received. In order to reduce the number of missing income values, I recoded these categorical variables by taking the midpoint of each category for those agreeing to estimate their income. Those responding parents who provided incomplete answers to the income questions were coded as missing 1996 parental income. This occurred in 441 observations in the analysis sample. In order to not drop more youths from the sample, especially when there may be a systematic reason why the income figures are missing, the missing income values were recoded to equal zero and a dummy variable was created equaling one if parental income was missing and zero otherwise. In cases where there was either no mother or no father figure residing in the household, parental income is simply the responding parent's income.

I created two variables related to the presence of minors within the household. The first is the number of household members aged six through seventeen excluding the youth. I assumed that these household members are treated as siblings under the care of the parent figures. This variable was created from two variables created by CHRR. The first CHRR created variable is the number of household members under the age of eighteen. The second CHRR created variable is the number of household members under the age of six. I hypothesize that, controlling for the amount of parental income, as the number of siblings receiving an allowance increases, then the amount a particular youth within the household receives decreases.

The second variable I created is a dummy variable equal to one if there are any household members under the age of six and zero if there are no household members under the age of six. I hypothesize that teens, especially females, are likely to be asked to baby-sit younger family members thus leaving them with fewer hours to earn income outside the household. Parents may compensate these youths by giving them higher allowances.

It has been suggested previously that the youth's physical ability may be necessary for certain manual jobs or that employers may tend to select youths with more adult-like characteristics (Dustmann, Rajah, and Smith 1997). For example, when parents search for a baby-sitter, they may choose a more mature looking teenager who they believe is more capable of ensuring the safety of their children. I include height in the work intensity equations to represent one measure of youth's perceived ability and hypothesize that a taller youth may be more likely to get a job. The height of the youth is reported in feet and inches. I converted feet to inches and added the remaining inches. Three youths' heights were recoded as missing since two were recorded as being under three feet tall and the third was recorded as being over eight and a half feet tall.

I hypothesize that non-white youths face discrimination in the labor market or lack access to jobs, and their parents may compensate for their poor job opportunities by increasing their allowances. In addition, parents' attitudes toward giving allowances may depend upon

their race/Hispanic origin. There are six race/Hispanic dummy variables. Race and Hispanic origin dummy variables are mutually exclusive so if a youth reports being Hispanic he or she is not included in one of the race categories. Each dummy variable equals one if the following is true and zero if it is false: non-Hispanic white, non-Hispanic black, Hispanic, Native North American, Asian or Pacific Islander, or other race.

I hypothesize that youths living in an urban area have a greater variety and quantity of jobs available to them. There are also more opportunities to spend money in retail shops and entertainment, so parents may provide greater allowances and youths may have a greater incentive to work and work longer. A dummy variable equals one if the youth lives in an urban area or zero if in a rural area. The geocode software defines urban places as “closely settled, named, communities that generally contain a mixture of residential, commercial, and retail areas, and have a population greater than 2,500” (NLSY97 Codebook Supplement Main File Round 1 1999). These are the same criteria used by the Census Bureau.

I have included a series of dummy variables indicating the quarter of the year each youth was born. The first quarter is excluded from the analyses. I hypothesize that youths born later in the year will have lower allowances and less income, since they are younger.

County unemployment rates are included in the analyses in order to account for local labor market conditions. This variable is the benchmarked 1996 annual county unemployment rates as obtained from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics’ Local Area Unemployment Statistics (1999). The county unemployment rates were merged with data from the NLSY97 geocode file using the state and county FIPS code.

5. SAMPLE SELECTION

There are 8,984 youths in the NLSY97 cohort. This paper analyzes only the employment behavior of “dependent” youths in 1996.³ Initially, I restricted the sample to 7,952 youths. I refer to this as the “initial” sample. Only those dependent youths for whom

³ I dropped 242 youths from the sample whom I classify as “independent” on December 31, 1996. These independent youths were not enrolled in school in the fall of 1996, were married, and/or had been/are currently a parent. This classification is different from the created independent symbol on the NLSY97 CD-ROM which classifies youth as independent if the youth respondent “has had a child, is enrolled in a 4-year college, has ever been married or is in a marriage-like relationship at the time of the survey, is no longer enrolled in school, or is living outside his or her parent figure’s home” as of the survey date (NLSY97 User’s Guide 1998). The reason I reclassified youths as independent” versus “dependent” on December 31, 1996 is because many of these issues are very time dependent.

there is complete information on allowances, hours worked, earned income, and race/Hispanic origin are included in the initial sample. In addition, nine youths were dropped from the sample because they were reported as working over 3,000 hours in 1996 in addition to schooling. Table 1 gives the initial sample size and composition by youth's age as of December 31, 1996, race, Hispanic origin, and gender.

Only 6,518 youths were included in the sample upon which the regression analyses are based. I call this the "analysis" sample. The analysis sample includes only those youths for whom no missing or incomplete data was available for all the independent and dependent variables in each analysis. Table 2 provides the reasons for dropping youths from each sample.⁴

6. DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

In Table 3, I compare the percent of youths employed any time during 1996 to those employed only during the summer months. The percent of youths who were employed during 1996 increased by age. Table 3 provides evidence that the majority of youths who work do so in addition to attending full-time schooling. A negligible number of twelve- and thirteen-year olds worked only during the summer. Among fifteen-year olds, 64.90 percent were employed in 1996 whereas 3.77 percent were employed only during the summer. Among sixteen-year olds, 72.49 percent were employed in 1996 whereas 3.54 percent were employed only during the summer. The Bureau of Labor Statistics found that youths aged fourteen to sixteen worked on average at employee-type jobs "59 percent of all weeks during the school year" (Bureau of Labor Statistics 1999). Participation rates among male and female youths were roughly the same. Black and Hispanic youths were less likely to be employed than white youths. Among twelve-year olds, 42.69% of whites and 31.29% of blacks were employed; however, among sixteen-year olds, 79.70% of whites and only 51.26% of blacks were employed. This dramatic difference among sixteen-year old whites and blacks is consistent with previous findings (Michael and Tuma 1984, O'Regan and Quigley 1998).

As described above, the NLSY97 Youth Questionnaire divided jobs into two types: employee-type jobs and freelance-type jobs. Table 4 gives the percent of youths employed in 1996 by type of job. At least 38.11 percent of youths aged twelve were employed in 1996. More youths may have been employed but the survey did not ask about jobs held prior to the youths' twelfth birthdays.

The majority of thirteen-, fifteen- and sixteen-year olds worked sometime in 1996 (52.31%, 64.90%, and 72.49% respectively). Youths aged sixteen were more likely to have been employed in an employee-type job than a freelance-type job. The difference is probably attributable to the new types of jobs that become available as youths reach their sixteenth birthdays. Federal and state child labor laws restrict youths at different ages from participating in certain types of occupations. Indeed, the percent of youths who held an employee-type job increased dramatically from age fifteen to age sixteen. Among youths aged fifteen 31.68 percent held an employee-type job in 1996 versus 52.39 percent of youths aged sixteen. Some youths held more than one job in 1996. Among youths aged fifteen 14.12 percent engaged in both

⁴ The mean and standard deviation of all the variables in the initial and analysis samples by age on December 31, 1996 and for males and females separately are shown in the Appendix. The means and standard deviations of the two samples do not vary considerably.

freelance- and employee-type of jobs in 1996 versus 18.37 percent of youths aged sixteen. Male youths were more likely to have held an employee-type job than female youths and were less likely to have held a freelance-type job.

