UC Berkeley

Earlier Faculty Research

Title

Family Networks and Youth Access to Jobs

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0b96s4b3>

Authors

O'Regan, Katherine M.

Quigley, John M.

Publication Date

1992-08-01

**Family Networks and
Youth Access to Jobs**

Katherine M. O'Regan
John M. Quigley

Working Paper
UCTC No. 128

**The University of California
Transportation Center**

University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720

The University of California Transportation Center

The University of California Transportation Center (UCTC) is one of ten regional units mandated by Congress and established in Fall 1988 to support research, education, and training in surface transportation. The UC Center serves federal Region IX and is supported by matching grants from the U.S. Department of Transportation, the California State Department of Transportation (Caltrans), and the University.

Based on the Berkeley Campus, UCTC draws upon existing capabilities and resources of the Institutes of Transportation Studies at Berkeley, Davis, and Irvine; the Institute of Urban and Regional Development at Berkeley; the Graduate School of Architecture and Urban Planning at Los Angeles; and several academic departments at the Berkeley, Davis, Irvine, and Los Angeles campuses. Faculty and students on other University of California campuses may participate in

Center activities. Researchers at other universities within the region also have opportunities to collaborate on selected studies. Currently faculty at California State University, Long Beach, and at Arizona State University, Tempe, are active participants.

UCTC's educational and research programs are focused on strategic planning for improving metropolitan accessibility, with emphasis on the special conditions in Region IX. Particular attention is directed to strategies for using transportation as an instrument of economic development, while also accommodating to the region's persistent expansion and while maintaining and enhancing the quality of life there.

The Center distributes reports on its research in working papers, monographs, and in reprints of published articles. For a list of publications in print, write to the address below.

University of California Transportation Center

108 Naval Architecture Building
Berkeley, California 94720
Tel: 415/643-7378
FAX: 415/643-5456

Authors of papers reporting on UCTC-sponsored research are solely responsible for their content. This research was supported by the U.S. Department of Transportation and the California State Department of Transportation, neither of which assumes liability for its content or use

Family Networks and Youth Access to Jobs

Katherine M. O'Regan
Yale University

John M. Quigley
University of California at Berkeley

Working Paper
August 1992

UCTC No. 128

The University of California Transportation Center
University of California at Berkeley

FAMILY NETWORKS AND YOUTH ACCESS TO JOBS

by

Katherine M. O'Regan
Yale University

and

John M. Quigley
University of California
Berkeley

This is a radically revised and extended version of a paper (O'Regan and Quigley [1992]) prepared for the Special Conference in Honor of Edwin S. Mills, Evanston, IL, April 10-12, 1992. Support for this research has been provided by the U.S. Department of Transportation, the Transportation Center, and the Center for Real Estate and Urban Economics at the University of California, Berkeley. We are grateful to Therese McGuire for extensive comments and suggestions on the original paper.

Abstract

Some networks may be more useful than others in affecting labor market outcomes. In particular, social contacts who are employed may be more useful in job referral than those who are not employed. Also, social networks containing non minority workers or male workers may have better and more extensive labor market contacts. This paper considers indirect evidence on the importance of job access via networks for the employment of urban youth. We measure the extent to which probabilities of employment and industry affiliation for urban youth are related to proxies for their access to informal networks. Proxies for labor market contacts include the labor market circumstances of other household members -- mothers, fathers, and siblings -- key members of a youth's social network.

The empirical analysis is based upon 1980 PUMS data with more than 55,000 observations on at-home youth in the 47 largest US metropolitan areas. The large sample permits us to test for differences across race and sex of youth and parent in determining youth labor market outcomes. Our results support the importance of family networks in facilitating youth access to jobs. We also find some evidence that male parents are more important in affecting youth employment. These effects vary by race and are more important for whites.

I. Introduction

It is by now widely acknowledged that accessibility has important effects on the probability of employment for urban workers, as well as the occupation or industry of employment, and the location of that employment. In this, the notion of employment access has several different dimensions. Until recently, the principal dimension of access analyzed by economists has been physical or spatial in nature. Urban residents living in areas isolated from job concentrations have been found to have lower employment probabilities and different patterns of occupational and industrial affiliations than those better served by transportation networks and those less physically remote from employment concentrations (See Kain [1968] and Ellwood [1986]).

More recently, it has been recognized that social access may be as important as physical access in conditioning labor market outcomes, particularly in low-wage labor markets. Social access to employment includes the networks of informal informational contacts available to potential workers, networks which may assist them in learning about available job openings and employment opportunities. Direct observation on job search strategies indicates, for example, that a large percentage of job seekers obtain information on specific jobs from friends and relatives, as contrasted with information obtained from formal announcements or employment agencies (See, for example, Holzer [1987]). It appears that about half of all jobs are obtained through contacts (Rees and Shultze [1970], Granovetter [1974], Corcoran, et al. [1980]). Moreover, jobs obtained informally are generally associated with higher earnings and more prestigious occupations (Granovetter [1974], Bridges and Villemez [1986], Staiger [1990]).

The importance of social networks in affecting access to employment immediately suggests that some networks may be far more useful than others in conditioning labor market outcomes. Networks which include more employed members may be presumed to be more effective in locating available jobs.¹ Thus job searchers in networks with low employment rates may be further disadvantaged (Montgomery [1991], O'Regan [forthcoming]).

