DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 241 623 UD 023 373

AUTHOR Santos, Richard
TITLE Hispanic Youth in the Labor Market. Special Report.
INSTITUTION Ohio State Univ., Columbus. Center for Human Resource Research.
SPONS AGENCY Employment and Training Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jul 83
NOTE 204p.; Research assistance by Linda Tyner.
PUB TYPE Statistical Data (110) -- Reports - General (140)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC09 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Attainment; *Employment Level; *Employment Opportunities; Federal Programs; *Hispanic Americans; *Labor Force Development; Military Service; Racial Differences; Sex Differences; *Socioeconomic Status; Work Attitudes; *Youth Employment
IDENTIFIERS National Longitudinal Survey Youth Labor Market Ex

ABSTRACT

This is a report on a study of how Hispanic youth fare in the labor market, based on data from the 1979 and 1980 National Longitudinal Surveys of Youth Labor Market Experiences. Chapter 1 reviews some of the major factors (low educational attainment, language problems, influx of foreign workers, cultural problems, and discrimination) that have been suggested as reasons for the economically disadvantaged status of Hispanics. Chapter 2 provides a socioeconomic and demographic profile of Hispanic youth, and Chapter 3 presents labor force participation rates, unemployment rates, and employment/population ratios relative to other groups and among Hispanics themselves. Chapter 4 examines the various dimensions of unemployment among Hispanics, including financial hardship, job search methods, types of jobs sought, and length of time required to find work. Chapter 5 provides a profile of employed Hispanics, while Chapter 6 summarizes government sponsored employment and training for youth. Chapter 7 focuses on attitudes toward work and military service, as well as delinquent behavior by Hispanic youth. The last chapter explores the need for specific employment policies directed toward Hispanic youth. Options outlined include the human capital approach, the market approach, the special youth characteristics approach, and the affirmative action approach. The report concludes that early intervention into the employment problems of young Hispanic workers will produce important social benefits. (CJM)

Hispanic Youth in the Labor Market

Special Report

by

Richard Santos

with research assistance by

Linda Tyner

Center for Human Resource Research
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

July 1983

This report was prepared under a contract with the Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, under the authority of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act. Researchers undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express their own judgments. Interpretations or viewpoints contained in this study do not necessarily represent the official position or policy of the sponsoring agency.

Table of Contents

Hispanic Youth in the Labor Market

Executive Summary

Hispanics are one of the most rapidly emerging population groups in the United States. To be Hispanic more than likely is to be young; half of the population is under 22 years of age. Using data from the National Longitudinal Surveys of Youth Labor Market Experience (NLS), this study is about how Hispanic youth fare in the labor market. Chapter I reviews some of the major factors--low educational attainment, language problems, influx of foreign workers, cultural problems, and discrimination--that have been suggested as reasons for the economically disadvantaged status of Hispanics. The study examines the effects of these factors on Hispanics in the youth labor market and presents an outline for analyzing their labor force participation.

Chapter II is a descriptive overview of Hispanic youth. Most were raised in Spanish-speaking households, and their socioeconomic level is usually between those of blacks and whites. Hispanics were more likely to have dropped out of high school than either blacks or whites. Over one-fourth of these Hispanic youth are foreign born and nearly one-fifth perceive that limited English has prevented them from getting a good job. These characteristics vary among youth according to their birthplace and Hispanic group: the socioeconomic problems are compounded, for example, among Puerto Ricans, chicanos and foreign born youth.

Labor force participation rates, unemployment rates, and employment/population ratios of Hispanic youth are presented in Chapter III. In general, employment status among Hispanics is not as favorable as it is

among whites, but it is not as unfavorable as it is among blacks. Differences in employment status among the Hispanic groups are substantial--Puerto Ricans, especially females, fare as poorly as blacks but Cubans do as well as whites. Age and increased education improve the employment situation of Hispanics, as they do for other youth, but Hispanics continue to suffer more employment problems than whites. As expected, employment status among Hispanic youth from poor families was worse than that among those from nonpoor families. Foreign born youth had lower unemployment rates than native born.

Chapter IV examines the various dimensions of unemployment among Hispanics. The financial hardships associated with adult unemployment are generally not linked with youth unemployment, but for some young people the consequences of not having a job are severe. Many unemployed minority females have had children and half of the unemployed Puerto Ricans reside in households classified as poor. Unemployed chicanos were the most likely to seek work in order to defray family expenses.

The most popular job search method among the unemployed was direct employer contact. Chicanos relied on friends and relatives more frequently than other youth. Hispanic and white males sought basically the same type of work, but foreign born Hispanic males were more likely than the native born to seek work in service occupations and as laborers. Furthermore, foreign born males were more willing than other youth to work in certain occupations below minimum wages.

The young people encountering the most difficulty in locating jobs within 90 days after the interview date were Hispanic and black females. White males had the least difficulty. For half the out-of-school youth who found work, their new jobs lasted fewer than eight weeks. Among high school students, a government sponsored job was more likely to end unemployment for blacks than for either Hispanics or whites.

Manufacturing is especially important in generating operative work for Hispanic males, especially chicanos and foreign born youth, as Chapter V shows. Hispanic females, like other young women, perform traditional work; they hold clerical jobs and service occupations in retail and professional-related industries. Employed Hispanic females, as in the case of males, however, had the highest proportion employed in manufacturing and operative occupations. Most youth expressed satisfaction with their work, but Puerto Ricans were the most likely to feel dissatisfied about pay or chances of promotion.

Completion of high school increased the wages of employed out-of-school black and white males, but it did not significantly affect wages of Hispanics. Collective bargaining as well as being native born, however, increased wages of Hispanic males. The wage results suggest that Hispanics tend to obtain work in manufacturing, a sector not likely to distinguish between high school graduates and dropouts, but one more associated with higher wages than other entry level jobs.

Chapter VI examines government sponsored employment and training for youth. Between January 1, 1978, and the 1979 interview date, 5 percent of white youth age 16-21 had participated in these programs. Blacks were nearly four times and Hispanics nearly three times more likely than whites to have been involved. Among minority high school students, the role of the government in providing jobs was extensive; about two-fifths of the blacks and one-fourth of Hispanics had worked since 1978 in at least one government sponsored job.

Hispanics tended more than other youth to enter a government program for job training. Only one-tenth of participating Hispanics received English training, but the proportion reached one-fifth among the foreign born. Most youth, except for Puerto Ricans, expressed satisfaction with the programs.

Attitudes toward work and military service as well as delinquent behavior are the focus of Chapter VII. Overall, most youth expressed a strong work commitment in adulthood, aspired for high status occupations, and considered employment prospects good. Foreign born Hispanics were more likely than native born to prefer operative occupations at age 35 and less likely to prefer craft work. Hispanic males had the most traditional attitudes toward women working, but low educational attainment and foreign birth accounted significantly for these views.

Youth generally considered military service a worthwhile activity but most have no intentions to enlist. Black and Hispanic males were twice as likely to consider enlisting as whites, and minority females considered enlisting more than white males or females. Over half of Puerto Rican males thought about enlisting.

Most youth are not involved in illegal activity or police contacts (stopped by police, booked/charged, convictions) but among those who are, males predominate. Hispanics and whites tended equally to report any of these activities. The use of marijuana/hash was popular among youth but Hispanics reported the least frequency. Foreign born Hispanics were the least likely to report illegal sources of income, police contacts, or drug use.

The last chapter explores the subject of providing employment opportunities for a growing young Hispanic population in a declining economy. The NLS findings are used to generate employment policies. A variety of approaches rather than a single policy will be needed to meet the challenge of integrating Hispanics into the economic mainstream. Arresting school dropout rates ranks as foremost in increasing Hispanic employability, but education is no panacea.

The limited effect of high school completion on wages and curbing unemployment suggest that discrimination continues to influence employment

prospects. Other avenues of employment besides operative work in manufacturing need to be made available to Hispanics. Furthermore, employed Hispanics will benefit from protection of trade unions.

Finally, the aspirations of Hispanic youth respresent an important source of productive talent to the nation. These young people show an eagerness to work as well as a high interest in training. In an era of seeking ways to revitalize the economy, Hispanic youth represent an important human resource.

Preface and Acknowledgements

This study is about Hispanic youth in the world of work. Using data from the 1979 and 1980 National Longitudinal Surveys of Youth Labor Market Experiences, it analyzes both their employment and unemployment and examines their attitudes toward work and military service. Differences between Hispanic youth and other racial groups are noted, and where the sample size is sufficiently large, differences among the various Hispanic groups--Puerto Ricans, chicanos, and Cubans. Also noted are the variations in employment status between native and foreign born Hispanics.

Chapter I introduces the major issues addressed in the study; a profile of Hispanic youth follows in Chapter II. Chapter III examines the employment status of Hispanic youth during the spring of 1979. Unemployment and employment among these youth are analyzed in Chapters IV and V, respectively, and Chapter VI examines the government's role in providing employment opportunities for Hispanics. The attitudes Hispanic young people have toward work and the military are discussed in Chapter VII. In the last chapter, the policy implications of the findings are presented.