Youths performed a variety of jobs in 1996. In Table 5, I report the leading freelance-type jobs held by youths during 1996 by gender and age. The most popular freelance-type job held by youths in the initial sample was baby-sitting. Female youths dominated this type of work whereas male youths did the majority of the mowing, yard work, and snow shoveling. At least 26.94 percent of female youths aged twelve had baby-sat sometime in 1996. Over a third of thirteen-, fifteen-, and sixteen-year olds baby-sat (37.34%, 39.29%, and 33.76% respectively). The leading employee-type jobs held by youths aged fifteen and sixteen on December 31, 1996 are reported in Tables 6 and 7. The top employee-type job was in the food preparation and service occupations.

Recently, there has been increasing concern about the hazards of allowing youths to participate in agricultural work. The federal government under the Fair Standards Labor Act allows minors as young as ten to do some hand harvest crops during off-school hours; however, the majority of states require that youths be at least twelve years old to participate in agricultural work outside of school hours. There are additional federal and state restrictions as to the type of machinery and chemicals that may be handled by youths under age sixteen (Office of External Affairs 1999). As shown in Table 5, one to two percent of youths participated as freelancers in farm work in 1996. Tables 6 and 7 indicate that an additional 2.74% of fifteen-year olds and .93% of sixteen-year olds were employees in the agricultural industry.

Hours worked are described in Table 8. Among employed youths, the number of hours worked per year increased by age. From age twelve to sixteen, the average hours worked by youths more than doubled. White youths worked more hours on average in 1996 than black youths.

Table 9 gives the distribution of income earned by youths in 1996. Among youths aged twelve, 66.25 percent reported earning no income versus 35.49 percent of youths aged sixteen. There is little difference between female and male youths who reported earning no income. However, female youths aged twelve and thirteen earned more than male youths aged twelve and thirteen. The trend was reversed for youths aged fourteen through sixteen. White youths were much more likely to earn income than black or Hispanic youths in every age category. The majority of youths aged twelve, thirteen, and fourteen earned less than two hundred dollars. The amount of income earned by youths aged fifteen and sixteen varied considerably more than the amount of income earned by youths under age fifteen. Over ten percent of youths aged sixteen earned more than two thousand dollars in 1996.

More youths reported earning no income than working no hours in 1996. There are several possible explanations for this discrepancy. First, youths may have received an in-kind transfer as payment for hours worked. Second, youths may not have been paid in 1996 for work performed in 1996. Third, for youths older than age fourteen, they may have reported working for a family business without pay. Finally, youths may have failed to answer the questions correctly. For example, a youth may have reported hours spent baby-sitting for his or her family for which he or she was not paid directly or they may have been compensated through an allowance. Since female youths dominated baby-sitting jobs, this may explain why

female youths were more likely to have reported hours worked than male youths but less likely to have reported earned income than males youths.

Table 10 shows the percent of youths who received an allowance during 1996 and the average yearly allowance received by age on December 31, 1996. The first row indicates that older youths are less likely to receive an allowance than younger youths. Among youths aged twelve, 58.14 percent received an allowance but only 38.69 percent of youths aged sixteen received an allowance. This is remarkably lower than the 92.80 percent of youths who received “pocket money” in the study by Dustmann, Micklewright, and Rajah (1996) of British youths aged sixteen in 1974. Of those who received an allowance, the amount they received on average increased by age. Youths aged twelve received on average \$227.73 allowance during 1996, which is approximately \$4.38 per week. Youths aged sixteen received an average \$476.45 allowance during 1996, or approximately \$9.16 per week. Female youths received higher allowances on average. Excluding youths aged fourteen, black youths were more likely to receive an allowance than white or Hispanic youths and on average received a greater amount.

In Table 11, I show the distribution of allowances received during 1996 comparing those who worked a positive amount of hours during 1996 to those who worked no hours during 1996. Among youths aged thirteen, fifteen, and sixteen who received no allowance, the percent of youths who worked was higher than the percent of youths who did not work. The difference between those who worked and those who did not work widened as age increased across the sample. Among youths who received an allowance, the average allowance was consistently higher for unemployed youths.

In Table 12, I show the distribution of allowances received during 1996, comparing those who earned income to those who earned none. Among youths aged thirteen to sixteen who received no allowance, the percent of youths who earned income was consistently higher than those who earned no income. The difference between those who earned income and those who did not earn income increased as age increased across the sample. Among youths who received an allowance, the average allowance was consistently higher for youths who earned no income during 1996. In addition, the amount of allowance received by youths varied significantly. For example, youths aged twelve earned on average \$227.73 per year, 13.69 percent earned less than \$50 in 1996 while 7.17 percent earned over \$450 in 1996.

Table 13 shows the distribution of money available for youths to spend at their discretion. Money is defined as the total of allowances received from parental figures plus the youth’s earned income in 1996. The majority of youths aged twelve to sixteen had spending money (72.81%, 74.38%, 74.83%, 78.07%, 83.05% respectively). As age increased, the amount of money available also increased. Among youths with spending money, youths aged twelve had approximately three hundred dollars per year on average whereas youths aged sixteen had over twelve hundred dollars per year on average. This increase in spending money is due primarily to an increase in youths’ earnings rather than increases in allowances. The proportion of allowances in total spending money on average declines from age twelve through age sixteen (74%, 71%, 66%, 57%, and 39% respectively). Female youths aged twelve and thirteen had on average more spending money than male youths. This trend is reversed for

youths aged fourteen to sixteen. Interestingly, black youths had on average more spending money than white youths for youths aged twelve, thirteen, and fifteen.

The remainder of this paper uses the analysis sample to analyze youth employment decisions and parental allowances. Table 14 compares youths who did not work to those who reported working positive hours in 1996. Youths who worked were more likely to come from a family with higher socioeconomic status as measured by parents' education levels, parents' employment status, and parental income. Employed youths were more likely to have received higher grades in the eighth grade. Employed youths aged fifteen were more likely to come from a family with two biological parents. Again, white youths were more likely to work than black or Hispanic youths.

7. ECONOMETRIC MODELS

I hypothesize that parental allowances and youth decisions regarding work intensity are jointly determined and seek to test for the determinants of youth work intensity and parental allowances with the focus on a variety of family background variables. In this section, I model the relationship between allowances and work intensity using hours worked and earned income as alternative measures of work intensity. Positive income and hours worked are both observed only if a youth chooses to participate in the labor force. As presented in the tables described in section 6, a high proportion of youths reported zero income, hours worked, and/or allowances. This suggests a Tobit simultaneous equations system.

a) Model A: Allowances and hours worked by youths

Let A and H be observed allowances and hours worked respectively. Let A^* and H^* be latent continuous variables where

$$\begin{aligned} A &= A^* \text{ if } A^* > 0 \\ &= 0 \text{ if } A^* \leq 0 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} H &= H^* \text{ if } H^* > 0 \\ &= 0 \text{ if } H^* \leq 0 \end{aligned}$$

Let X be a vector of independent variables which affects both allowances and hours worked. Let V_A be the instrumental variable that affects allowances but does not directly affect hours worked. Let V_H be the vector of instrumental variables that affects hours worked but does not directly affect allowances. The latent hours worked variable depends upon the observed parental allowances while the latent allowance variable depends upon the observed hours worked.