It is also likely that employed social contacts differ in their knowledge of, and influence over, the hiring decisions of firms. Whites and males may be more useful in providing knowledge or more authoritative in providing references than are minorities or women. Empirical work has shown that more men than women obtain jobs through contacts (Corcoran et al. [1980], Montgomery [1990]), and blacks appear to be less successful than whites in using contacts to obtain employment (Rees and Shultze [1970], Holzer [1987]).

¹The classic papers reporting these phenomena and analyzing their causal factors include Kain [1968], Price and Mills [1985], and Ellwood [1986]. More recent work includes Ihlanfeldt and Sjoquist [1991]. Holzer [1991] provides a concise review of much of this literature.

The interactions between these two dimensions of labor market access reinforce the importance of the spatial aspects of urban labor markets, so emphasized in the work of Edwin Mills [1967]. The development of social contacts is conditioned by spatial structure and transport opportunities. Many informal contacts arise in a spatially limited area, through institutions whose members live in geographic proximity -- schools, neighborhood organizations, day care centers, and the like. Given the limited mobility of youth, geography may have its greatest impact on youths' networks. Youth generally have the most limited pools from which to create networks, many of which are geographically proximate to their homes. Moreover, the opportunity set from which to create networks increases with age and experience; thus youth may have the most spatially limited networks. In addition, the networks of lower-income people have been shown to be more spatially limited (Fischer [1982]), suggesting that social networks for youth in low-income households may be particularly limited by geography and space.

In a detailed study of middle class adolescents -- students in the seventh through tenth -- grade, neighborhood residents were found to dominate the youths' networks (Blyth, Hill and Theil [1982]). Nuclear family members (parents and siblings) accounted for over a quarter of those named as important social contacts. Of the non-related individuals named as network members, more than half lived in the same neighborhood as the youth. A separate study which focused on black adolescent youth also found proximity to be very important in black youth networks (Coates [1987]).

In the classic "choice-constraint" description of the formation of networks, individuals are presumed to create their networks by selecting members from a limited pool of contacts (Fischer [1982]). To the extent that the pool of contacts is residence-based, location theory suggests that networks will be more homogeneous in demographic character. Spatial segregation by income, race and social class will exacerbate the "in-breeding" noted by observers of social networks² -- social contacts tend to be segregated by race, ethnicity, sex, and income. Recent increases in the concentration of urban poverty have only heightened this segregation. Low-income and minority youth are likely to be members of networks which include a disproportionate fraction of minority, low-income or unemployed persons, the least effective networks for labor market success.

This paper provides a detailed examination of labor market outcomes for urban youth located in the largest US metropolitan areas. We observe labor market outcomes by sex and by racial or ethnic group for some 55,000 youth living at home and residing in the 47 largest metropolitan areas (MSAs). We use this rich body of data, available in the 1980 Public Use Micro

² For example, Granovetter [1974] found that 71 percent of those who found their jobs through personal referrals were employed at the same firm as the individual who provided the referral.

Sample (PUMS Sample B), to conduct a variety of indirect tests of the differential impact of networks on outcomes. Specifically, we consider the networks provided to these at-home youth by other family members --mothers, fathers, and siblings. We note variations in labor market outcomes --employment and industry affiliation -- separately for white, black, and hispanic youth by sex.

The results are strongly supportive of the importance of social access in affecting labor market outcomes. Even controlling for MSA-wide influences, youth are far more likely to be employed if parents or siblings are employed. They are far more likely to have the same industrial affiliation as their parents, and, as noted in our previous paper (O'Regan and Quigley [1992]), they are also far more likely to be employed in the same part of the metropolitan area as their parents. These associations vary by racial and ethnic group and by the sex of the parent and the offspring. The results of these indirect tests strongly suggest that some youth are at a distinct disadvantage in the labor market due to the character of their social networks. The greatest disadvantage may be a consequence of the lower employment rate of family members of minority youth.

II. Tests

The basic expectation is that youth with "better" networks will fare better in the labor market. A specific prediction is that youth whose networks include employed parents and siblings have greater access to jobs; they are more likely to be employed themselves. We rely on information about family members for two purposes. First, as indicated above, family members are consistently reported to be important members of youths' social networks (Blyth, Hill and Theil [1982]). Moreover, parents play a particularly crucial role in the social networks of their own children; youth networks have been found to be similar to those of their parents in composition and structure (Tietjen [1982], Olivera and Reiss [1987]). In terms of job search behavior, parents are likely to be the first people youth consult when looking for work.

Second, the homogeneity noted within networks means that the attributes of family members are representative of the attributes of an entire network.³ Thus to the extent that the employment conditions of parents and siblings are correlated with that of other members of the youth's network, they serve as proxies for the larger social environment.

³ See Marsden [1988] and Bell [1989] for reviews and Cocharan et al. [1980] for recent evidence on the similarity of racial segregation in youth networks with segregation in their parents networks.

A. Youth Employment

We test for network effects by relating the probability of youth employment to the employment status of parents and siblings. For all at-home youth reported in the 1980 US Census Public Use Micro Sample, aged 16 to 19 years and residing in the 47 largest MSA's, we estimate logit models relating youth employment probabilities to individual and household characteristics, metropolitan economic conditions, and these measures of information access. Specifically, the logit models include variables measuring the race, sex and schooling levels of the youth, household income (net of youth's earnings) and head parent's education. We also include a binary variable indicating female-headed families and another representing residential location in the central city of the metropolitan area. We control for local labor market conditions by including the metropolitan-wide unemployment rate. As a control for the job opportunities specific to the youth, we include a dummy variable indicating current school enrollment, and a set of dummy variables representing the youth's industrial affiliation. A complete description of these variables is noted in Appendix Table A1.