The detailed findings on Hispanic youth presented here would not have been possible without strong support from several sources. First of all, my colleagues at the Center for Human Resource Research, The Ohio State University, and especially those who produced Pathways to the Future, Volume 1, helped carve out a systematic approach to analyzing youth employment with the initial NLS youth survey. In particular, Michael E. Borus, Joan E. Crowley, Choongsoo Kim, and Gilbert Nestel provided valuable contributions. Ann Bertagnolli carefully edited each of the chapters. Linda Tyner, Hojin Kang, and Cathy Mitten provided expert research assistance in compiling the

output generated by the computer staff at the Center, and Sherry Stoneman McNamara typed and retyped the various chapters. The study never would have been completed without the help of these individuals.

Several other persons outside the center were instrumental in the completion of this study. Robert Taggart, former Director of the Office of Youth Programs in the U.S. Department of Labor, emphasized and encouraged the need for a study on Hispanic youth. Several symposia on Hispanic youth sponsored by the National Council of La Raza offered me the opportunity to ponder employment-related issues more carefully and to interact with other researchers interested in this area.

Prior to this study, the National Council of La Raza and The Vice-President's Task Force on Youth Employment sparked my original interest in Hispanic youth. The National Council of La Raza commissioned Professor Gilbert Cardenas, Pan American University, and me to undertake a literature review on youth employment. I was also provided an opportunity by the Vice-President's Task Force on Youth Employment to analyze economic policies designed to improve the employment situation of Hispanics.

I sincerely appreciate the support of these individuals and organizations. Any shortcomings or errors are solely my own, and the viewpoints I express are not necessarily those of the organizations or individuals mentioned.

List of Tables

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Hispanics are one of the youngest and fastest growing populations in the United States. According to the 1980 U.S. Census, a total of 14.6 million Hispanics were residing in the United States, a growth of 61 percent from the 1970 Census.[1] During the same decade the total U.S. population increased by only 11 percent.[2] The median age of Hispanics was 22 years, compared to 30 years for the non-Hispanic population.[3]

The need to study the experience of Hispanic youth is underscored by the well-known fact that young people experience the highest incidence of unemployment of any group in the labor force. Among teenagers age 16-19, the national unemployment rate in 1979 was nearly three times higher than the national average--16 percent versus 6 percent.[4] For minorities and females of all races the employment problem is compounded. Although the plight of black youth in search of work has received national attention--over a third of black teenagers in 1979 were unable to find work--studies of Hispanic youth have been less numerous. The second largest minority group, Hispanics differ from others in several socioeconomic characteristics. They are more likely to be high school dropouts than both blacks and whites; a substantial number are foreign born; and a large proportion were raised in Spanish-speaking households. Their employment status is generally between those of blacks and whites.[5]

Opportunities to study Hispanic youth have been expanded recently by public data sources which identify Hispanics. In addition to Census data, the National Longitudinal Study of the High School Class of 1972, the Survey of

Income and Education (1976), the National Longitudinal Surveys of Youth Labor Market Experience (1979), and the High School and Beyond Survey (1980) all contain Hispanic samples. In order to permit statistically reliable generalizations, the National Longitudinal Surveys of Youth Labor Market Experience (NLS) also oversampled Hispanics in their national survey of 12,686 youths age 14-21. This report is based upon NLS data from the 1979 and 1980 surveys; it assesses the experience of Hispanic youth in the labor force during the spring of 1979. Special attention is given to the impact of their unique characteristics on employment and unemployment.

Statement of the Problem

In 1979, teenagers age 16-19 comprised about one-tenth of the Hispanic labor force but one-fourth of all unemployed Hispanics.[6] The labor market experience of Hispanic youth has generally been better than that of blacks but not so favorable as that of whites, and for certain Hispanic groups such as Puerto Ricans, unemployment rates have approached those of black youth. Although the employment difficulties of Hispanic youth have been documented, few studies have systematically examined the factors that influence Hispanic unemployment, the types of jobs held by Hispanics, and their perceptions of work.[7] The work experience of Hispanics may also be usefully compared not only with that of both black and white youth, but also among the various Hispanic groups.

Unlike youth, adults in the labor market have generally completed their formal education, chosen a career, work full-time, and have family responsibilities: generally their goals are to provide stable work and adequate earnings to meet basic family responsibilities. The goals of working youth are less clear, especially those of in-school youth. The work

objectives of youth also vary widely: some youth are interested in working only long enough, for example, to buy a stereo. Others, however, seek career or skill training in their jobs and still others may need to work to help defray family expenses. This study will consider several questions generated by a recognition of such diversity. For example, is the adult employment goal of providing stable and full-time work with adequate earnings applicable to Hispanic youth, even among those who are enrolled in school? Which Hispanic groups are more likely to be in the labor force and which ones are more likely to encounter unemployment? Does completion of high school improve the employment prospects and wages of Hispanic youth? Are Hispanic youth employed in different types of occupations than blacks or whites? How do Hispanic youth view their jobs, employment of women, and the military as an alternative to the labor market?

To answer these questions, we will examine the impact of the following factors on the labor market status of Hispanics:

Education. Hispanic youth have the highest proportion of high school dropouts, and the employment difficulties they encounter are often traced to their low level of educational attainment. One study attributes the lower wages of chicano males to lower education;[8] other studies of education and earnings have produced mixed results. One study of out-of-school Hispanic males and females using the 1979 NLS showed no significant difference in hourly wages between those who completed high school and those who completed only 9-11 years of schooling;[9] another showed significant returns to education for Hispanics age 18-64, especially for those who attended college.[10]

Still other studies, however, question the conclusion that education alone will improve the socioeconomic status of Hispanic workers. According to one study, our society's failure to eliminate discrimination and increase the

rate of return on education for Hispanics makes their economic improvement remote.[11] Another study noted that, for Hispanic males, schooling must upgrade their cognitive skills, although for whites and blacks schooling is rewarded regardless of its impact on cognitive skills.[12]

Language. Most Hispanic youth were raised in Spanish-speaking households, but whether Hispanic youth have problems with English is difficult to ascertain. About one-fifth of the Hispanic adults in government-sponsored employment and training viewed limited English as an employment problem, but among youth, who may be more acculturated than adults, only five percent viewed limited English as a problem.[13]

Nevertheless, the few studies done on language use among Hispanic males age 18-64 reveal payoffs to improved English competency. One study indicated that the more English used to the exclusion of Spanish, the greater the increase in education and job performance.[14]

On the other hand, any serious study on the effects of language on socioeconomic status should also recognize that knowledge of Spanish can be an aid to employment. For example, fluency in both English and Spanish can increase employment opportunities in many retail stores in the Southwest. In regions where Spanish is frequently spoken, Spanish may be a vital employment prerequisite.

Immigration. One-fourth of Hispanic youth age 14-21 are foreign-born,[15] and Puerto Ricans, citizens of the U.S., commonly migrate to the mainland in search of better jobs. Both legal and illegal immigration to the United States from Mexico and other Latin American countries are important issues related to Hispanic youth employment, but most studies on this subject lack conclusive data.[16] Most studies also view illegal immigration as producing negative employment outcomes for local workers: aliens are said to work "hard

and scared" and compete with youth for low-paying jobs.[17] Others contend that the economic problems of chicanos will not disappear until illegals do.[18]

Job Search Skills. Different job search methods from other youth and limited occupational information may contribute to high levels of unemployment for Hispanics and their greater distribution in low-paying jobs. One study found that chicanos, like blacks, do not rely on formal channels such as employment agencies, but use instead informal channels through friends and relatives to obtain work.[19] Another study suggests that the relatively insignificant effect of job experience on occupation level for Hispanic youth may be due to poor labor market information: in other words, their first job often becomes a career.[20] Special attention should thus be given to job search methods and knowledge of the labor market among Hispanic youth.

Illegal Activities. Several studies have provided insight into the possible impact of drugs, illegal activities such as gambling, and youth gangs on Hispanic employment. For example, one study among chicano youths in Chicago concluded that illicit drug use is a common means for enhancing status and prestige.[21] What impact such activities have on employment is not clear, but in communities where jobs are not available to youth, the lure of illegal activities may be stronger. A study of convicted drug dealers in South Texas that included 18-24-year-old chicanos concluded that lack of economic alternatives was the main reason for drug dealing. The researchers felt that given increased education and better jobs, drug dealing would cease.[22]

The relationship between chicano youth gangs and employment has recently received careful attention in a detailed study of East Los Angeles.[23] A typical male youth gang member in a barrio is described as follows:

> He develops in response to reference groups that include the traditional barrio gangs in adolescence, and barrio factions in the special schools, Juvenile Hall probation camps, and Youth

> Authority facility. His work career develops....at the bottom of the illegal market, with casual pills and marijuana. In young adulthood....reference groups include Chicano factions in prison. In maturity....he....has a harder time getting income. He may become an alcoholic....[24]

So much attention has been focused on drugs and illegal activities that Hispanic youth culture has often been subjected to negative stereotypes. Several studies, however, have identified a willingness to work and strong desire for economic mobility among Hispanics: one notes that most "Mexican-American youth (whether male or female) demonstrate a desire for upward social mobility."[25] Another study found a very strong "puritan work ethic" among young Puerto Rican males.[26] They also had very high occupational aspirations, which were downgraded after some labor market experience.