The model is written as follows:

$$A^* = X'\beta_A + V_A'\alpha_A + \mu_A + \eta_A H \quad (1)$$

$$H^* = X'\beta_H + V_H'\alpha_H + \mu_H + \eta_H A \quad (2)$$

where the β 's, α 's, and η 's are parameters and the stochastic disturbances μ_A and μ_H are assumed to follow a joint normal distribution.

b) Model B: Allowances and earned income

Let A and I be observed allowances and earned income respectively. Let A^* and I^* be latent continuous variables where

$$A = A^* \text{ if } A^* > 0 \\ = 0 \text{ if } A^* \leq 0$$

and

$$I = I^* \text{ if } I^* > 0 \\ = 0 \text{ if } I^* \leq 0$$

Let X be a vector of independent variables which affects both allowances and earned income. Let V_A be the instrumental variable that affects allowances but does not directly affect earned income. Let V_I be the vector of instrumental variables that affects earned income but does not directly affect allowances. The latent income variable depends upon observed parental allowances while the latent allowance variable depends upon observed income.

The model is written as follows:

$$A^* = X'\lambda_A + V_A'\theta_A + v_A + \gamma_A I \quad (3)$$

$$I^* = X'\lambda_I + V_I'\theta_I + v_I + \gamma_I A \quad (4)$$

where the λ 's, θ 's, and γ 's are parameters and the stochastic disturbances v_A and v_I are assumed to follow a joint normal distribution.

c) Identification

In order to identify the hours worked and earned income equations, it is necessary to include at least one variable in the allowance equation that is unlikely to directly affect hours worked and earned income. I included as the instrumental variable V_A , the number of household members aged six through seventeen besides the youth respondent, and argue that this variable is likely to affect the amount of allowances available to the youth in question given parental income but unlikely to directly affect youth employment behavior. In order to identify the allowances equation, I include the height of the youth and the county unemployment rates in the work intensity equations as independent variables in V_I and V_H and argue that they are unlikely to directly affect allowances. The grade point average in the eighth grade was also included in the work intensity equations for fifteen- and sixteen-year olds.

I concede that there may be a better instrumental variable to identify allowances in the employment equations; however, other variables that are uncorrelated with the work intensity variables but affect allowances are not apparent in the data set. Dustmann, Micklewright, and Rajah (1996) used school variables, regional variables, and an ability index to identify labor force participation in their transfers equation and the number of younger siblings and education of parents to identify transfers in their labor force participation equation. I would disagree with the use of their latter two instrumental variables since in section 4, I hypothesized that parents may require youths to help care for young siblings, and parents' education affects parental attitudes toward child rearing in general.

8. RESULTS

For each model, I first estimated reduced-form equations using a Tobit model and the analysis sample for youths, separately by gender and age on December 31. I chose to estimate the models separately by age for several reasons. First, job opportunities tend to change quickly for these youths as federal and state child labor laws restrict youths according to age from certain types of employment. Second, youths' physical and mental capabilities change

rapidly from the time they are twelve- until they are sixteen-years old. Finally, parents' restrictions also tend to change with their child's age. We might expect a twelve-year old to have less freedom to choose his or her activities than a sixteen-year old. I chose to estimate the models separately by gender because certain jobs, such as baby-sitting, are dominated by females and because parents may raise male and female youths differently.

I then estimated both models using a Tobit two-stage procedure, again separating by age and gender. For example, in order to obtain the marginal effects for the allowances equation, I predicted the unconditional expected value for hours worked. Then I estimated the structural allowance equation by the Tobit method using the predicted value. This method was followed for each of the structural equations. The marginal effects presented in Tables 15- 22 are based upon the censored mean (Berndt 1991, Greene 1993, Maddala 1983). Standard errors were corrected using bootstrapping. The variables used in the estimation are defined in the Appendix.

Model A: Tobit reduced-form

Allowances: Previously, I hypothesized that parental education and employment status may influence parents attitudes toward raising their children. I find that male youths aged twelve and fifteen whose fathers have more education receive greater allowances. In addition, parents' ability to provide youths with an allowance depends upon parental income and the number of siblings likely to share in receiving transfers. I find male youths aged thirteen and fifteen whose parents have a greater income receive higher allowances, although the marginal effect is quite small. For male youths aged thirteen, parental income squared is significant and negative suggesting a curvilinear relationship between parental income and allowances. The number of youths between the ages of seven and sixteen excluding the NLSY97 youth, **HH617**, is significant and negative for all youths excluding female youths aged thirteen and male youths aged sixteen. Male youths aged fifteen who live only with their biological mother, **singm**, as opposed to both biological parents, receive higher allowances, which may be attributable to the non-resident father giving the youth extra money. Interestingly, Hispanic and black youths receive greater allowances than white youths.

The marginal effect of being black upon allowances for female youths is much larger than the marginal effect of being black upon allowances for males youths aged twelve and thirteen. Black females aged thirteen received \$118.93 more per year than white females, while black males received only \$52.94 more per year than white males.

Hours worked: Table 16 provides support for my hypothesis that working parents can provide increased access to jobs. A mother figure earned income, **mainc**, is significant and positive for male youths aged fifteen; and a father figure self-employed, **paself**, is significant and positive for male youths aged fifteen and female youths aged sixteen. Another likely explanation for the positive effect of **mainc** on hours worked for female youths aged thirteen is that the mother figure is a positive role model. The sign of the coefficient on **painc** is positive and significant for male youths aged twelve but negative and significant for female youths aged thirteen. Parental income is negative and significant for male youths aged twelve and thirteen. I find that tall female youths aged twelve and sixteen work more hours per year than short youths, probably

due to the increased likelihood of employment participation. Male youths aged fifteen who live only with their biological mother work fewer hours than youths who live with both biological parents. Grades in the eighth grade have a significant positive impact upon hours worked for female youths aged sixteen — a result inconsistent with the findings of Warren, LePore, and Mare (1998) but consistent with results from Dustmann, Micklewright and Rajah (1996). Hispanic and black youths of all ages worked significantly fewer hours per year, which may be attributable to early discrimination in the labor market or the poor accessibility of jobs to black and Hispanic youths given their location in central-cities.

Results from the Tobit two-stage method allow me to answer the first two questions presented in the introduction: 1) Are youths' employment decisions negatively affected by parental allowances? 2) Do parents adjust allowances in response to youths' decisions regarding work intensity?

Model A: Tobit structural equations

Allowances: The marginal effects as presented in Table 19 may be interpreted as the change in allowances when the variable in question changes. In response to question 2, I find no evidence that parents adjust allowances in response to the number of hours their children choose to work. For all regressions, the hours worked variable is insignificant.

For male youths aged thirteen and fifteen, parental income is significant and positive. Again, I find evidence of a curvilinear relationship between parental income and allowances for male youths aged thirteen. If parental income increases by \$10,000 per year, youths may expect a \$20 increase in yearly allowances.⁵ For male youths aged fifteen, the number of youths in the household aged six to seventeen excluding the NLSY97 youth, **HH617**, is significant and positive. Both of these results suggest that parental ability to provide allowances is not a key determinant of the amount of allowance received. The presence of children under age six in the household, **dHH6**, has a significant negative impact on allowances.

Hours worked: The marginal effects as presented in Table 20 may be interpreted as the change in hours worked per year when the variable in question changes. In response to question 1, I find that parental allowances negatively affect hours worked for male youths aged fifteen and female youths aged sixteen. The marginal effects of parental allowances are remarkably similar for the two regressions. A \$10 increase in allowances leads to slightly more than an eleven hour decrease in hours worked per year.