Column 1 of Table 1 reports the coefficients of the logit model estimated using individual observations on some 55,000 at-home youth. Youth employment probabilities vary significantly with the age, education and residential location of the youth and with the socioeconomic characteristics of the household. Employment probabilities are also significantly lower in metropolitan areas with higher aggregate unemployment rates.

Employment outcomes vary significantly by race and ethnicity, but *ceteris paribus*, there is no difference in employment probabilities for male and female youth.

The measure of information access in Model I of Table 1 is the variable indicating whether the household contains a working parent. The coefficient of this variable is significant, positive and large. If a youth lives in a household in which a parent is working, she is more likely to be employed herself. In the absence of a working parent in the home, the average youth employment rate is 37.8 percent; if there is a working parent at home, the probability increases by 5.9 percentage points (or 15.6 percent) to 43.7 percent.

Model II reports an analogous logit model in which access is proxied by the presence of employed siblings in the household. This model is estimated using the subset of 32,000 youth who have siblings of working age, 16 to 19 years, also living in the home. Again, we find that the presence of an employed family member in the household has a significant positive effect on the probability that a youth herself will be employed.

Table 2 summarizes an extensive series of tests of the relative importance of parental employment on youth labor market outcomes -- disaggregated by race and by the sex of both parents and youth. The table reports the coefficients of the variable indicating parental employment

TABLE 1
Logit Models of Employment Probabilities for At-Home Youth*
(t-ratios in parentheses)

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Model I</u>	<u>Model II</u>
Sex (1=female)	0.016 (0.71)	0.045 (1.44)
Residence (1=central city)	-0.073 (2.81)	-0.095 (2.76)
Age (years)	0.082 (5.55)	0.090 (4.61)
Education (years)	0.155 (13.88)	0.167 (11.30)
In-School (1=yes)	-0.534 (17.67)	-0.552 (14.22)
Female-headed household (1=yes)	-0.139 (4.19)	-0.282 (6.53)
Education of head of parent	-0.030 (7.96)	-0.017 (3.38)
Family income (thousands of dollars)	-0.004 (4.61)	-0.007 (6.57)
MSA unemployment rate (Adult, white workers)	-0.058 (6.37)	-0.060 (5.00)
Race (1=black)	-0.675 (17.93)	-0.695 (14.59)
Ethnicity (1=hispanic)	-0.194 (4.43)	-0.275 (4.90)
Either parent working (1=yes)	0.394 (9.22)	
Sibling working (1=yes)		0.365 (17.69)
Intercept	-5.497 (23.84)	-5.586 (18.45)
Log likelihood	23940.95	13687.11
Number of observations	55,411	32,124

* Logit models also include ten variables indicating the industrial affiliation of the youth and three regional dummy variables.

TABLE 2
Coefficients from Logit Model Indicating the Effect of Parental Employment
Upon Youth Employment Probabilities by Race and Sex*
(sample size includes 55,411 at-home youth)

	<u>Log</u> <u>Likeli-</u> <u>hood</u>	<u>Working</u> <u>Parent</u>	<u>Log</u> <u>Likeli-</u> <u>hood</u>	<u>Working</u> <u>Father</u>	<u>Working</u> <u>Mother</u>
A. All Youth	23940.95	0.394 (9.22)	23920.42	0.339 (7.26)	0.198 (8.50)
B. Youth by Race	23940.94		23916.16		
White youth		0.398 (7.31)		0.320 (6.53)	0.206 (7.84)
Black youth		0.386 (4.96)		0.422 (5.54)	0.176 (2.74)
Hispanic youth		0.386 (3.73)		0.374 (4.19)	0.127 (1.64)
C. Youth by Sex	23938.25		23910.99		
Male youth		0.367 (6.53)		0.337 (6.44)	0.137 (4.40)
Female youth		0.424 (7.12)		0.342 (6.29)	0.271 (7.92)
D. Youth by Race and Sex	47876.493		47821.973		
Male youth					
White		0.365 (5.54)		0.309 (5.60)	0.151 (4.39)
Black		0.351 (3.82)		0.391 (4.19)	0.108 (1.32)
Hispanic		0.442 (3.83)		0.488 (4.64)	0.040 (0.40)
Female youth					
White		0.437 (6.35)		0.332 (5.76)	0.273 (7.23)
Black		0.424 (4.50)		0.462 (4.78)	0.253 (3.03)
Hispanic		0.322 (2.66)		0.230 (2.05)	0.244 (2.29)

* t ratios in parentheses. Each logit model includes all the control variables noted in Table 1 and defined in Appendix Table A1.

in logit models predicting youth employment, using the same sample of at-home youth. It summarizes eight different specifications of the effect of parental employment on labor market outcomes for youth. Each of the eight logit models includes all of the control variables noted in Table 1, and defined in Appendix Table A1.

Panel A compares the coefficient estimate for the variable indicating parental employment with separate coefficients reflecting the employment of mothers and fathers. Panel B presents separate coefficients for parental employment by race and sex of the parent. Panel C presents separate coefficients for parental employment by the sex of both youth and parents. Panel D presents the complete disaggregation.

Within each of the four panels, the effect of parental employment on youth employment probabilities is significantly different for employed mothers than for fathers.⁴ When the sex of the parent is not taken into account, there are no significant differences in the effects of working parents on youth employment probabilities by race⁵ or by sex.⁶ When the employment status of mothers and fathers are considered separately, the significance of the coefficient differences by race⁷ and sex⁸ of youth are larger. There are significant interaction effects between parents and their adolescent offspring, and these vary by race and by the sex of parents and youth.