Cultural. Some studies have raised the issue of whether cultural and psychological factors within the Hispanic community affect employment. At one extreme is the view that the traditional values of their culture, which emphasize family and religious ties, reduce the importance of monetary and employment gains among Hispanics. One study finds that the desire among chicano youth for higher income and better jobs is hampered by traditional values and group loyalty.[27] Other researchers find that economic stresses of the Hispanic community rather than these cultural factors account for low aspirations among chicanos.[28]

Cultural factors have also been used to explain the low participation rate of Hispanic women in the labor force. Several researchers have suggested that "residual cultural factors still operating in chicano families" discourage women from seeking work.[29] Recently other researchers have moved away from this explanation of the low labor force participation rates among Hispanic females to consider socioeconomic factors such as education, birthplace (foreign versus native) and age in explaining the decision to

work.[30] How young Hispanic females and males view work for women and how women perform in the work force are important issues to examine.

Discrimination. Racism affects the socioeconomic status of Hispanics. Employers may hire only non-Hispanics or relegate Hispanics to certain occupations because of their own preferences and/or those of their non-Hispanic employees. As one study on the earnings differences between chicano male workers and white workers notes:

> It is unlikely, however, that all of the earnings advantage is due to differences in educational attainment; there is direct and indirect evidence that Mexican Americans suffer discrimination in the labor market, inter alia, which in turn has an impact on the earnings they receive.[31]

Results from several studies indicate that Hispanic workers encounter discrimination. After controlling for factors such as age, education, birthplace, and tenure, one study indicated Hispanic male workers earned about one-fifth less than white workers.[32] For chicano workers, the economic costs of discrimination appear not to have diminished with passage of equal employment opportunity legislation. One study shows that the costs of being a chicano worker increased from 1960 to 1970.[33]

The Data Source

This study examines the labor market experiences of Hispanic youth using the 1979 National Longitudinal Survey of Youth Labor Market Experience (NLS).[34] Data from the 1980 NLS will also be presented to examine unemployment outcomes and extent of illegal activities, police contacts, and drug use. The NLS youth cohort is a nationally representative sample of 12,686 young people born in the calendar years 1957 through 1964, who were

thus age 14-21 on January 1, 1979. Included in the sample are interviews with 1,280 persons within the age group who were serving in the armed forces on September 30, 1978. Within the NLS youth cohort are 1,924 civilian Hispanic youth, 946 males and 978 females. Although Hispanic youth were also in the NLS military sample, this report focuses on the experience of civilians: military respondents who had become civilians by the time of interview in 1979 were included in the civilian totals. Persons are thus identified by their characteristics when interviewed--that is between the end of January 1979 and August 1979.

Footnotes

[1]U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1980 Census of Population and Housing: Advance Reports, PHC80-V-1.

[2]The increase in the Hispanic population from the 1970 Census more than likely overstates the actual increase. Improved counting methods in 1980 may account for a substantial proportion of the increase. Nevertheless, there is no doubt that Hispanics are an increasing force in the nation.

[3]U.S. Bureau of the Census, Persons of Spanish Origin in the United States: March 1979 (Advance Report. Series P-20, No. 347).

[4]U.S. Department of Labor, Monthly Labor Review, April 1980, Current Labor Statistics: Household Data, Table 2, p. 72.

[5]U.S. Department of Labor, A Profile of Hispanic Youth, Youth Knowledge Development Report 10.2, Office of Youth Programs, April 1980.

[6]U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Report of the President, 1981, Washington, D.C., Table A-9, p. 134.

[7]A detailed literature review on Hispanic youth is presented in Gilbert Cardenas and Richard Santos, "Barrier to Hispanic Youth Employment: A Literature Review," National Council of La Raza, Hispanic Youth Employment, Knowledge Development Report 10.1, October 1979.

[8]Cordelia W. Reimers, "Labor Market Discrimination Against Hispanic and Black Men," Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs and Department of Economics, Princeton University, October 1981.

[9]Steven C. Myers and Randall H. King, "Relative Earnings of Hispanic Youth in the U.S. Labor Market," University of Akron. Paper presented at the Hispanic Labor Conference, University of California, Santa Barbara, December 21, 1981.

[10]Lisa J. Neidert and Marta Tienda, "Converting Education into Earnings: Patterns Among Hispanic Origin Men," in Marta Tienda, editor, Hispanic Origin Workers in the U.S. Labor Market, University of Wisconsin, Department of Rural Sociology, Madison, Wisconsin, October 1981.

[11]James E. Long, "Productivity, Employment, Discrimination, and the Relative Economic Status of Spanish Origin Males," Social Science Quarterly, Vol. 58, No. 3, December 1977.

[12]Stuart Greenfield and John Vrooman, "The Human Capital Model and Discrimination: The Roles of Schooling, Experience, and Functional Literacy in Texas," Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, Austin, Texas, 1979.

[13]Gilbert Cardenas and Richard Santos, "Hispanic Population in CETA: A Preliminary Assessment." Paper presented at the National Symposium on Hispanics and CETA, sponsored by the University of Texas at San Antonio and U.S. Department of Labor, February 1980.

[14]Steve B. Garcia, "Language Usage and the Status Attainment of Chicano Males." Unpublished master's thesis, University of Wisconsin, Department of Sociology, Madison, 1979.

[15]U.S. Department of Labor, A Profile of Hispanic Youth, op. cit.

[16]For a review of immigration issues, refer to "Immigration Issues in an Era of Unsanctioned Migration: A Symposium," edited by Walter Fogel in Industrial and Labor Relations Review, April 1980, Vol. 23, No. 3.

[17]Arvil V. Adams and Garth Mangum, The Lingering Crisis of Youth Unemployment, W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, Kalamazoo, Michigan, 1978.

[18]Vernon M. Briggs, et al., The Chicano Worker, University of Texas Press, Austin, 1977.

[19]Paul Bullock, Aspirations vs. Opportunity: "Careers" in the Inner City, Ann Arbor: Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, University of Michigan, 1973.

[20]Richard Santos, "An Analysis of Earnings Among Persons of Spanish Origin in the Midwest," East Lansing, Michigan State Univerity. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, 1977.

[21]Alberto G. Mata, "The Drug Street Scene: An Ethnographic Study of Mexican American Youth in South Chicago," South Bend: Notre Dame University, 1978.

[22]Estevan T. Flores and Gilbert Cardenas, "Chicano Drug Dealing in Marijuana," report to the Hogg Foundation for Mental Health, Unversity of Texas at Austin, May 1978.

[23]Joan W. Moore, Homeboys: Gangs, Drugs, and Prisons in the Barrios of Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Temple University Press, 1978.

[24]Ibid.

[25]William P. Kulvesky, Mexican-American Youth and the American Dream, Columbus, Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1975.

[26]Paul Seindenstat, A Labor Market Success Model of Young Male Hispanic Americans, Wilmington, Delaware, Latin American Community Center, 1978.

[27]Celia S. Heller, Mexican American Youth: Forgotten Youth at the Crossroads, New York, Landon House, 1966.

[28]Bullock, op. cit., and Moore, op. cit., 1978.

[29]Briggs, op. cit.

[30]Rosemary Santana Cooney, "The Mexican American Female in the Labor Force," in Cuantos Somos: A Demographic Study of the Mexican American Population, edited by Charles H. Teller, Center for Mexican American Studies, Monograph No. 2, 1977.

[31]Dudley L. Poston, Jr., et al., "Earnings Differences Between Anglo and Mexican American Male Workers in 1960 and 1970," Social Science Quarterly, Vol. 57, 1976.

[32]R. Santos, op. cit.

[33]Dudley L. Poston, Ibid.

[34]A detailed description of the NLS can be obtained from The Ohio State University, Center for Human Resource Research, 5701 N. High Street, Worthington, Ohio 43085.

CHAPTER II

Hispanic Youth in the U.S.

Introduction

The 1979 National Longitudinal Survey of Youth estimated that 2.1 million Hispanic young people age 14-21 reside in the continental United States, accounting for about 6 percent of the youth population. Of these, Mexican Americans (also known as chicanos) were the largest group, representing 58 percent of the Hispanic population; Puerto Ricans comprised 16 percent of the Hispanic population, Cubans 6 percent, and other groups of Spanish origin--mostly from Central and South America--20 percent.[1]

Hispanics differ from blacks and whites in certain socioeconomic characteristics. In addition, the various groups of Hispanics exhibit important differences (Table 2.1) as well as similarities.[2]

Region

Hispanics reside in all regions of the country, but, depending on the Hispanic group, are more likely to live in certain regions. One-fifth reside in the Northeast, but less than one-tenth in the North Central region. Among chicanos, 9 out of every 10 youths reside either in the West or South. Most of the chicanos not in the Southwest reside in Michigan, Illinois, Ohio, Wisconsin, and Indiana, where a large number of migrant farm workers have resettled. The chicano population in the North Central region is growing.

Nearly 3 out of every 4 Puerto Rican youths reside in the Northeast, and over half of Cuban youth reside in the South, primarily Florida. About one-fourth of the Cubans also reside in the Northeast. Many of the youth from the other Spanish group, i.e., those from Central and South America, reside in the North Central region, but they are spread more uniformly across the United States.