A mother, **mainc**, or father figure being employed, **painc**, or a father figure being self-employed, **paself**, has a significant positive impact upon hours worked per year. **Mainc** is significant and positive for female youths aged thirteen and male youths aged sixteen. **Painc** is significant and positive for male youths aged twelve. **Paself** is significant and positive for male youths aged sixteen. The impact is larger for older youths, which may result from the fact that these youths work more hours on average if they have a job.

³ This result is consistent with the results of Dustmann, Micklewright, and Rajah (1996) who showed that transfers were inelastic with respect to parental income.

Dustmann, Micklewright, and Rajah (1996) did not find parental income to be significant in any of their participation equations when taking account of allowances. I find here that parental income is significant and positive for male youths aged fifteen and female youths aged sixteen but significant and negative for male youths aged twelve, although the marginal effect is quite small.

I find that **height** is significant and positive for female youths aged twelve and sixteen and male youths aged thirteen. The marginal effect was once again greater for the older youths. A one inch increase in the height of a twelve year old female increases her hours worked by more than four hours per year while a one inch increase in the height of a sixteen year old female increases her hours worked by more than eleven hours per year.

Again, I find as in the Tobit reduced-form hours worked equation that female youths aged sixteen who received higher grades in the eighth grade worked more hours in 1996. For a one point increase in GPA, such as from a 2.0 to 3.0, hours increase by almost eighty-three per year.

In most of the regressions, Hispanic and black are significant and negative. Again, the impact is stronger for older youths.

Model B: Tobit reduced-form

Allowances: Results for the Tobit reduced-form regression for allowances for Model B as presented in Table 17 are similar to those of Model A. The years of schooling completed by the father figure, **pagrade** is significant and positive for all youths aged fourteen and for male youths aged twelve and fifteen. In addition, the Tobit regression for male youths aged fourteen provides more evidence that the relationship between parental income and allowances is curvilinear. Allowances increase as parental income increases but at a diminishing rate. **HH617** and **singm** are also significant for male youths aged fourteen. The same strong results for black youths are prevalent, here although the results are not as strong for Hispanics.

Earned Income: Results for the Tobit regression on earned income differ from those of the Tobit regression on hours worked in a number of ways. I find more evidence that a mother figure employed has a positive effect upon work intensity, here defined as earned income. **Mainc** is significant and positive for female youths aged thirteen through sixteen and also for male youths aged sixteen. **Painc** is significant and consistently positive for male youths aged twelve and fourteen. **Paself** is significant and positive for male youths aged twelve and fifteen and also significant and positive for all youths aged fourteen and sixteen. The sign on parental income is inconsistent. Height has a significant effect upon the earned income of males youths aged twelve and thirteen. There is more evidence that family structure may matter to work intensity but the sign differs by gender. **Singm** is negative and significant for male youths aged fifteen but positive and significant for female youths aged twelve through fourteen. **Stepm** is positive and significant for male youths aged fourteen. **Singf** is significant and positive for male youths aged thirteen and fifteen.

Model B: Tobit structural equations

Allowances: Using earned income as a measure of work intensity, I still find no evidence that parents adjust allowances in response to youths' work intensity. Again, I find that black youths receive higher allowances than white youths. Parental income is significant and positive for male youths aged fourteen and fifteen. Parental income squared is significant and negative for male youths aged fourteen. The marginal effect is the same as in Model A. The presence of younger siblings under the age of six, **HH6**, has a significant negative impact upon allowances. I find evidence that family structure matters. Male youths aged fourteen and fifteen, living with a biological mother only, **singm**, have higher allowances than male youths living with two biological parents. As suggested previously, these youths may be receiving larger sums of money from a non-custodial father wishing to gain the youth's favor.

Earned Income: For male youths aged fifteen, allowances are significant and negatively affect earned income, which concurs with the results of Model A using hours worked as the dependent variable. For each \$1 increase in allowances, earned income falls by slightly more than \$2, which is most likely less than earnings from an hour of work.

Concurrent with results from Model A, I find parental employment status has a significant positive impact upon earned income. **Mainc** is significant for female youths aged fourteen and male youths aged sixteen. **Painc** is significant for male youths aged fourteen and female youths aged fifteen. **Paself** is significant for male youths aged thirteen and fifteen and female youths aged fourteen.

The effects of parental income on work intensity are still unclear in Model B. As in Model A, grades in the eighth grade, **GPA8th**, significantly increase earnings of sixteen-year old females. A one point increase in GPA leads to \$173.12 more in earnings per year. Hispanic and black are again significant and negative as in Model A..

There is some evidence that family structure affects youths' work intensity even after accounting for parental allowances. For male youths aged fourteen, living with a biological mother and spouse, **stepf**, negatively affects earnings. For male youths aged fifteen, living with a biological father, **singf**, positively affects earnings. For female youths aged thirteen and male youths aged fourteen, living with only a biological mother, **singm**, positively impacts earnings.

9. CONCLUSION

Many youths aged twelve to sixteen in the United States work in addition to full-time schooling. They also control a large sum of money obtained from earnings and parental allowances. As they age, they control more money as they work more hours, while the proportion of allowances in total spending money decreases. Labor force participation rates are similar by gender; however, there are differences in work intensity. Female youths aged twelve and thirteen earn more on average than male youths aged twelve and thirteen, while male youths aged fourteen and older earn more on average than female youths aged fourteen and older.

In this paper, I have examined the relationship between youths' employment decisions and parents' willingness to grant allowances. I also looked at what other family and individual characteristics determine youths' work intensity as measured either by earned income or hours worked and parental allowances.

Using a Tobit two-stage procedure, I found that parental allowances negatively impacted work intensity as measured by either hours worked or earned income for male youths aged fifteen and hours worked by female youths aged sixteen. Parents do not appear to adjust allowances in response to youths' decisions regarding work intensity. Allowances are consistently insignificant in the work intensity equations.

Among the other familial influences, parental income has a significant and positive effect (although small) on parental allowances. There is evidence that the relationship between parental income and allowances is curvilinear. The number of other youths in the household between the ages of six and seventeen is significant and positive. These results suggest that parental ability to give allowances, as restrained by parental income and the number of children in the household, is not a key determinant of the amount given. The effect of parental income on work intensity was significant but inconsistent in sign.

A mother or father figure earning income or being self-employed has a large positive impact upon work intensity. This is probably due to the increased job connections an employed parent can provide. However, another explanation is that parental employment status influences both parents and youths' attitudes toward youth employment.

There is some evidence that family structure has an impact upon parental allowances and youth employment behavior. It is interesting that youths who live with their biological mother only receive greater parental allowances than those who live with both biological parents. Further study including the youth's interaction with a non-custodial father may provide further insight into this result.

A most striking result is that black and Hispanic youths receive higher allowances than white youths while working fewer hours and earning less.