The impact of a working father on youth employment is invariably higher than the impact of a working mother. This difference is not simply caused by the presence or absence of a father in the home, regardless of his employment status. Female headship is controlled for in the logit specification. (We also estimated the same model using the subsample of youth who have fathers in the home. The difference between the effect of employed mothers and employed fathers upon

⁴ For Panel A, $\chi^2=2$ (23740.95-23920.42) = 41.06 with 1 degree of freedom while for panel B, $\chi^2=2$ (23940.95-23918.76) = 44.36 with 2 degrees of freedom. For panel C, $\chi^2=2$ (23740.67-23916.16) = 49.06 with 3 degrees of freedom while for panel D, $\chi^2=2$ (23938.25-23910.99) = 54.52 with 6 degrees of freedom.

⁵ $\chi^2=2$ (23940.95-23940.94) = 0.02 with 1 degree of freedom.

⁶ $\chi^2=2$ (23940.95-23940.69) = 0.52 with 1 degree of freedom.

⁷ $\chi^2=2$ (23920.42-23918.76) = 3.32 with 4 degrees of freedom.

⁸ $\chi^2=2$ (23920.42-23916.16) = 8.52 with 2 degrees of freedom.

youth employment probabilities remains significant and increases in magnitude.)⁹

Most of these differences persist when the model is fully disaggregated, distinguishing between the employment of mothers and fathers and also the race and sex of the youth. Panel D reports coefficients for the twelve variables signifying the presence of a working parent. The difference between the effect of fathers' employment status and mothers' employment status upon employment probabilities for youth is much larger for male than for female youth. Employment probabilities for female youth are significantly affected by the employment status of mothers and fathers. In contrast, only for whites are the employment outcomes for male youth significantly affected by the presence of a working mother.

While the coefficients signifying working parents are estimated separately by the race and sex of youth, they are not systematically lower for minority or female youth. The largest differences across race and ethnicity are not in the size of the effect of a working parent upon youth employment, but rather in the likelihood that such youth will be living in a household in which a working parent is present. Only seven percent of white youth live in a home with no working parent. Twenty-seven percent of black youth and seventeen percent of hispanic youth live in homes with no working parent present. The comparisons are particularly striking for working fathers. While twentyone percent of white youth have no working father present in their homes, the corresponding numbers are fifty-one percent for black youth and thirty-four percent for hispanic youth.

Table 3 presents the predicted employment rates for youth, separately by the employment status of parents, computed from each of the eight logit models summarized in Table 2. For each of the eight specifications of the model, employment probabilities were computed at the individual level using the estimated coefficients and individual level data. Individual probabilities were computed conditional upon employment status of the parent. The table presents the average probability estimated for each of the demographic groups.

The larger effect of fathers on youth employment probabilities arises mainly from variations in the sensitivity of youth employment probabilities to parental employment by sex of youth. The employment prospects of black female youth are equally influenced by the presence of a working mother or father. This is also true for white females. The employment prospects of black and hispanic male youth are not significantly affected by the presence of a working mother.

If this "working-parent effect" on youth employment is caused by access to information,

⁹ The magnitude of the coefficient of the variable indicating female headship is much smaller and is insignificant when the employment status of parent is disaggregated by mothers and fathers. It appears that the significance of the coefficient indicating female headship in Table 1 reflects the absence of an employed father, rather than the absence of a father, per se.

TABLE 3
Aggregate Youth Employment Rate Estimated from Logit Models
by Employment Status of Parent*
(Sample size includes 55,411 at-home youth)

	Parent		Father		Mother	
	<u>Not</u> <u>Working</u>	<u>Working</u>	<u>Not</u> <u>Working</u>	<u>Working</u>	<u>Not</u> <u>Working</u>	<u>Working</u>
A. All Youth	37.8%	43.7%	39.0%	44.0%	41.0%	43.8%
B. Youth by Race						
White youth	42.8	49.3	44.6	49.7	46.8	50.0
Black youth	20.0	24.2	20.7	25.3	21.7	23.6
Hispanic youth	31.9	36.9	32.7	37.4	35.0	36.6
C. Youth by Sex						
Male youth	39.0	44.7	39.2	44.5	40.6	42.8
Female youth	37.6	43.5	40.5	45.1	42.9	46.4
D. Youth by Race and Sex						
Male youth						
White	43.8	50.0	45.3	50.3	47.9	50.3
Black	20.7	24.6	21.1	25.5	22.5	23.7
Hispanic	33.8	39.8	34.0	40.6	38.3	38.8
Female youth						
White	42.9	49.5	45.8	50.7	47.3	51.2
Black	20.1	24.5	21.8	26.5	22.3	24.8
Hispanic	30.9	34.7	32.8	35.4	33.0	35.8

* Youth employment probabilities in columns 1 and 2 are estimated for each individual and then averaged using the coefficients from the logit models, assuming non working and working parents, respectively. Youth employment rates are estimated using analogous procedures, distinguishing between working and non working fathers (in columns 3 and 4) and mother (in columns 5 and 6).

then fathers appear to be somewhat more influential as job contacts than mothers, particularly for male youth -- who seem to gain little in their employment prospects from the added presence of a working mother.