Table 2.1 Profile of Youth by Race/Hispanic Groups, 1979

(Percentage distributions)

Characteristic	Total[a]	White	Black	Hispanic[b]	Chicano	Cuban	Puerto Rican	Others
Overall	100	80	14	6	58	6	16	20
Sex								
Female	50	50	51	50	51	46	50	50
Male	50	50	49	50	49	54	50	51
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Age								
14-15	25	24	26	27	27	17	27	28
16-17	25	25	26	25	25	27	29	25
18-19	25	25	25	25	27	25	20	21
20-21	25	25	23	24	22	31	24	26
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Region								
Northeast	21	22	19	20	1	25	77	32
North Central	30	34	19	8	8	5	8	8
South	32	28	56	28	31	63	12	22
West	16	16	6	44	60	7	13	38
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Enrollment status								
High school dropout	11	10	15	23	25	14	29	16
High school student	49	49	53	50	50	40	50	52
College student	16	17	12	11	10	30	8	12
Nonenrolled high school graduate	24	25	20	16	16	16	12	20
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Educational attainment								
1-8	19	18	22	29	31	20	30	24
9-11	41	40	47	44	44	34	49	44
12	26	27	22	18	18	20	14	21
13 or more	14	15	10	9	8	26	7	11
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Marital and family status								
Never married	89	89	94	85	84	85	87	89
Married	9	10	5	12	14	11	10	8
Separated, widowed, divorced	2	1	2	3	2	4	3	3
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Has children (total)								
Yes	9	7	17	12	14	5	15	6
No	91	93	83	88	86	95	85	94
Females only								
Yes	13	10	25	18	20	8	23	12
No	87	90	75	82	80	92	77	88

Table 2.1 (continued)

Characteristic	Total[a]	White	Black	Hispanic[b]	Chicano	Cuban	Puerto Rican	Others
Family income								
Less than $5,000	8	6	17	15	13	12	22	14
5,000-9,999	13	10	23	23	23	19	30	19
10,000-14,999	12	11	15	15	16	21	15	12
15,000-19,999	11	11	10	10	11	12	6	8
20,000-24,999	11	13	5	7	8	13	3	7
25,000-29,999	8	9	3	5	5	3	2	8
30,000-39,999	9	10	3	4	4	2	3	4
40,000 or more	8	9	2	3	2	3	1	7
Not available	21	21	21	18	17	15	19	21
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Poverty status								
Poor	12	7	33	27	26	15	40	22
Nonpoor	67	72	47	55	56	70	41	57
Not available	21	22	21	18	17	15	19	21
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Ever participated in government-sponsored employment and training program								
Yes	13	9	32	21	20	10	34	18
No	87	91	68	79	80	90	66	82
Language other than English spoken in household when child								
Yes	14	10	3	90	91	97	95	78
No	86	90	97	10	9	3	5	22
Place of birth								
U.S.-born	95	97	97	73	74	35	98	64
Foreign-born	5	3	3	27	26	65	2	36
Born on mainland U.S. (Puerto Ricans only)								
Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	62	-
No							38	
Residence in U.S. at age 14								
Yes	98	99	99	90	90	96	99	83
No	2	1	1	10	10	4	1	17
Residence on mainland U.S. at age 14 (Puerto Ricans only)								
Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	91	-
No							9	

[a]UNIVERSE: Civilians age 14-21 on January 1, 1979. (N=32,870,000)
UNIVERSE: Hispanic civilians age 14-21 on January 1, 1979. (N=2,070,000)

Enrollment Status

Approximately half of all youth age 14-21 are currently enrolled in high school, but minority youth, Hispanics in particular, are less likely than white youth to graduate and enroll in college. Over one-fifth are high school dropouts.

The severity of the dropout problem varies among the Hispanic groups, ranging from more than one-fourth among Puerto Ricans and chicanos to one-seventh for Cubans. The proportion of Cuban youth enrolled in college exceeded, in fact, the rate of enrolled white youth.

Marital and Family Status

Most youth in this age group--14 to 21--have never been married; among Hispanics only 12 percent are married, and nearly the same percentage reported having had children. Black and Hispanic young women more frequently reported having had children than did whites; one-fourth of the blacks and one-fifth of the Hispanics have had a child in contrast to one-tenth of whites. Cuban females reported having had fewer children than chicanos and Puerto Ricans, whose rates of childbirth were similar to the overall Hispanic rate.

Family Income and Poverty Status

More than a third of Hispanic youth live in families who earn less than $10,000 a year. About this same proportion of chicanos, half the Puerto Ricans, and less than a third of Cubans reside in such low-income families. In contrast, over two-fifths of black youth and less than one-seventh of white youth live in low-income families.

A fourth of Hispanic youth fell below the poverty guidelines of the U.S. Census Bureau.[3] Puerto Ricans had the highest proportion living in poverty, involving two-fifths of the youth. Cuban youth had the lowest proportion within the Hispanic groups, but they nevertheless doubled the white poverty rate. Less than one-tenth of white youth and a third of black youth live in poverty.

Participation in Government-Sponsored Employment and Training

Low family incomes among minority youth partially explain why one-fifth of Hispanics and about one-third of blacks had participated in government-sponsored employment and training. Puerto Ricans participated in about the same proportion as blacks, but Cubans reflected the white participation rate, which did not exceed 10 percent.

Language, Place of Birth, and Place of Residence at Age 14

In comparison to other youth, Hispanics are unique in that most were raised in bilingual households. Nearly one out of every four youths among the Hispanic population is also foreign born, both legal and illegal migration contributing to the population's overall growth. The percentage of non-native youth varies substantially among the Hispanic groups; two-thirds of the Cuban youths were foreign born, but virtually every Puerto Rican was native-born because Puerto Ricans are U.S. citizens. Because the NLS sample only included Puerto Ricans on the mainland when screening was conducted, a comparison between mainland youth and those residing on the island was not possible. Nearly two-fifths of the Puerto Rican youths residing on the mainland were born in Puerto Rico[4].

Overall, Hispanics appear not to be recent arrivals to this country; the overwhelming majority were residing in the United States by the age of 14. Among Puerto Ricans, most lived on the mainland by this age.

Birthplace of Parents

The NLS provided birthplace information for the youths' parents as well as for paternal grandfathers. Table 2.2 presents the parents' background for U.S.-born and foreign-born Hispanic, excluding Puerto Rican, youth. Parents of one-third of the U.S.-born Hispanic youth were second generation U.S. citizens and parents of slightly less than one-fifth of U.S.-born Hispanics were first generation. Approximately one-third of U.S.-born Hispanics, however, had one foreign-born parent. Parents of U.S.-born chicanos shared the same birthplace distribution as Hispanics in general, but nearly half the U.S.-born among the other Hispanic group (from Central and South America) had second generation parents.

Since many Cubans came to the U.S. in the early sixties as political refugees, it is not surprising that over four-fifths of the Cuban youth born in this country had foreign-born parents.[5]

Comparison of Native and Foreign-Born Hispanics

Three predominant characteristics of Hispanic youth are that they grow up in low income households where Spanish is spoken, and they frequently drop out of high school. Table 2.3 presents a comparative profile of Hispanic youth by place of birth to determine whether certain characteristics are more predominant for foreign-born than for native-born youth. One can quickly notice that the age distribution of foreign-born youth is more likely to be skewed toward the older age group, and it follows that more are likely to be

Table 2.2 Birthplace of Hispanic Youth by Birthplace of Parents and Grandfather[a]

(Percentage distributions)

Parent's generation	Chicano		Cuban		Others		Total	
	Native-born	Foreign-born	Native-born	Foreign-born	Native-born	Foreign-born	Native-born	Foreign-born
Second generation	30	0	2	0	47	1	33	0
First generation	19	1	2	0	17	2	18	1
Foreign-born parent	30	89	87	99	25	84	31	89
Missing information	20	10	9	1	11	14	18	10
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

[a]Puerto Rican youth are excluded from the analysis because virtually all are native-born.

UNIVERSE: Non-Puerto Rican Hispanic civilians age 14-21 on January 1, 1979. (N = 1,750,000)

Table 2.3 Selected Characteristics of Native-Born and Foreign-Born Hispanics, 1979

(Percentage Distributions)

Characteristic	Native-born					Foreign-born		
	Chicano	Cuban	Puerto Rican mainland[a]	Puerto Rican non-mainland	Others	Chicano	Cuban	Others
Sex								
Female	53	45	53	46	51	46	47	46
Male	47	55	47	54	49	54	53	54
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Age								
14-15	29	31	31	19	30	21	10	25
16-17	26	30	30	29	26	21	25	22
18-19	26	17	20	19	20	29	30	23
20-21	19	22	19	33	23	29	35	30
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Region	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Northeast	0	22	73	84	19	1	27	55
North Central	8	2	7	10	9	9	6	7
South	36	72	15	7	25	16	59	16
West	55	5	6	0	48	74	8	22
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Enrollment status								
High school dropuot	18	12	25	37	12	45	16	23
High school student	54	53	53	46	55	38	32	47
College student	11	25	10	5	10	7	33	15
Nonenrolled high school graduate	17	10	13	12	13	11	19	15
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Educational attainment								
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
1-8	24	24	30	31	20	49	19	31
9-11	48	41	48	52	47	33	29	39
12	20	15	14	13	22	11	23	19
13 or more	8	20	8	4	11	6	29	11

Table 2.3 (continued)