References

- Berndt, Ernst R. 1991. *The Practice of Econometrics: Classic and Contemporary*. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Center for Human Resource Research. 1999. *See* U.S. Department of Labor. 1999.
- Dickinson, Amy. 1999. Piggy-Bank Blues: Some parents think an allowance teaches kids about money - but I don't buy it. Here's why. *Time*, 20 September, 88.
- Dustmann, Christian, John Micklewright, and Najma Rajah. 1996. Intra-Household Transfers and the Part-Time Work of Children. Institute for Fiscal Studies. *Working Paper* 96/3.
- Dustmann, Christian, Najma Rajah, and Stephen Smith. 1997. Teenage Truancy, Part-Time Working and Wages. *Journal of Population Economics* 10, no. 4: 425-442.
- Goldfarb, Robert and Anthony Yezer. 1983. A Model of Teenage Labor Supply. *Journal of Economics and Business* 35, no.2: 245-255.
- Greene, William H. 1993. *Econometric Analysis*, 2d ed. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Maddala, G.S. 1983. *Limited-Dependent and Qualitative Variables in Econometrics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Michael, Robert T. and Nancy Brandon Tuma. 1984. Youth Employment: Does Life Begin at 16? *Journal of Labor Economics* 2, no.4: 464-476.
- Micklewright, John, Najma Rajah, and Stephen Smith. 1994. Labouring and Learning: Part-Time Work and Full-Time Education. *National Institute Economic Review* 2:73-85.
- NLSY97 Codebook Supplement Main File Round 1. 1999. *See* U.S. Department of Labor. 1999.
- NLSY97 User's Guide. 1998. *See* U.S. Department of Labor. 1998.

- Office of External Affairs. 1999. *See* U.S. Department of Labor. 1999.
- O'Regan, Kathleen M. and John M. Quigley. 1998. Spatial Effects upon Employment Outcomes: The Case of New Jersey Teenagers. 19 June. UC Berkeley Working Paper IBER-CalBerk E96-247 <<http://papers.ssrn.com>>
- Ransom, Michael. 1996. Labor Force Participation and Hours of Work of Young Men and Women. Brigham Young University, Salt Lake City.
- Rees, Albert and Wayne Gray. 1982. Family Effects in Youth Employment. In *The Youth Labor Market Problem: Its Nature, Causes, and Consequences*, ed. Richard B. Freeman and David .A. Wise, 453-464. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ruhm, Christopher J. 1997. Is High School Employment Consumption or Investment? *Journal of Labor Economics*. 15, no. 4: 735-776.
- Schill, William J., Rosemarie McCartin, and Katrina Meyer. 1985. Youth Employment: Its Relationship to Academic and Family Variables. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 26:155-163.
- Turner, Mark. 1996. The Effects of Part-Time Work and The Minimum Wage on Educational Outcomes. Ph.D. diss., University of Maryland.
- U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. 1999. *Employment Experience and Other Characteristics of Youths: Results from a New Longitudinal Survey*. 30 April. Washington, D.C. <<ftp://146.142.4.23/pub/news.release/nlsyth.txt>>
- U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. 1999. *Local Area Unemployment Statistics*. 18 August. <<http://www.bls.gov/lauhome.htm>>
- U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. 1998. *NLSY97 User's Guide*. Columbus, Ohio: Center for Human Resource Research.
- U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. 1999. *The National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1997: Geographic MicroData, Release 1.0*. Coumbus, Ohio: Center for Human Resource Research.
- U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. 1999. *The National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1997: Public Use & Event History Data, Release 1.1*. Coumbus, Ohio: Center for Human Resource Research.

- U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. 1999. *NLSY97 Codebook Supplement Main File Round 1*. Columbus, Ohio: Center for Human Resource Research.
- U.S. Department of Labor, Office of External Affairs, Wage and Hours Division, Employment Standards Administration. 1999. *State Child Labor Laws Applicable to Agricultural Employment - January 1, 1999*. 11 June. <<http://www.dol.gov/dol/esa/public/programs/whd/state/agriemp2.htm>>
- Warren, John Robert, Paul C. LePore, and Robert D. Mare. 1998. *Employment During High School: Consequences for Students' Grades in Academic Courses*. University of Washington, Seattle.
- Westcott, Diane. 1981. The youngest workers: 14 and 15-year-olds. *Monthly Labor Review* 194, no. 2: 65-69.
- Yeatts, James. 1994. *Which Students Work and Why?* Master's thesis, Greensboro: University of North Carolina.

TABLE 1

INITIAL SAMPLE SIZE & COMPOSITION, BY AGE, GENDER, RACE, & HISPANIC ORIGIN

Age in 1996 and gender	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	Total
Age 12, Total	810	409	359	68	1,646
Female	374	213	176	33	796
Male	436	196	183	35	850
Age 13, Total	817	431	343	67	1,658
Female	375	215	162	38	790
Male	442	216	181	29	868
Age 14, Total	814	437	371	45	1,667
Female	395	195	192	18	800
Male	419	242	179	27	867
Age 15, Total	824	406	342	63	1,635
Female	415	193	165	40	813
Male	409	213	177	23	822
Age 16, Total	668	357	271	50	1,346
Female	320	193	121	20	654
Male	348	164	150	30	692
Total (all ages)	3,933	2,040	1,686	293	7,952

Note: Other includes American Indians, Alaskan Natives, Asian, Pacific Islanders, and all others. Race and Hispanic origin categories are mutually exclusive.

TABLE 2**Sample selection**

Reasons youths dropped from sample	Initial sample	Analysis sample
Independent youths	242	242
Hours worked missing, incomplete, or unrealistic	272	272
Allowances missing	189	189
Youth's earned income missing	303	303
Race missing	26	26
No response to Parental Questionnaire	-	889
Mother figure highest grade completed missing	-	202
Father figure highest grade completed missing	-	120
Mother figure worked in 1996 missing	-	12
Father figure worked in 1996 missing	-	34
Father figure self-employed missing	-	29
Height missing	-	148
Total number of youths dropped	1,032	2,466
Youths in NLSY97	8984	8984
Sample size	7,952	6,518
Proportion of original cohort	89%	73%

Note: The number of youths dropped from each sample is cumulative. The reason for each drop is in addition to the previous drops.

TABLE 3

Percent of youths employed in 1996 and only during the summer, by age on December 31, 1996, by gender, race, and Hispanic origin

Characteristic	N	Employed in 1996 (%)	Employed only during summer ¹ (%)
Age 12, Total	1,623	38.11	0.08
Female	786	39.23	0.00
Male	837	37.09	0.15
White	797	42.69	0.12
Black	405	31.29	0.00
Hispanic origin	353	25.03	0.00
Age 13, Total	1,067	52.31	0.13
Female	503	52.55	0.00
Male	564	52.09	0.25
White	518	61.02	0.20
Black	270	33.21	0.00
Hispanic origin	229	37.33	0.00
Age 15, Total	1,635	64.90	3.77
Female	813	65.67	2.44
Male	822	64.16	5.04
White	824	72.77	2.68
Black	406	46.07	5.69
Hispanic origin	342	46.21	5.25
Age 16, Total	1,346	72.49	3.54
Female	654	74.90	3.11
Male	692	70.30	3.93
White	668	79.70	3.13
Black	357	51.26	3.77
Hispanic origin	271	57.25	4.33

¹ Summer is defined as the 13-week period between June 2 and August 31, 1996 for employee-type jobs and the months of June, July, and August for freelance-type jobs.

Note: This table was constructed using the initial sample and sampling weights to correct for oversampling. The percentages for youths aged 12 may be underestimated since jobs held prior to the twelfth birthday were not recorded in the survey. The percentages for youths aged 12 and 13 were only calculated with those youths who had not reached their fourteenth birthday by the interview date.