B. Industrial Affiliation of Youth

It is tempting to attribute these results to unobserved, household-specific, attributes -- "tastes for work," or even to genetic differences in behavioral propensities. There are, however, a number of implications of the network hypothesis which cannot be attributed to household unobservables. Some of these can be tested for, at least indirectly. If the effect of working members of a household on youth employment probabilities is indicative of job access, then job-related information is gained through the parents and siblings who provide labor market contacts. Youth with employed parents should be more likely, not only to be working, but also to be working at a kindred job. Although we do not have firm level data to test this, evidence consistent with these implications can be found using the industry affiliation of individuals reported in PUMS.

The industry affiliation of each individual in the Public Use Micro Sample is recorded, regardless of whether that individual is employed or unemployed or whether the individual is currently in the labor force.¹⁰ We have grouped industry affiliations in ten categories, corresponding to one digit census industrial categories.

In this section we analyze the effect of the industrial affiliation of parents upon the industrial affiliation of their children. We consider the four largest industrial classifications (which together include 85 percent of the at-home youth in our sample): trade, manufacturing, business and related services, and professional services.

Table 4 presents the results of logit estimates of the probability that at-home youth are affiliated with each of these industries as a function of parental industrial affiliation in the same industry.¹¹ Each model utilizes a principal specification similar to that reported in Table 1. The difference is the inclusion of a variable reflecting the percent of total employment in the youth's metropolitan area in that industry. In each of the four logit models, this control variable is highly significant.

¹⁰ The categories of individuals lacking industry affiliation are: those with no prior work experience, the unemployed whose last job was in the military, and those who have not been employed for five years or more.

¹¹ The sample is limited to youth who have reported an industry affiliation and who live in a household in which at least one parent has also reported an industry affiliation.

TABLE 4
Logit Models of Probabilities of Industry Affiliations for Youth*
(Sample size includes 35,168 at-home youth)

<u>Variable</u>	Probability that youth is affiliated with:			
	<u>Trade</u>	<u>Manufacturing</u>	<u>Business Services</u>	<u>Professional Services</u>
Sex (1=female)	0.163 (4.07)	-0.670 (17.60)	-0.028 (6.82)	0.774 (21.19)
Residence (1=central city)	0.001 (0.05)	-0.105 (2.50)	-0.009 (0.85)	0.055 (1.35)
Age (years)	-0.159 (10.87)	0.216 (9.41)	0.008 (0.24)	0.051 (2.09)
Education (years)	0.018 (1.62)	-0.037 (2.39)	-0.072 (4.63)	0.058 (2.95)
In-School (1=yes)	0.542 (19.57)	-0.869 (20.94)	0.001 (0.02)	0.447 (9.58)
Female headed household (1=yes)	0.009 (0.26)	0.136 (2.53)	0.092 (1.88)	-0.006 (0.12)
Education of head of parent	0.150 (3.93)	-0.028 (4.52)	0.040 (7.20)	-0.012 (1.93)
Family income (thousands of dollars)	0.001 (0.094)	-0.001 (0.98)	0.002 (1.74)	-0.004 (3.21)
MSA unemployment rate (Adult, white workers)	0.031 (3.44)	-0.066 (4.46)	0.006 (0.45)	-0.003 (0.19)
Percent of MSA employment in same industry	0.034 (4.90)	0.039 (11.37)	0.032 (2.51)	0.044 (4.51)
Race (1=black)	-0.445 (11.48)	-0.150 (2.32)	-0.015 (0.26)	0.737 (14.05)
Ethnicity (1=hispanic)	-0.233 (5.31)	0.237 (3.64)	-0.019 (0.29)	0.300 (4.33)
Parent working in same industry (1=yes)	0.435 (17.20)	0.708 (19.03)	0.634 (14.72)	0.510 (13.50)
Constant	1.090 (4.07)	-5.329 (13.78)	-2.363 (6.82)	-5.249 (12.81)
Log likelihood	23460.70	10913.00	13647.66	11275.25

* t-ratios in parentheses. Logit models also include three dummy variables signifying region.

Female youth are significantly more likely to be affiliated with the trade and professional services industries than are male youth, while the reverse is true for manufacturing and business services industries. The manufacturing industry is the only industry for which residence site is a significant factor. Central city youth are significantly less likely to be affiliated with the manufacturing industry than youth living outside of central cities. This suggests that spatial access to jobs affects at least the composition of employment available to youth.

Age also differentially affects the industry in which youth are likely to work. Older teenagers are less likely to have a trade affiliation and are more likely to have an affiliation in the manufacturing or professional service sectors. Those in school are more likely to have a trade or professional services affiliation and are less likely to be affiliated with the manufacturing sector.

Note the differences in the effects of race on industry affiliations. *Ceteris paribus*, black youth are less likely to be affiliated with the trade or manufacturing industries, and more likely to be affiliated with the professional services industry.

Importantly, for each of the industry groups, the variable indicating parental employment in the same industry is significant, positive, and large.

For each of the probability models reported in Table 4, we estimated the same eight specifications noted earlier, to test for differences in the strength of the effect of parental industrial affiliation upon youth affiliation by race or by the sex of parents or children. The results for manufacturing and trade industries were similar to each other, as were the results for the two service industries. Table 5 summarizes the disaggregated results for two representative industries, trade and professional services.

A consistent finding for all four industrial affiliations is the importance of parental affiliation in affecting the industrial affiliation of youth of the same sex. For the trade and professional services industries, this can be seen by examining Panels C and D.