Characteristic	Native-born					Foreign-born		
	Chicano	Cuban	Puerto Rican mainland[a]	Puerto Rican non-mainland	Others	Chicano	Cuban	Others
Marital and family status								
Never married	85	89	89	83	91	80	83	87
Married	12	9	8	13	6	19	12	11
Separated, widowed, divorced	3	2	3	5	3	1	5	2
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Has children (total)								
Yes	13	b	12	20	5	15	7	8
No	87	b	80	80	95	85	93	92
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Females only								
Yes	18	0	19	30	10	25	12	17
No	82	100	81	70	90	75	88	83
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Family income								
Less than $5,000	13	17	19	26	13	12	9	16
5,000-9,999	22	7	22	44	13	27	25	29
10,000-14,999	17	26	19	6	12	16	18	13
15,000-19,999	12	20	7	4	10	11	8	6
20,000-24,999	8	6	3	2	8	6	17	4
25,000-29,999	5	4	3	0	9	4	2	5
30,000-39,999	5	6	4	2	3	1	0	7
40,000 or more	3	2	1	1	9	0	4	3
Not available	16	12	22	15	24	23	16	17
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Poverty status								
Poor	24	20	32	51	18	32	13	29
Nonpoor	60	69	46	33	59	45	71	55
Not available	16	12	22	15	24	23	16	17
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Table 2.3 (continued)

Characteristic	Native-born					Foreign-born		
	Chicano	Cuban	Puerto Rican mainland[a]	Puerto Rican non-mainland	Others	Chicano	Cuban	Others
Ever participated in a government-sponsored employment and training program								
Yes	22	5	32	38	19	14	12	15
No	78	95	68	62	81	86	88	85
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Language other than English spoken in household when child								
Yes	89	93	93	100	67	99	99	96
No	11	7	7	0	33	1	1	4
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

UNIVERSE: Hispanic civilians age 14-21 on January 1, 1979. (N=2,070,000)

[a]Puerto Ricans are categorized into youth born on the U.S. mainland and those outside the mainland. Youth born in Puerto Rico and other places outside the mainland including foreign areas are included in nonmainland born.

[b]Insufficient number of sample cases.

married. As one would expect, nearly all foreign-born Hispanics were raised in Spanish-speaking households, but so were the native-born.

The proportion of foreign- and native-born Hispanic youth who dropped out of high school remained high but was greater for foreign-born, ranging from 45 percent of the chicanos to 16 percent of the Cubans. Nearly one-fifth of the native-born chicanos dropped out, and among foreign-born chicanos, nearly half have completed fewer than eight years of schooling. Among Puerto Ricans, dropout rates were highest for those born outside the mainland, but the problem was severe for all Puerto Ricans, irrespective of birthplace.

A substantial proportion of both foreign- and native-born Hispanic youth resided in families who earned annual incomes of less than $10,000 and met the poverty classification. Foreign-born youth were slightly more likely to reside in these income-disadvantaged families. Two-fifths of the foreign-born chicanos and one-third of the native-born lived in families earning less than $10,000; the vast majority of Puerto Ricans born in Puerto Rico and two-fifths of those born on the mainland lived in families with comparably low incomes. Poverty status prevailed more among foreign-born but distinguished almost as many native-born youth. Although foreign-born Hispanics were more income-disadvantaged than were the native-born, they participated less in government-sponsored employment and training; mainland-born Puerto Ricans participated in such programs slightly less than did those born in Puerto Rico.

Perception of Discrimination

Minority status in the United States has generally been associated with social, political, and economic discrimination. Both black and Hispanic youth perceived discrimination in employment. Table 2.4 presents by selected

Table 2.4 Percentage of NLS Youth Stating Certain Barriers Caused Them Problems in Getting a Good Job by Race, Hispanic Groups, and Native- versus Foreign-Born, 1979

	Nationality discrimination	Racial discrimination	Problem with English
Race			
Black	10	19	4
Hispanic	14	15	18
White	1	3	2
Total	3	6	3
Hispanic groups			
Chicano	13	14	17
Native-born	9	11	4
Foreign-born	24	23	52
Cuban	9	6	12
Native-born	0	0	0
Foreign-born	13	9	17
Puerto Rican	16	19	17
Born on mainland U.S.	16	18	9
Born outside mainland	17	22	29
Others	16	15	23
Native-born	10	8	10
Foreign-born	27	28	47

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 on January 1, 1979. (N=24,800,000)

characteristics the proportion of NLS youth age 16-22 who have perceived their race, nationality, or difficulty with English as obstacles in getting good jobs. Black youth were more likely than Hispanics to report race discrimination (19 percent versus 15 percent), but Hispanics cited discrimination on the basis of nationality more frequently than blacks (14 versus 10 percent). The proportion of white youth reporting discrimination on the basis of race or nationality did not exceed 3 percent. Problems with English were considered an employment barrier by 18 percent of Hispanic youth, compared to less than 5 percent for blacks and whites.

Some Hispanic groups perceived discrimination more vividly than others. Nearly a fifth of the Puerto Ricans, equal to the proportion of blacks, felt race discrimination had prevented them from getting a job. Less than 10 percent of the Cubans perceived race or nationality as employment barriers, but many felt language difficulties were a problem. Hispanics from Central and South America cited language problems most frequently. The proportion of chicanos who felt discriminated against because of race, nationality or language problems corresponded to the overall Hispanic rate.

Perceptions of discrimination also varied among Hispanic youth according to their place of birth. One would expect the less assimilated foreign-born Hispanics to experience more discrimination, and as Table 2.4 shows, their perception of both race and nationality discrimination was generally more pronounced than that of native-born. In fact, they perceived themselves racially discriminated against more often than black youth did. About one-fourth of the foreign-born chicanos, in comparison to about one-tenth of the native-born, stated they had employment problems because of race or nationality. Among Puerto Ricans, slightly more of the youth born in Puerto Rico felt they had been discriminated against on similar grounds. Native-born

Cubans did not feel their race or nationality significantly prevented them from getting good jobs.

Foreign-born Hispanic youth most frequently claimed limited English as an obstacle in obtaining employment. Limited English is viewed as the foremost employment barrier by half of the foreign-born chicanos, compared to less than 4 percent of the native-born.

Conclusions

A profile of Hispanic youth revealed the similiarities and differences they share among themselves and with youth of other races. Most were raised in households where Spanish was spoken, and their socioeconomic level was generally between those of blacks and whites. Puerto Ricans and chicanos were more likely than other Hispanics, however, to be living in families whose income was below the poverty level; in fact, the proportion in poverty of Puerto Ricans slightly exceeded that of black youth.

Furthermore, improvement in the income status of Hispanics is not in sight. Hispanic youth are more likely than blacks or whites to drop out of high school. The problem is especially acute for chicanos and Puerto Ricans, and compounded for foreign-born Hispanics. Moreover, Hispanic youth, particularly those who are foreign-born, perceive both nationality and race discrimination as major employment barriers. Foreign-born Hispanics also frequently cite limited English as an employment obstacle.

One should not assume, however, that the problems of Hispanics are caused by the presence of foreign-born youth. Dropout rates for native-born Hispanics exceeded those of blacks and whites. A substantial proportion of native-born Hispanic youth lived in poverty and many experienced discrimination. Both native- and foreign-born Hispanic youth are thus

entering the labor market with low educational attainment, limited English, and perceptions of discrimination. The effects of these attributes on employment are explored in the next chapters.

Footnotes

[1]In the Hispanic cohort, about four percent of the youth did not identify with a specific Hispanic group. These youth were classified in the "other" Hispanic group.

[2]A preliminary profile of Hispanic youth by group is presented in U.S. Department of Labor, A Profile of Hispanic Youth, Office of Youth Programs: Youth Knowledge Development Report 10.2, April 1980.

[3]The poverty lines were taken from the Office of Management and Budget Guidelines and adjusted by the change in the Consumer Price Index between January and October, 1978

[4]Less than two percent of Puerto Rican youth were foreign-born. For purposes of analysis, Puerto Ricans are divided by birthplace into those born on the U.S. mainland and those born elsewhere. These latter are so predominantly born in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico that they are sometimes referred to as island-born.

[5]Most Cubans entered the country as political refugees during the Cuban revolution in the early sixties, and the proportion of foreign born is correlated with age of youth. For example, the proportion of foreign born is lowest among the youngest age Cubans: age 14-15, 38 percent foreign born; age 16-17, 61 percent; age 18-19, 77 percent; and age 20-21; 75 percent.

CHAPTER III

Employment Status of Hispanics

Introduction

The NLS Youth Survey estimated that during the spring of 1979 about a million Hispanic youth age 16-21 were in the labor force, with approximately 721,000 employed and 218,000 unemployed. The largest single Hispanic group participating was that of Mexican origin. Each of the groups except for Puerto Ricans had about the same proportion among the employed and unemployed as their representation in the labor force (Table 3.1).

Variations in labor force participation rates (LFPR), unemployment rates, and employment/population ratios distinguished the Hispanic groups. This chapter examines the employment status differences among these youth by focusing on their race, age, school enrollment status, poverty status and place of birth.