TABLE 4

Percent of youths employed in 1996, by age on December 31, 1996 and type of job

Characteristic	N	Percent Employed					
		Any job	Any employee job	Any freelance job	Employee jobs only	Freelance jobs only	Both employee and freelance
Age 12, Total	1,623			38.11			
Female	786			39.23			
Male	837			37.09			
White	797			42.69			
Black	405			31.29			
Hispanic	353			25.03			
Age 13, Total	1,067			52.31			
Female	503			52.55			
Male	564			52.09			
White	518			61.02			
Black	270			33.21			
Hispanic	229			37.33			
Age 15, Total	1,635	64.90	31.68	47.34	17.56	33.22	14.12
Female	813	65.67	25.92	52.87	12.80	38.72	14.15
Male	822	64.16	36.22	42.01	22.14	27.93	14.08
White	824	72.77	36.38	53.35	19.42	36.39	16.96
Black	406	46.07	23.21	33.33	12.74	22.87	10.47
Hispanic	342	46.21	19.42	33.15	13.06	26.79	6.36
Age 16, Total	1,346	72.49	52.39	38.47	34.02	20.10	18.37
Female	654	74.90	51.08	45.10	29.80	23.82	21.28
Male	692	70.30	53.59	32.42	37.88	16.70	15.71
White	668	79.70	59.85	47.52	37.18	19.85	22.66
Black	357	51.26	32.66	24.33	23.94	18.61	8.71
Hispanic	271	57.25	38.04	28.12	29.13	19.21	8.90

Note: This table was constructed using the initial sample and sampling weights to correct for oversampling. The percentages for youths aged 12 may be underestimated since jobs held prior to the twelfth birthday were not recorded in the survey. The percentages for youths aged 12 and 13 were calculated with those youths who had not reached their fourteenth birthday by the interview date.

TABLE 5

The leading freelance-type jobs held in 1996 by youths, by age on December 31, 1996

Freelance-type job	Age 12			Age 13			Age 15			Age 16		
	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total
Baby-sitting	26.94	3.15	14.52	37.34	5.67	20.95	39.29	3.42	21.01	33.76	2.18	17.26
Mowing	1.05	9.58	5.50	2.66	13.16	8.10	2.76	17.84	10.44	2.76	12.43	7.81
Yard work	1.11	4.86	3.07	1.17	5.23	3.27	1.13	5.14	3.17	0.67	3.82	2.32
Cleaning	2.49	1.67	2.06	2.87	1.96	2.40	2.94	0.92	1.91	2.55	0.69	1.58
Paper route	1.19	2.67	1.96	1.92	2.25	2.09	0.35	0.93	0.64	0.47	0.03	0.24
Chores	2.28	1.60	1.92	1.35	2.78	2.09	1.25	1.17	1.21	0.43	1.37	0.92
Snow removal	0.17	3.00	1.64	0.29	5.21	2.84	0.31	3.08	1.72	0.43	3.09	1.82
Farm work	0.85	1.75	1.32	0.83	3.36	2.14	0.73	1.50	1.12	0.23	1.95	1.13
Car washing	0.17	1.92	1.08	0.46	2.46	1.50	0.29	1.66	0.99	0.58	1.18	0.90
Carpentry	0.00	1.72	0.90	0.04	1.98	1.04	0.74	3.02	1.90	0.00	2.83	1.48

Note: This table was constructed using the initial sample and sampling weights to correct for oversampling. Percentages are based on all youths in each age and gender category. Percentages for youths age 12 and 13 were only calculated using youths who had not reached their fourteenth birthday by the interview date. For youths age 12, the percentage working may be underestimated since jobs held prior to the twelfth birthday were not recorded in the survey.

TABLE 6**The leading employee-type occupations held in 1996 by youths aged 15 on December 31, 1996**

Employee-type occupation	Female	Male	Total
Food preparation & service occupations	4.80	6.44	5.64
Sales workers, retail and personal services	4.57	4.39	4.47
Handlers, equipment cleaners, helper, and laborers	1.75	5.48	3.65
Cleaning and building service occupations	1.77	3.73	2.77
Agricultural and related occupations	1.62	3.81	2.74
Personal service occupations	2.94	1.99	2.46
Miscellaneous administrative support	1.51	0.67	1.08

Note: This table was constructed using the initial sample and sampling weights to correct for oversampling. These jobs were coded according to the 1990 Census Industrial & Occupation Classification Codes.

TABLE 7**The leading employee-type occupations held in 1996 by youths aged 16 on December 31, 1996**

Employee-type occupation	Female	Male	Total
Food preparation & service occupations	1.81	2.70	2.27
Handlers, equipment cleaners, helper, and laborers	1.05	2.54	1.82
Sales workers, retail and personal services	2.23	1.32	1.76
Agricultural and related occupations	0.23	1.57	0.93
Cleaning & building service occupations	0.52	1.25	0.90
Personal service occupations	0.76	0.22	0.48
Miscellaneous administrative support	0.77	0.19	0.47

Note: This table was constructed using the initial sample and sampling weights to correct for oversampling. These jobs were coded according to the 1990 Census Industrial & Occupation Classification Codes.

TABLE 8

Hours worked in 1996, by age on December 31, 1996

Characteristic	N	Hours worked in 1996											Average ¹	
		None	<50	51-100	101-200	201-300	301-400	401-500	501-600	601-800	801-1000	1001-1500		>1500
Age 12, Total	1,623	61.89	9.89	7.65	8.58	4.42	2.31	1.14	0.77	1.49	0.64	0.56	0.66	216.48
Female	786	60.77	10.41	7.41	9.76	4.66	2.58	0.58	0.77	1.11	0.65	0.78	0.52	207.07
Male	837	62.91	9.42	7.86	7.51	4.21	2.06	1.66	0.77	1.84	0.64	0.35	0.79	225.60
White	797	57.31	10.74	8.78	10.10	4.24	2.62	1.23	0.97	1.63	0.76	0.76	0.88	224.73
Black	405	68.71	10.43	4.70	7.08	5.09	1.37	0.41	0.72	0.83	0.47	0.10	0.10	164.06
Hispanic origin	353	74.97	5.78	4.66	4.79	3.16	2.25	2.14	0.09	0.89	0.54	0.27	0.46	238.25
Age 13, Total	1,067	47.69	9.00	8.67	11.64	6.88	4.67	3.40	1.95	2.44	1.33	1.81	0.51	273.04
Female	503	47.45	7.59	6.31	11.45	7.47	6.50	3.77	2.49	3.12	1.10	1.97	0.79	307.36
Male	564	47.91	10.31	10.88	11.81	6.34	2.97	3.06	1.44	1.81	1.55	1.67	0.26	240.74
White	518	38.98	9.38	10.01	14.57	8.52	5.94	3.42	2.63	2.13	1.88	1.77	0.76	273.65
Black	270	66.79	9.88	5.18	5.46	1.87	1.82	3.20	0.76	2.14	0.63	2.28	0.00	269.63
Hispanic origin	229	62.67	8.43	6.51	4.41	7.41	2.19	1.20	0.99	3.57	0.13	2.35	0.15	280.23

¹ The average hours worked in 1996 is calculated for youths who worked a positive amount of hours in 1996.

Note: This table was constructed using the initial sample and sampling weights to correct for oversampling. Work is defined as having worked a positive amount of hours in 1996. Percentages for youths age 12 and 13 were only calculated using youths who had not reached their fourteenth birthday by the interview date. For youths age 12, the percentage not working may be overestimated since jobs held prior to the twelfth birthday were not recorded in the survey.