For male youth the coefficients indicating parents in the same industry are always larger for fathers than for mothers; for female youth, the coefficients are always larger for mothers in the same industry than for fathers. The likelihood of a youth working in an industry is always more affected by the presence of a parent of the same sex in that industry than the presence of a parent of the opposite sex in that industry. Note that this does not arise simply from differences in the sex composition of the industry; the sex of the youth is controlled for separately in each logit model.

In interpreting these results, it is worth emphasizing that most workers who obtain jobs by referral are, in fact, referred by members of the same sex. For example, Montgomery [1990] reports that 86.5 percent of male workers who obtained jobs from personal referrals were referred by a male contact. Similarly, 69.8 percent of female workers who found their jobs through contacts were referred by a female social contact. Sociologists have documented the great degree

of segregation by sex as well as race in networks, referred to as the "sex cleavage" (See Marsden [1988] for a review).¹ The pattern of employment outcomes for father-son and mother-daughter pairs, reported in Tables 2 and 4, is consistent with the network interpretation.

Table 5 also reveals differences across industries. The two service industries differ from manufacturing and trade in the differential impact of parental industry affiliation for male and female youth, and also in the importance of race. In the professional service industry, the effect of parent industrial affiliation upon youth affiliation is smaller for female than for male youth.

These tables also document racial differences across the industries. For the professional services industry, Panel B indicates that the parent's industry affiliation does not affect the industrial affiliation of black youth. As indicated in Panel D, the effect of parental affiliation on the industrial affiliation of minority female youth is insignificant. Effects are also smaller for black males than for white males. In some industries, minority and female youth appear to benefit much less from the presence of a parent in an industry than whites and, male youth. We note that 19 percent of black youth in our sample work in the professional services industry. For female youth, this industry is particularly important; 23 percent of black female youth and 15 percent of hispanic female youth are in this industry.

Table 6 presents predicted rates of youth affiliation for these two industries, separately by the affiliation of parents. These rates were computed from each of the logit models summarized in Table 5. For each of the eight specifications of the model, probabilities were computed at the individual level using the estimated coefficients and individual level data. These probabilities were computed conditional upon the industrial affiliation of the parent. The table presents the average probability estimated for each of the demographic groups.

For the trade industry, Panel B indicates that increases in industry affiliation associated with parental affiliation in the trade industry are of similar magnitude for mothers' and fathers' affiliations and across race and ethnicity categories. This is not true for the professional services industry. The presence of a father in the professional services industry generally has a slightly larger effect upon youth affiliation than the presence of a mother in this industry, and the effect of parental affiliation is smaller for blacks than for whites and hispanics. Panel D, which presents results for the fully disaggregated model, documents similar differences across the two industries. With the exception of black female youth who appear less affected, the presence of a parent in the trade industry has a similar impact upon youth affiliation regardless of race or sex and for both parents. In the professional services industry, only the affiliation of white female youth is affected by the presence of a father in the industry. The affiliation of black female youth is not positively affected by the presence of either a father or a mother in the industry. Again, these differences across industries suggest that some youth, particularly black and female youth, may not gain

TABLE 5
Coefficients from Logit Models Indicating the Effect of Parental Industry Affiliation
Upon the Probabilities that Youth has the Same Industry Affiliation

	<i>Professional Services</i>			<i>Trade</i>	
	<u>Log Likelihood</u>	<u>Father in Industry</u>	<u>Mother in Industry</u>	<u>Father in Industry</u>	<u>Mother in Industry</u>
A. All Youth	11271.25	0.509 (8.78)	0.397 (10.16)	0.392 (11.71)	0.394 (13.07)
B. Youth by Race	11259.75				
White youth		0.569 (8.98)	0.478 (10.53)	0.381 (10.60)	0.399 (12.27)
Black youth		0.164 (1.05)	0.103 (1.20)	0.268 (2.10)	0.326 (3.07)
Hispanic youth		0.367 (1.64)	0.418 (2.89)	0.599 (5.13)	0.411 (3.40)
C. Youth by Sex	11254.70				
Male youth		0.840 (10.44)	0.449 (7.33)	0.504 (11.22)	0.382 (9.30)
Female youth		0.245 (3.18)	0.364 (7.28)	0.255 (5.21)	0.411 (9.32)
D. Youth by Race and Sex	22477.55				
Male youth					
White		0.916 (10.26)	0.467 (6.60)	0.479 (9.95)	0.374 (8.51)
Black		0.531 (2.53)	0.325 (2.72)	0.452 (2.63)	0.467 (3.17)
Hispanic		0.716 (2.47)	0.565 (2.66)	0.809 (4.95)	0.405 (2.56)
Female youth					
White		0.311 (3.72)	0.488 (8.52)	0.261 (4.95)	0.432 (9.09)
Black		-0.186 (0.84)	-0.050 (0.48)	0.067 (0.36)	0.198 (1.34)
Hispanic		-0.030 (0.09)	0.317 (1.76)	0.336 (1.99)	0.408 (2.29)

TABLE 6
Probability of Youth Industrial Affiliation:
Average Employment Rates Implied by Logit Models