Differences by Race, Sex, and Hispanic Groups

Table 3.2 shows that among all youth age 16-21, the overall labor force participation rate was 71 percent, the unemployment rate 19 percent, and the employment/population ratio 57 percent.[1] White youth participated more in the labor force and incurred lower unemployment rates than black or Hispanic youth. Hispanic youth had the lowest LFPR and were intermediate relative to blacks and whites in unemployment rate and employment/population ratio . Females, particularly those from minorities, did not have an employment status as favorable as males: Hispanic females had the lowest LFPR of all the race-sex groups and black females the highest unemployment rates.

Depending on the indicators, the status of the Hispanic groups varies. For example, chicano males participated extensively in the labor force, having

Table 3.1 Estimated Size of the Hispanic Labor Force,[a] 1979 (in thousands)

	Labor force		Employed		Unemployed	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total Hispanic	939	(100)	721	(100)	218	(100)
Chicano	561	(60)	440	(61)	121	(56)
Puerto Rican	137	(15)	86	(12)	50	(23)
Cuban	62	(7)	51	(7)	10	(5)
All other Hispanics[b]	180	(19)	144	(20)	36	(17)

[a]Due to rounding, the labor force sizes may be at slight variance. In addition, the percentage may not equal 100 percent.

[b]All other Hispanics includes youth who did not self identify with any of the groups listed above or any Hispanic identification.

UNIVERSE: Hispanic civilians age 16-21 on interview date. (N=1,518,000)

Table 3.2 Employment Status by Sex, Race and Hispanic Group, 1979

Sex	Labor force participation rate	Unemployment rate	Employment/ population ratio
	Total		
Female	67.6	20.7	53.6
Male	74.1	17.6	61.1
Total	70.8	19.1	57.3
	White		
Female	70.0	17.5	57.7
Male	74.9	14.4	64.1
Total	72.4	15.9	60.9
	Black		
Female	60.1	41.2	35.4
Male	71.0	36.0	45.4
Total	65.3	38.5	40.2
	Hispanic (total)		
Female	53.4	24.7	40.2
Male	70.7	22.0	55.1
Total	61.8	23.2	47.5
	Chicano		
Female	53.5	24.0	40.7
Male	74.0	19.7	59.4
Total	63.3	21.6	49.7
	Cuban		
Female	64.6	a	51.4
Male	65.4	13.2	56.8
Total	65.1	16.6	54.3
	Puerto Rican		
Female	50.5	40.8	29.9
Male	67.4	33.6	44.8
Total	58.7	36.8	37.1
	Other Hispanics		
Female	52.4	15.8	44.1
Male	65.3	23.3	50.1
Total	59.0	20.0	47.2

[a]Insufficient number of sample cases.
UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 on interview date. (N=24,580,000)

a LFPR of 74 percent, which exceeded that of blacks and equalled that of whites; but they experienced substantially higher unemployment than white youth did. Puerto Rican and Cuban males both had lower LFPR than whites or blacks, but the unemployment rate and employment/population ratio for Puerto Ricans corresponded to those of blacks, while these statistics for Cubans paralleled those for whites.

Among the female Hispanic groups, the LFPR of Cubans falls into an intermediate range, but the LFPR for chicanas and Puerto Ricans drops below that of both white and black females. Puerto Rican females endure one of the most unfavorable employment situations of any of the NLS youth groups; they have an unemployment rate of 41 percent and an employment/population ratio of 30 percent.

Effect of Age

As in the case of all youth, the prospects of obtaining a more favorable employment situation appear to increase with age for Hispanics (Table 3.3). In general, older youth experience an increase in the LFPR and a decline in the unemployment rate, but this improvement distinguishes black and Hispanic youth less than white. High unemployment rates exist among minority youth irrespective of their age. For example, unemployment among males age 20-21 dropped to 9 percent for whites but was 23 percent for blacks and 13 percent for Hispanics. For females age 20-21, a higher proportion relative to males remained unemployed, and a higher proportion of minority females were unemployed than white females.

Because of the small number of sample cases, the effect of age on employment status cannot be traced for all the Hispanic groups, but Table 3.3 presents this information for selected Hispanic groups where sufficient sample

Table 3.3 Employment Status by Sex, Age, Race and Selected Hispanic Groups, 1979

(Percentage distributions)

Sex, race and age	Labor force participation rate	Percent unemployed	Employment/ population ratio
White	72.4	15.9	60.9
Female	70.0	17.5	57.7
16-17	62.4	25.0	46.8
18-19	73.9	17.4	61.1
20-21	73.5	11.2	65.3
Male	74.9	14.4	64.1
16-17	64.4	23.3	49.4
18-19	77.7	12.8	67.8
20-21	82.9	8.6	75.8
Black	65.3	38.5	40.2
Female	60.1	41.2	35.4
16-17	48.1	54.6	21.9
18-19	63.9	40.3	38.1
20-21	67.9	32.6	45.8
Male	71.0	36.0	45.4
16-17	59.6	53.5	27.7
18-19	72.8	33.7	48.3
20-21	82.9	22.8	64.0
Hispanic	61.8	23.2	47.5
Female	53.4	24.7	40.2
16-17	42.0	36.7	26.5
18-19	57.3	22.3	44.5
20-21	60.3	19.1	48.8
Male	70.7	22.0	55.1
16-17	60.1	37.9	37.3
18-19	76.2	16.0	64.0
20-21	77.7	13.3	67.3
Chicano	63.3	21.6	49.7
Female	53.5	24.0	40.7
16-17	41.8	33.4	27.9
18-19	58.2	20.4	46.3
20-21	61.1	20.7	48.5
Male	74.0	19.7	59.4
16-17	56.8	31.0	39.2
18-19	78.9	15.6	66.6
20-21	85.6	16.4	71.6
Puerto Rican	58.7	36.8	37.1
Female	50.5	40.8	29.9
16-17	44.7	a	22.3
18-19	45.9	a	28.4
20-21	59.6	a	37.2
Male	67.4	33.6	44.8
16-17	66.4	a	30.8
18-19	73.1	a	59.5
20-21	63.1	a	56.7

[a]Insufficient number of sample cases.

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 on interview date. (N=24,580,000)

cases were available in the data. With the exception of youth age 16-17, chicano males participated more in the labor force than whites but had slightly lower employment/population ratios and in turn higher rates of unemployment. Puerto Rican males of all ages experienced lower LFPR and employment/population ratios than either chicanos or whites. Chicano and Puerto Rican females participated less in the labor force irrespective of their age than did blacks or whites. Increasing age improved their employment prospects but not as much as it did for whites or, in some cases, for blacks; among Puerto Rican females age 20-21, only 37 percent were employed as opposed to 46 percent among black females.

Employment Status and School Enrollment Status

One must consider the employment status of youth by viewing it in the context of school enrollment. While some youth do not participate in the labor force because of school responsibilities, others attend school and hold a job or are in the labor force but not enrolled (see Table 3.4). High school students comprise a third of the civilian labor force age 16-21, but they also account for over two-fifths of youth unemployment. By comparison, those youth who complete high school are favored in the employment distribution.

As in other youth groups, the Hispanic youth labor force is heavily comprised of high school students, but it is different, especially for chicanos and Puerto Ricans, in that it also contains a large number of high school dropouts. These youth who have left school constitute more than a fourth of the Hispanic labor force and over a third of the unemployed. For Cubans, the proportion of dropouts in the labor force corresponded to the distribution of whites.

Table 3.4 Distribution of the Labor Force by School Enrollment Status for Race and Selected Hispanic Groups, 1979
(Percentage distributions)

Educational status	Total labor force	Employed	Unemployed
	White		
High school dropout	12.6	10.6	23.2
High school student	32.3	29.9	44.9
College student	17.5	18.9	9.9
Nonenrolled high school graduate	37.7	40.6	22.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Black		
High school dropout	19.2	17.4	22.1
High school student	35.1	28.1	46.4
College student	13.8	16.6	9.3
Nonenrolled high school graduate	31.9	37.9	22.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Hispanic		
High school dropout	30.4	28.8	35.7
High school student	29.6	25.3	44.1
College student	13.4	14.6	9.6
Nonenrolled high school graduate	26.6	31.4	10.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Chicano		
High school dropout	33.1	31.3	39.8
High school student	27.3	24.4	37.8
College student	12.8	14.0	8.6
Nonenrolled high school graduate	26.8	30.3	13.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Puerto Rican		
High school dropout	37.1	37.8	35.9
High school student	33.8	28.2	43.3
College student	10.3	7.6	14.9
Nonenrolled high school graduate	18.8	26.3	5.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 3.4 (continued)

Educational status	Total labor force	Employed	Unemployed
	Cuban		
High school dropout	16.1	12.0	a
High school student	26.2	26.2	a
College student	37.3	40.5	a
Nonenrolled high school graduate	20.5	21.4	a
Total	100.0	100.0	a
	Others		
High school dropout	20.8	20.7	21.1
High school student	35.1	25.9	71.6
College student	10.3	12.2	2.5
Nonenrolled high school student	33.9	41.2	4.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

[a]Insufficient number of sample cases.

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 on interview date. (N=24,580,000)

The employment status of youth is presented by school enrollment status in Table 3.5 and the findings are discussed in the following sections.

High School Students

An impressive six out of every ten high school students participated in the labor force, although Hispanic students were less likely than either blacks or whites to be participants. The marginal female participation rate, especially among chicanas, generally accounts for the lower LFPR of Hispanic students.