TABLE 8 (CONTINUED)

Hours worked in 1996, by age on December 31, 1996

Characteristic	N	Hours worked in 1996											Average ¹	
		None	<50	51-100	101-200	201-300	301-400	401-500	501-600	601-800	801-1000	1001-1500		>1500
Age 15, Total	1,635	35.10	6.02	6.79	12.86	8.40	7.69	4.16	4.45	6.04	2.62	3.74	2.14	408.84
Female	813	34.33	5.26	5.57	13.45	9.35	7.33	4.38	4.95	6.24	2.93	4.33	1.89	421.71
Male	822	35.84	6.74	7.96	12.30	7.48	8.04	3.94	3.97	5.85	2.33	3.17	2.39	396.17
White	824	27.23	6.60	6.28	14.13	9.01	8.93	4.81	5.63	7.17	3.10	4.31	2.80	429.23
Black	406	53.93	4.67	7.03	8.98	5.86	5.64	2.82	2.30	2.03	1.84	3.47	1.44	389.40
Hispanic origin	342	53.79	3.77	8.01	8.44	7.84	4.33	3.29	1.54	5.01	1.53	1.99	0.46	343.58
Age 16, Total	1,346	27.51	3.08	5.29	9.39	10.58	6.81	6.13	5.23	7.47	5.13	9.52	3.86	569.38
Female	654	25.10	3.36	4.35	12.25	10.81	6.91	5.94	4.41	8.26	5.95	10.03	2.62	544.66
Male	692	29.70	2.82	6.16	6.77	10.36	6.72	6.31	5.97	6.75	4.38	9.06	5.00	593.46
White	668	20.30	2.58	5.50	9.29	11.30	7.09	7.29	5.78	9.06	5.56	11.94	4.30	598.37
Black	357	48.74	2.70	3.13	7.47	7.02	7.62	4.33	3.42	4.89	4.25	3.71	2.72	523.10
Hispanic origin	271	42.75	4.23	4.85	8.51	9.24	5.47	3.65	3.95	4.05	4.31	6.24	2.75	502.85

¹ The average hours worked in 1996 is calculated for youths who worked a positive amount of hours in 1996.

Note: This table was constructed using the initial sample and sampling weights to correct for oversampling. Work is defined as having worked a positive amount of hours in 1996. Percentages for youths aged 12 and 13 were only calculated using youths who had not reached their fourteenth birthday by the interview date. For youths aged 12, the percentage not working may be overestimated since jobs held prior to the twelfth birthday were not recorded in the survey.

TABLE 9

Earned income in 1996, by age on December 31, 1996, gender, race, and Hispanic origin

Characteristic	N	Earned income (dollars per year)							Average (\$)
		None (%)	<200 (%)	201-500 (%)	500-1,000 (%)	1,001-2,000 (%)	2,001-5,000 (%)	>5,000 (%)	
Age 12, Total	1,646	66.25	26.20	4.96	1.93	0.49	0.09	0.09	261.18
Female	796	67.46	26.35	4.36	1.32	0.33	0.00	0.19	308.77
Male	850	65.15	26.06	5.51	2.48	0.64	0.17	0.00	220.66
White	810	60.54	30.85	5.53	2.18	0.62	0.13	0.13	280.29
Black	409	78.82	15.86	3.85	1.07	0.40	0.00	0.00	194.80
Hispanic	359	77.88	14.75	4.78	2.51	0.09	0.00	0.00	218.62
Age 13, Total	1,658	61.67	25.60	8.43	2.69	1.00	0.47	0.13	355.74
Female	790	61.77	24.48	9.84	1.93	1.27	0.44	0.27	429.65
Male	868	61.57	26.67	7.10	3.41	0.75	0.50	0.00	285.64
White	817	54.30	30.42	10.45	3.20	0.87	0.64	0.12	303.01
Black	431	79.27	15.46	3.20	1.26	0.82	0.00	0.00	238.13
Hispanic	343	74.35	14.93	5.80	3.02	1.06	0.43	0.41	977.83
Age 14, Total	1,667	54.93	23.35	12.33	5.68	2.49	1.05	0.18	445.28
Female	800	55.37	27.77	10.52	4.03	1.42	0.89	0.00	341.42
Male	867	54.52	19.19	14.02	7.22	3.50	1.21	0.34	541.02
White	814	46.76	27.05	14.21	7.46	3.08	1.32	0.11	457.41
Black	437	72.56	15.13	7.85	1.88	1.44	0.51	0.63	487.98
Hispanic	371	70.85	14.62	9.73	2.72	1.46	0.62	0.00	359.45

Note: This table was constructed using the initial sample and sampling weights to correct for oversampling.

TABLE 9 (CONTINUED)

Earned income in 1996, by age on December 31, 1996, gender, race, and Hispanic origin

Characteristic	N	Earned income (dollars per year)							Average (\$)
		None (%)	<200 (%)	201-500 (%)	500-1,000 (%)	1,001-2,000 (%)	2,001-5,000 (%)	>5,000 (%)	
Aged 15, Total	1,635	47.13	18.00	14.33	11.29	6.03	2.89	0.33	698.17
Female	813	49.76	19.89	13.28	9.33	4.52	2.91	0.32	640.04
Male	822	44.59	16.20	15.35	13.16	7.49	2.87	0.35	748.89
White	824	40.05	20.38	15.65	12.45	7.32	3.89	0.27	723.18
Black	406	62.35	10.69	12.63	10.14	2.92	0.83	0.46	630.39
Hispanic	342	65.19	12.21	10.24	7.31	4.30	0.74	0.00	588.05
Aged 16, Total	1,346	35.49	12.38	12.34	13.80	15.50	8.80	1.69	1,297.14
Female	654	34.50	12.91	14.12	15.72	15.03	6.38	1.34	1,140.33
Male	692	36.40	11.89	10.72	12.04	15.92	11.02	2.02	1,444.76
White	668	26.41	13.40	14.16	14.78	18.81	10.67	1.77	1,330.84
Black	357	58.30	7.49	9.65	10.22	8.30	4.34	1.71	1,170.36
Hispanic	271	57.53	9.45	6.23	12.61	7.15	5.08	1.96	1,306.49

Note: This table was constructed using the initial sample and sampling weights to correct for oversampling.

TABLE 10

Percent of youths who received an allowance in 1996 and their average yearly allowance received by age on December 31, 1999

Characteristic	Age 12		Age 13		Age 14		Age 15		Age 16	
	Received allowance (%)	Average allowance (\$/yr)	Received allowance (%)	Average allowance (\$/yr)	Received allowance (%)	Average allowance (\$/yr)	Received allowance (%)	Average allowance (\$/yr)	Received allowance (%)	Average allowance (\$/yr)
Total	58.14 (1,646)	227.73	57.14 (1,658)	285.81	52.11 (1,667)	330.15	45.71 (1,635)	407.99	38.69 (1,346)	476.45
Female	56.90 (796)	250.25	55.46 (790)	310.81	52.58 (800)	334.03	43.72 (813)	426.33	39.10 (654)	493.97
Male	59.27 (850)	208.02	58.73 (868)	263.31	51.68 (867)	326.44	47.63 (822)	391.79	38.32 (692)	460.10
White	58.31 (810)	207.54	56.41 (817)	255.47	49.54 (814)	334.62	43.95 (824)	370.14	36.13 (668)	469.25
Black	62.63 (409)	285.35	61.21 (431)	431.01	60.09 (437)	315.20	52.93 (406)	565.59	43.71 (357)	570.50
Hispanic origin	52.14 (359)	274.93	56.49 (343)	274.61	51.55 (371)	350.30	48.35 (342)	379.35	42.97 (271)	413.12

Note: This table was constructed using the initial sample and sampling weights to correct for oversampling. The average allowance received was calculated using youths who received an allowance. Figures in parentheses are the Ns for the corresponding percentages.