	Father		Mother	
	<u>Not in</u> <u>Industry</u>	<u>In</u> <u>Industry</u>	<u>Not in</u> <u>Industry</u>	<u>In</u> <u>Industry</u>
I. Trade				
A. All Youth	49.6%	58.8%	49.3%	58.6%
B. Youth by Race				
White youth	51.8	60.8	51.4	60.8
Black youth	38.6	44.9	38.3	45.9
Hispanic youth	42.2	56.4	42.9	52.7
C. Youth by Sex				
Male youth	47.4	59.2	47.5	56.6
Female youth	51.2	58.1	51.3	60.9
D. Youth by Race and Sex				
Male youth				
White	49.5	60.8	49.5	58.4
Black	36.8	47.4	36.5	47.4
Hispanic	40.1	59.3	41.5	51.0
Female youth				
White	54.6	60.7	53.6	63.7
Black	40.5	42.0	40.1	44.7
Hispanic	44.7	52.6	44.6	54.4
II. Professional Services				
A. All Youth	10.1	15.5	9.6	13.5
B. Youth by Race				
White youth	8.8	14.3	8.3	12.6
Black youth	19.1	21.6	18.7	20.3
Hispanic youth	11.1	15.1	10.6	14.9
C. Youth by Sex				
Male youth	6.5	13.7	6.3	9.5
Female youth	14.4	17.6	13.5	18.2
D. Youth by Race and Sex				
Male youth				
White	5.6	12.7	5.0	7.8
Black	11.8	18.5	11.9	15.6
Hispanic	6.9	13.1	6.5	10.9
Female youth				
White	12.6	16.4	11.6	17.5
Black	25.1	21.8	25.2	24.2
Hispanic	15.7	15.3	14.8	19.2

employment benefits from their family networks.

The most obvious alternative explanation for this association of parents and youth by industry is some form of "mimicking behavior" on the part of youth. Residence in a household with a construction worker increases the likelihood that a youth will pursue a job in construction, because youth imitate parents and not because they can capitalize on the information available about the construction field gained through contact. This alternative explanation is similar to the unobserved household effect discussed earlier, in that it presumes that no general or specific information is gained through the network, but rather that children attempt to resemble their parents.

Distinguishing mimicking behavior from the effects of networks requires much more information about the composition of the youths' networks than is available in census data. However, an additional indirect test, which focuses on the effect of specific data, suggests that mimicking behavior cannot account for these findings.

If the increased probability of youth employment results in part from information access rather than the mere presence of an employed parent, then youth who have successfully taken advantage of the information and contacts available through parents will be more likely to be employed than other youth. Youth who are affiliated with the same industry as a parent may or may not have gained access through the parent, but youth who work outside their parents' industries are much less likely to have relied on parents in finding a job. If specific information is transmitted through family networks, employment probabilities should be higher for youth who have relied on parental information to attain jobs in industries in which a parent works. The final set of empirical results considers youth employment probabilities for at-home youth where both the presence of an employed parent and the presence of a parent in the same industry as the youth are considered.¹² The results are presented in Table 7.

In addition to the effect of an employed parent, youth who work in the same industry as a parent are more likely to be employed than youth who work in an industry with no parent contact. For this result to arise from simple mimicking behavior, youth who are mimicking the industry affiliation of parents separately from the employment status of parents must be more successful at finding employment than youth who mimic the employment status of parents but look for work outside their parents' industries. There is no obvious explanation as to why they should differentially be more successful at finding employment than other youth if the presence of a parent in that industry does not itself provide increased access.

¹² Again, the sample is limited to youth who have reported an industry affiliation and who live in a household in which at least one parent has also reported an industry affiliation.

TABLE 7
Logit Models of Employment Probabilities
At-Home Youth
(t-ratios in parentheses)

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Coefficient</u>
Sex (1=female)	0.021 (0.86)
Residence (1=central city)	-0.065 (2.39)
Age (years)	0.056 (3.65)
Education (years)	0.142 (12.15)
In-School (1=yes)	- 0.507 (16.17)
Female-headed household (1=yes)	-0.178 (5.12)
Education of head of parent	-0.032 (8.13)
Family income (thousands of dollars)	-0.004 (5.20)
MSA unemployment rate (Adult, white workers)	-0.053 (5.61)
Race (1=black)	-0.748 (18.93)
Ethnicity (1=hispanic)	-0.186 (4.08)
Either parent working (1=yes)	-0.403 (7.60)
Sibling working (1=yes)	-0.081 (3.08)
Intercept	-1.62 (6.46)
Log likelihood	21470.53
Number of observations	35168

III. Conclusions

This paper has presented evidence that the employment outcomes for youth are strongly associated with those of other family members, especially parents. Youth are more likely to be employed if their mothers, fathers or siblings are employed. Employment outcomes for youth are strongly associated with the outcomes for their parents, more strongly so for their fathers than for their mothers.

We attribute this result, in part, to the information and informal contacts provided by employed family members to youth living in the same household. A competing explanation emphasizes the importance of mimicking behavior (perhaps arising merely because parents are "role models" for their offspring), or unmeasured "tastes for work," or perhaps even genetics that vary by household. Our analysis casts doubt on these as independent explanations of employment outcomes, at least for at-home youth. We find that at-home youth are far more likely to work in the same industry as the mother or father, even after controlling for metropolitan-wide labor market conditions.

An explanation for this in terms of "tastes" rather than information is less persuasive. The presence of a parent in the same industry has a substantial effect upon youth employment probabilities. This effect is independent of the presence of a working parent in the home. This suggests that the mimicking explanation is incomplete at best. Specific access appears to be gained from the presence of a parent in the youth's industry.

If the correlations in employment outcomes reflect the labor market access gained through parents, then the pattern also indicates that some youth are at a distinct disadvantage in the labor market -- due to the character of their social networks. Black parents, and all female parents, appear to be less effective as job contacts in at least two of the four industries considered.

The most significant difference in access through family networks is likely to occur through differences in the employment rates of those in youths' networks of contacts. All youth whose parents are not employed are themselves less likely to be employed, and the absence of employed parents occurs more often in black households. Youth who must rely on these contacts in their labor market search should be expected to have less favorable employment outcomes.