A third of the Hispanic students in the labor force did not have jobs; their unemployment rate was lower than that of blacks, with nearly half their student labor force out of work. Unemployment varied, however, among the Hispanic groups: for chicanos, the rate was slightly less than the overall Hispanic rate but among Puerto Ricans, it approached the unemployment rate of blacks. Only one-fifth of the white high school youth in the labor force were without work.

High School Dropouts

Most male high school dropouts are in the labor force, although blacks participate less than whites or Hispanics. Chicanos had the highest LFPR among Hispanic male dropouts, 91 percent, and Puerto Ricans the lowest, 80 percent. The unemployment rates were lower for Hispanic male dropouts than they were for whites or blacks, but they varied among the Hispanic groups. For chicano dropouts, unemployment was lower than that of whites, but the rate for Puerto Ricans fell between those of white and black youth.

Female dropouts, particularly blacks and Hispanics, on the other hand, participated much less in the labor force and had higher unemployment rates.

Table 3.5 Employment Status by Educational Status, Sex, Race and Selected Hispanic Groups, 1979
(Percentage distributions)

Race	Labor force participation rate			Percent unemployed			Employment/ population ratio		
	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total
	High school student								
White	63.1	65.3	64.2	23.6	20.8	22.1	48.2	51.7	50.0
Black	50.9	59.9	55.5	51.1	50.7	50.9	24.9	29.5	27.3
Hispanic	41.6	56.9	50.0	35.0	34.2	34.5	27.1	37.5	32.7
Chicano	42.2	53.1	47.5	30.8	29.0	29.8	29.2	37.7	33.3
Puerto Rican	45.4	61.2	55.8	a	46.6	47.2	23.3	32.7	29.5
Total	59.9	64.0	62.1	27.7	25.6	26.6	43.4	47.6	45.6
	High school dropout								
White	62.2	89.7	76.4	37.9	23.5	29.2	38.6	68.6	54.0
Black	45.9	81.6	65.3	68.7	32.6	44.1	14.4	55.0	36.5
Hispanic	46.0	87.5	65.7	40.5	19.5	27.2	27.4	70.5	47.8
Chicano	48.7	90.7	68.5	38.3	18.3	25.8	30.1	74.1	50.8
Puerto Rican	39.7	80.0	55.6	a	25.2	35.6	20.2	59.9	35.8
Total	57.2	87.8	73.0	42.5	24.7	31.5	32.9	66.1	50.0
	College student								
White	63.3	58.1	60.6	9.4	8.6	9.0	57.4	53.1	55.2
Black	62.9	57.6	60.8	23.9	29.1	25.9	47.8	40.9	45.0
Hispanic	61.5	57.4	59.6	19.4	12.9	16.6	49.5	50.0	49.7
Chicano	62.1	70.0	66.0	13.1	15.7	14.5	54.0	59.0	56.5
Puerto Rican	a	a	52.3	a	a	a	a	a	24.5
Total	63.2	58.0	60.6	11.6	10.5	11.0	55.8	52.0	53.9
	Nonenrolled high school graduate								
White	83.6	94.8	88.5	11.3	7.0	9.3	74.2	88.2	80.3
Black	80.4	90.5	84.7	30.8	22.0	26.8	55.6	70.6	61.9
Hispanic	75.1	86.6	80.1	6.9	11.8	9.2	69.9	76.4	72.7
Chicano	75.4	91.6	82.9	8.9	13.2	11.1	68.7	79.6	73.7
Puerto Rican	a	a	80.7	a	a	a	a	a	71.4
Total	82.8	94.0	87.7	13.3	8.8	11.2	71.0	85.8	77.9

[a]Insufficient number of sample cases.

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 on interview date. (N=24,580,000)

Only about one-seventh of the blacks and one-fourth of the Hispanics held jobs in comparison to two-fifths of the whites. Puerto Ricans were the least likely to be in the labor force and their employment/population ratio closely resembled that of blacks.

College Students

Female college students participated more in the labor force and had higher employment/population ratios than males. There was little variation in LFPR amongs whites, blacks, and Hispanics. In unemployment rate and employment/population ratio, Hispanics were between whites and blacks. Chicano male college students had above average LFPR but otherwise were not very different from other Hispanics. Puerto Rican college students had very low employment/population ratios.

Nonenrolled High School Graduates

As one would expect, high school graduates not enrolled in college had high LFPRs, ranging from 95 percent for white males to 75 percent for Hispanic females. These rates reflected the youths' shifts from school to work responsibilities. In general, females participated in the labor force less than males and had poorer employment situations. Hispanic female graduates, however, had the lowest unemployment rate of all the groups under study. Hispanic male high school graduates, on the other hand, while faring much better than blacks are not without their own problems. Their unemployment rate is substantially higher than that of whites.

Employment Status and Poverty

Low income youth are likely to reside in poor neighborhoods where jobs are not readily available. Their employment status is thus generally more unfavorable than that of nonpoor youth. This point is made in Table 3.6, which shows that youth living with families whose 1978 income fell below the poverty line experienced more unemployment and did not participate in the labor force as much as nonpoor youth.[2] The unfavorable employment status of poor youth was compounded for females and minorities.

Among Hispanic and white poor youth, unemployment rates were approximately twice those of nonpoor youth and were about 50 percent higher for blacks. Chicanos had the highest LFPR among Hispanic groups and the lowest unemployment rate among males in poverty. Among all youth in poverty, Puerto Ricans suffered the lowest employment/population ratio.

Employment Status: Foreign-Born Versus Native-Born

One might reasonably expect foreign-born Hispanic youth to have a less favorable employment status than the native-born have because of limited labor market information and lack of assimilation into the U.S. culture. Surprisingly, however, only slight differences appear between the LFPRs of native-born and foreign-born Hispanics (see Table 3.7A). Males born outside this country were more likely to be in the labor force than were the native-born, but the reverse was true for Hispanic females. Furthermore, foreign-born Hispanic males and females encountered lower unemployment than native-born. For Puerto Ricans, however, findings are consistent with the hypothesis that those born on the mainland are more assimilated into both the labor market and U.S. culture.[3] Table 3.7B shows that young people born in Puerto Rico are more disadvantaged than the mainland-born. Puerto Rican

Table 3.6 Employment Status and Poverty Status by Race, Sex and Selected Hispanic Groups, 1979

(Percentage distributions)

	Poor		Nonpoor		Poverty status unavailable	
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male
	Labor force participation rate					
White	62.2	69.1	71.7	76.1	67.4	72.0
Black	52.1	65.8	63.9	74.1	65.2	70.7
Hispanic	40.0	67.5	62.8	74.7	45.6	61.9
Chicano	42.6	71.7	63.2	77.9	39.3	64.8
Puerto Rican	35.0	61.9	65.3	68.5	52.9	a
Total	55.3	67.7	70.5	75.8	65.9	71.3
	Percent Unemployed					
White	26.7	31.2	15.7	12.7	20.5	15.4
Black	54.0	44.7	33.7	32.4	39.7	33.7
Hispanic	38.0	35.3	20.1	16.7	26.6	21.6
Chicano	28.6	27.1	20.8	16.5	32.3	20.4
Puerto Rican	a	a	a	15.8	a	a
Total	38.0	36.4	17.4	14.7	23.1	18.4
	Employment/population ratios					
White	45.6	47.6	60.4	66.4	53.6	60.9
Black	24.0	36.4	42.4	50.1	39.3	46.9
Hispanic	24.8	43.6	50.2	62.2	33.4	48.5
Chicano	30.4	52.3	50.0	65.1	26.6	51.6
Puerto Rican	14.4	23.2	40.4	57.7	36.7	a
Total	34.3	43.0	58.2	64.7	50.7	58.2

[a]Insufficient number of sample cases.

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 on interview date. (N=24,580,000)

Table 3.7A Employment Status, by Sex, Selected Hispanic Groups, and Birth Place, 1979

Sex	Labor force participation rate		Percent unemployed		Employment/ population ratio	
	U.S.	Foreign-born	U.S.	Foreign-born	U.S.	Foreign-born
	Total Hispanics					
Total	61.4	62.9	24.7	19.3	46.3	50.8
Female	53.9	51.8	27.1	17.4	39.3	42.8
Male	69.7	72.8	22.7	20.6	53.9	57.8
	Chicano					
Total	62.5	65.4	23.8	15.7	47.6	55.1
Female	54.4	50.8	25.7	18.2	40.4	41.6
Male	72.0	78.7	22.2	14.2	56.0	67.5

[a]Insufficient number of sample cases.
UNIVERSE: Hispanic civilians age 16-21 on interview date. (N=1,518,000)

Table 3.7B Employment Status of Puerto Ricans by Sex and Birth Place, 1979[a]

Sex	Labor force participation rate		Percent unemployed		Employment/ population ratio	
	Main-land U.S.A.	Outside mainland U.S.A.	Main-land U.S.A.	Outside mainland U.S.A.	Main-land U.S.A.	Outside mainland U.S.A.
	Puerto Ricans					
Total	60.5	56.1	34.5	40.4	39.6	33.4
Female	55.7	42.4	41.8	b	32.4	25.9
Male	65.9	69.5	27.6	41.4	47.7	40.7

[a]Less than two percent for Puerto Rican youth 16-21 years were foreign born. For analytical purposes, Puerto Ricans are divided into two categories: born mainland U.S.A. and those born outside the mainland, presumably Puerto Rico. Included in the born outside mainland are foreign born and other U.S. territories.
[b]Insufficient number of sample cases.
UNIVERSE: Puerto Rican civilians age 16-21 on interview date. (N=224,400)

females born on the island have the lowest LFPR and employment/population ratio, and their male counterparts have an unemployment rate one and a half times greater than the rate of those born on the mainland.