TABLE 11

Allowances received by youths and whether or not they worked in 1996, by age

Amount Received (\$)	Age 12			Age 13			Age 15			Age 16		
	Not Working (%)	Working (%)	All (%)	Not Working (%)	Working (%)	All (%)	Not Working (%)	Working (%)	All (%)	Not Working (%)	Working (%)	All (%)
None	42.00	42.14	42.05	42.44	42.85	42.66	48.54	57.71	54.49	48.97	66.47	61.66
1-50	12.14	13.86	12.79	10.01	11.84	10.97	7.26	4.70	5.60	4.17	3.93	4.00
51-150	14.83	15.76	15.18	14.64	13.20	13.89	6.76	7.35	7.14	4.87	5.53	5.35
151-250	10.80	11.64	11.12	10.85	11.71	11.30	8.77	6.98	7.61	8.62	4.82	5.87
251-350	9.60	7.71	8.88	7.95	8.25	8.11	4.52	5.27	5.01	3.24	3.32	3.29
351-450	2.20	0.99	1.74	1.60	1.61	1.61	2.52	3.47	3.14	2.76	2.07	2.26
451-550	5.55	4.99	5.34	8.83	7.99	8.39	8.70	8.66	8.67	15.19	5.80	8.38
551-1500	2.64	2.78	2.69	2.81	2.53	2.66	11.75	5.32	7.58	10.09	6.97	7.83
1501+	0.25	0.15	0.21	0.86	0.00	0.41	1.18	0.53	0.76	2.10	1.09	1.37
average ¹	\$236.87	\$211.68	\$227.23	\$286.93	\$229.21	\$256.68	\$449.87	\$380.25	\$407.99	\$512.44	\$455.55	\$476.45
N	1,068	555	1,623	564	503	1,067	653	982	1,635	443	903	1,346

¹ The average allowance was calculated for youths who received a positive allowance.

Note: This table was constructed using the initial sample and sampling weights to correct for oversampling. Work is defined as having worked a positive amount of hours in 1996. Percentages for youths aged 12 and 13 were only calculated using youths who had not reached their fourteenth birthday by the interview date. For youths aged 12, the percentage working may be underestimated since jobs held prior to the twelfth birthday were not recorded in the survey.

TABLE 12

Allowances received by youths and whether or not they earned income in 1996, by age

Amount Received (\$)	Age12			Age 13			Age 14		
	Earned No Income (%)	Earned Income (%)	All (%)	Earned No Income (%)	Earned Income (%)	All (%)	Earned No Income (%)	Earned Income (%)	All (%)
None	42.55	41.85	42.31	41.55	45.93	43.23	45.82	51.28	48.28
1-50	12.34	13.69	12.79	10.49	10.97	10.67	8.60	5.72	7.30
51-150	15.06	15.13	15.08	11.98	12.60	12.22	9.50	10.75	10.06
151-250	10.34	12.45	11.05	11.25	10.62	11.01	9.02	9.45	9.21
251-350	9.09	8.36	8.84	8.06	7.75	7.94	6.70	7.04	6.85
351-450	1.90	1.36	1.72	2.17	1.13	1.77	1.32	3.25	2.19
451-550	5.16	5.52	5.28	10.07	7.69	9.16	11.44	7.72	9.77
551-1500	3.25	1.65	2.71	3.62	3.05	3.40	7.02	4.69	5.97
1501+	0.31	0.00	0.21	0.82	0.27	0.61	0.57	0.11	0.36
average ¹	\$ 241.02	\$ 202.06	\$ 227.73	\$ 309.12	\$ 245.42	\$ 285.81	\$ 348.84	\$ 304.86	\$ 330.15
N	1,171	475	1,646	1,102	556	1,658	1,014	653	1,667

¹ The average allowance was calculated for youths who received a positive allowance.

Note: This table was constructed using the initial sample and sampling weights to correct for oversampling.

TABLE 12 (CONTINUED)

Allowances received by youths in 1996 and whether or not they earned income in 1996, by age

Amount Received (\$/year)	Aged 15			Aged 16		
	Earned No Income (%)	Earned Income (%)	All (%)	Earned No Income (%)	Earned Income (%)	All (%)
None	46.54	61.58	54.49	47.75	69.31	61.66
1-50	7.61	3.80	5.60	5.26	3.30	4.00
51-150	6.90	7.36	7.14	6.24	4.85	5.35
151-250	9.24	6.15	7.61	8.62	4.35	5.87
251-350	4.82	5.18	5.01	3.77	3.03	3.29
351-450	3.47	2.84	3.14	2.70	2.01	2.26
451-550	9.67	7.79	8.67	12.84	5.93	8.38
551-1500	10.50	4.97	7.58	10.68	6.26	7.83
1501+	1.25	0.32	0.76	2.12	0.95	1.37
average ¹	\$ 431.73	\$ 378.30	\$ 407.99	\$ 502.62	\$ 451.92	\$ 476.45
N	848	787	1,635	562	784	1,346

¹ The average allowance was calculated for youths who received a positive allowance.

Note: This table was constructed using the initial sample and sampling weights to correct for oversampling.

TABLE 13

Money¹ available for youths' personal consumption

Characteristic	N	Money available (\$ per year)							Average ² (\$)
		None (%)	<200 (%)	201-500 (%)	500-1000 (%)	1001-3000 (%)	3001-5000 (%)	>5,000 (%)	
Age 12	1,646	28.19	38.04	23.08	7.92	2.63	0.05	0.09	307.15
Female	796	30.40	38.15	19.68	8.68	2.81	0.11	0.19	348.97
Male	850	26.18	37.94	26.19	7.23	2.46	0.00	0.00	271.21
White	810	25.26	40.16	24.56	7.40	2.49	0.00	0.13	309.89
Black	409	31.75	29.89	23.59	11.09	3.68	0.00	0.00	322.32
Hispanic	359	38.39	33.04	17.67	7.84	2.64	0.43	0.00	311.13
Age 13	1,658	25.62	32.32	25.46	12.00	3.93	0.53	0.13	402.90
Female	790	27.21	29.73	25.12	12.92	4.28	0.47	0.27	462.48
Male	868	24.11	34.78	25.79	11.13	3.61	0.58	0.00	348.42
White	817	22.48	33.30	27.47	12.53	3.82	0.28	0.12	364.55
Black	431	32.30	28.58	21.23	11.35	4.75	1.79	0.00	462.56
Hispanic	343	31.62	29.73	21.88	12.67	3.26	0.43	0.41	593.62
Age 14	1,667	25.17	27.21	22.37	17.69	6.79	0.51	0.26	498.08
Female	800	26.66	28.13	21.72	18.14	4.77	0.40	0.18	447.20
Male	867	23.77	26.35	22.98	17.27	8.69	0.60	0.34	544.08
White	814	22.34	26.97	22.13	20.07	7.67	0.59	0.24	527.03
Black	437	29.25	29.42	21.90	13.41	4.79	0.62	0.63	456.93
Hispanic	371	35.58	24.38	21.89	12.01	6.04	0.09	0.00	442.96

¹ Money is earned income plus allowances received in 1996.

² Average is calculate using youths who received an allowance and/or earned income in 1996.

Note: This table was constructed using the initial sample and sampling weights to correct for oversampling.