REFERENCES

- Belle, Deborah (ed.) (1989) *Children's Social Support Networks and Social Supports* (New York: John Wiley and Sons).
- Bridges, William P. and Wayne J. Villemez (1986) "Informal Hiring and Income in the Labor Market" *American Sociological Review* 51:574-582.
- Blyth, Dale A., John P. Hill, and Karen Smith Theil (1982) "Early Adolescents' Significant Others: Grade and Gender Differences in Perceived Relationships with Familial and Nonfamilial Adults and Young People" *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 11:6 425-451.
- Coates, Deborah L. (1987) "Gender Differences in the Structure and Support Characteristics of Black Adolescents' Social Networks" *Sex Roles* 17:11/12 667-687.
- Corcoran, Mary et al. (1980) "Information and Influence Networks in Labor Markets" in Greg Duncan and James Morgan, (eds) *Five Thousand Families: Patterns of Economic Progress* Vol 7 (Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research).
- Ellwood, David T. (1986) "The Spatial Mismatch Hypothesis: Are There Teenage Jobs Missing in the Ghetto?" in Richard B. Freeman and Harry J. Holzer, (eds) *The Black Youth Unemployment Crisis* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press)
- Fischer, Claude S. (1982) *To Dwell Among Friends: Personal Networks in Town and City* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).
- Granovetter, Mark (1974) *Getting a Job: A Study of Contacts and Careers* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press).
- Holzer, Harry J. (1991) "The Spatial Mismatch Hypothesis: What Has the Evidence Shown?" *Urban Studies* 28:105-122.
- Holzer, Harry J. (1987) "Informal Job Search and Black Youth Unemployment" *American Economics Review* 77:446-452.
- Ihlanfeldt, Keith R. and David L. Sjoquist (1991) "The Role of Space in Determining the Occupations of Black and White Workers" *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 21:295-315.
- Kain, John F. (1968) "Housing Segregation, Negro Employment, and Metropolitan Decentralization" *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 82:175-197.
- Marsden, Peter V. (1988) "Homogeneity in Confiding Relations" *Social Networks* 10:57-76.
- Montgomery, James D. (1990) "Social Networks and Persistent Inequality in the Labor Market," unpublished presented at the annual meetings of The American Economic Association, December 1990.
- Montgomery, James D. (1991) "Social Networks and Labor Market Outcomes: Toward an Economic Analysis" *American Economic Review* 81:1408-1418.
- Mills, Edwin S. (1967) "An Aggregative Model of Resource Allocation in a Metropolitan Area" *American Economic Review* 57:197-211.

O'Regan, Katherine M. (forthcoming) "The Effects of Social Networks and Concentrated Poverty on Black Youth Employment" *The Annals of Regional Science*.

O'Regan, Katherine M. and John M. Quigley (1991) "Labor Market Access and Labor Market Outcomes for Urban Youth" *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 21:227-293.

O'Regan and Quigley (1992) "Networks and Access in Labor Markets for Youth: Minorities and Women: Working Paper 92-205, Center for Real Estate and Urban Economics, University of California, Berkeley.

Oliveri, M.E. and D. Reiss (1987) "Social Networks of Family Members: Distinctive Roles of Mothers and Fathers" *Sex Roles* 17:11/12 719-736.

Price, Richard and Edwin S. Mills (1985) "Race and Residence in Earnings Determination" *Journal of Urban Economics* 17:1-18.

Rees, Albert and George Shultze (1970) *Workers and Wages in an Urban Labor Market* (Chicago: Chicago Press).

Staiger, Doug (1990) "The Effect of Connections on the Wages and Mobility of Young Workers" Unpublished mimeo, MIT.

Tietjen, A. (1982) "The Social Networks of Preadolescent Children in Sweden" *International Journal of Behavioral Developments* 5:111-130.

Troll, Lillian E. (1987) "Gender Differences in Cross-Generation Networks" *Sex Roles* 17:11/12 751-766.

APPENDIX TABLE A1

<u>Variables</u>	<u>Description</u>
Individual Level	
Sex	Sex of youth; 1=female, 0=male.
Residence	Residence of youth; 1=central city, 0=outside of central city.
Age	Age in years of youth.
Education	Years of education completed by youth.
In-school	School enrollment status of youth; 1=in school, 0=not in school.
Female-headed household	Headship status of household; 1=female headed; 0=male headed.
Education of head parent	Years of education completed by head of household (as designated by the census).
Family income	Family income, net of youth's earnings, in thousands of dollars
Black	Race of youth; 1=black, non hispanic, 0=non black.
Hispanic	Ethnicity of youth; 1=hispanic, 0=non-hispanic.
Parent working	Parent working in household; 1=at least one parent working, 0=no parent working.
Sibling working	For households with a sibling 16 years or older present; 1=at least one sibling working.
Parent in industry	Parent in household with same 1 digit SIC code as youth; 1=yes, 0=no.
Industry affiliation	Industry affiliation of industry for: farming, mining, construction, nondurable manufacturing, durable manufacturing, transportation services, retail and whole sale trade, finance-insurance-and real estate (FIRE), business and related services, professional services, and public administration.
Metropolitan Level	
Unemployment	Unemployment rates for white adults.
Percent employment in industry	Percent of total MSA employment in: manufacturing (durable and non- durable), trade (wholesale and retail), business services, and related professional services.
Region	Northeast, Northcentral, West, South.