The finding that foreign-born Hispanics have lower unemployment rates than native-born was not expected and may be partially explained by the older age of foreign-born Hispanics and by the fact that a vast portion of non-native chicanos are school dropouts and thus not burdened by school responsibilites. One would expect, nonetheless, that their lack of formal schooling would undermine the employment advantage they enjoy due to working full-time. Unfortunately, the small number of observations of the foreign-born precludes a more detailed analysis by school enrollment status and age.

Youth Out of the Labor Force

Three out of every ten youths age 16-21 do not have or are not actively seeking a job. About three-fourths of those out of the labor force (OLF) were enrolled in either high school or college, but the remaining one-fourth neither attended school, held a job, or looked for work (Table 3.8). Out of the labor force blacks and Hispanics are more likely than whites not to be in school. Among the Hispanic groups, nearly half of the OLF Puerto Ricans are not in school, and the vast majority of these youth are dropouts. At the other extreme, Cuban youth who are OLF are more likely to be in school than OLF whites.

When students were asked their reason for being out of the labor force, not surprisingly, schooling emerged as the predominant reason.[4] Females largely comprise the OLF out-of-school youth group; nearly eight out of ten in the group are women. Over half the OLF out-of-school Hispanic young women and

Table 3.8 Youth Out of the Labor Force by School Enrollment Status, Race, and Hispanic Group, 1979

(Percentage distribution)

	School enrollment status				
	High school dropout	High school student	College student	Nonenrolled high school graduates	Total
Total	13	48	27	12	100
Race					
White	10	47	30	13	100
Black	19	53	17	11	100
Hispanic	26	49	15	11	100
Hispanic groups					
Chicano	27	52	12	10	100
Puerto Rican	42	38	13	6	100
Cuban	7	47	31	15	100
Others	16	46	21	17	100

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 out of the labor force on interview date. (N = 7,200,000)

two-fifths of those who are black and white cited problems in obtaining child care and in alleviating other family responsibilities. About 18 percent of both blacks and whites and 15 percent of the Hispanics also gave pregnancy as a reason for their OLF status.

Implications of the Hispanic Employment Statistics

The employment status of Hispanics age 16-21 is overall not as favorable as that of whites and only slightly more favorable than that of blacks. Puerto Ricans and chicanos, as shown in other studies, suffer the most disadvantaged employment status.[5] Their situation approaches that of black youth while the situation of Cubans parallels that of whites. Moreover, differences in employment status appear among Hispanic females--Puerto Rican young women have the lowest LFPR and employment/population ratios among all the NLS youth groups. These differences among Hispanic groups must be noted when addressing issues of Hispanic youth employment.

Employment status varied among these youth according to their age, school enrollment status, poverty status and place of birth. Labor market difficulties of Hispanic youth are also compounded by a high proportion of dropouts. Although age and graduation from high school improve the employment status of all youth, the relative position of Hispanic youth continues to fall below that of whites.

Finally, as Appendix 3-B points out, the NLS survey shows a higher level of labor market activity and higher unemployment rates among Hispanics than the Current Population Survey. NLS data suggest the youth employment dilemma is more severe than previously considered. It seems advisable to monitor Hispanic employment and develop programs to combat their labor market problems, with particular attention directed to youth who are not enrolled in

school and not holding or actively seeking a job. Among OLF Puerto Ricans, the problem is particularly acute because half are not attending school. For young women, child care must be considered if we hope to improve their labor force participation.

Footnotes

[1]Youth interviewed after May 1979 are excluded to control for the large influx of students in the labor force during the summer. Youth interviewed after May 1979 are assumed to be distributed proportionately to those who were interviewed prior to May 1979. In the NLS, less than three percent of the youth were interviewed in the summer.

[2]The poverty lines were taken from the Office of Management and Budget Guidelines and adjusted by the change in the Consumer Price Index between January and October, 1978.

[3]Nearly all the Puerto Ricans are U.S. born, but since a substantial number were born outside the U.S. mainland, it is worthwhile to examine employment status differences by place of birth.

[4]Reasons for being OLF are presented in the appendix to this chapter as Tables 3A.1 and 3A.2.

[5]For comparison of Hispanic groups, refer to Morris J. Newman, "A Profile of Hispanics in the U.S. Work Force," Monthly Labor Review. December 1978.

Appendix 3-A

Reasons for Being Out of the Labor Force

Table 3A.1 Reasons OLF Youth in School Not Seeking or Wanting Work, by Race and Sex

(Percentage distributions)

Reason	White		Black		Hispanic	
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male
Believed no work available or could not find work	3	3	5	4	2	6
Personal limitations (e.g., too young, no training, handicap)	2	2	2	2	4	4
Can't arrange child care	*	--	2	--	2	--
Family responsibilities	2	*	2	--	4	2
In school or other training	82	78	80	76	87	7
Health	1	2	1	2	1	1
Pregnancy	--	--	2	--	1	--
Spouse or parent opposed	1	1	2	1	3	3
Does not want to work	11	12	2	7	1	6
Can't arrange transportation	6	4	9	4	7	6
Other	12	18	14	16	12	14

*Percentage is between 0.1 and 0.5

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 out of the labor force and enrolled in school on interview date. (N=4,000,000)

Table 3A.2 Reasons OLF Youth Out of School Not Seeking or Wanting Work, by Race and Sex

(Percentage distributions)

Reason	White		Black		Hispanic	
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male
Believed no work available or could not find work	1	16	11	16	5	4
Personal limitations (e.g., too young, no training, handicap)	4	6	4	3	10	9
Can't arrange child care	11	--	27	--	34	--
Family responsibilities	32	--	15	--	21	--
In school or other training	7	25	12	21	5	38
Health	3	9	2	4	1	5
Pregnancy	18	--	18	--	15	--
Spouse or parent opposed	6	--	4	--	5	--
Does not want to work	20	12	8	5	4	27
Can't arrange transportation	12	11	10	11	7	3
Other	12	51	16	56	20	33

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 out of the labor force and not enrolled in school on interview date. (N=3,170,000)

Appendix 3-B

NLS and CPS Employment Status Comparison: Hispanic Youth Age 16-21

Introduction

The National Longitudinal Surveys (NLS) generally obtain higher employment status estimates for youth than the Current Population Survey (CPS).[1] In the 1979 survey, the NLS obtained a one-sixth higher labor force participation rate (LFPR) and an 11 percent higher employment/population ratio for youth age 16-21. These differences tend to be greater for younger youth, minority youth, and those whose major survey week activity was school.[2] Other studies have noted these differences and generally attributed them to use of proxy respondents in the CPS.[3] The NLS determines employment status using CPS questions and procedures through personal interviews with the youth, but the CPS does not necessarily interview the youth directly and may obtain information through the parent or other responsible adult in the household. Although other studies have shown NLS-CPS differences by race in employment status of youth, a detailed survey comparison of employment status for Hispanics has not been undertaken because the published CPS data are restricted to youth 16-19 and printed only on a quarterly basis.[4] The availability of the March 1979 CPS public use sample tape does permit a more detailed NLS-CPS comparison by age and Hispanic group in the employment status of Hispanics.[5]

NLS-CPS Differences

Table 3B.1 presents the survey differences in employment status for Hispanics age 16-21 by sex and group. Overall, the NLS obtained a rate 5 percentage points higher in both LFPR and unemployment than the CPS but

Table 3B.1 Employment Status of Hispanics Age 16-21 by Group and Sex: Comparison of NLS and CPS,[a] 1979

	Labor force participation rate			Percent unemployed			Employment/ population ratio		
	NLS	CPS	Difference	NLS	CPS	Difference	NLS	CPS	Difference
	Total								
Total Hispanics	61.8	56.9	4.9	23.2	18.1	5.1	47.5	46.6	0.9
Chicano	63.3	59.9	3.4	21.6	17.5	4.1	49.7	49.4	0.3
Puerto Rican	58.7	39.8	18.9	36.8	25.4	11.4	37.1	29.7	7.4
Cuban	65.1	63.9	1.2	16.6	23.4	-6.8	54.3	48.9	5.4
Others	59.0	57.9	1.1	20.0	13.7	6.3	47.2	49.9	-2.7
	Female								
Total Hispanics	53.4	49.3	4.1	24.7	19.3	5.4	40.2	39.8	0.4
Chicano	53.5	51.3	2.2	24.0	19.8	4.2	40.7	41.1	-0.4
Puerto Rican	50.5	33.6	16.9	40.8	29.4	11.4	29.9	23.7	6.2
Cuban	64.6	62.5	2.1	a	a	a	51.4	54.4	-3.0
Others	52.4	53.8	-1.4	15.8	12.3	3.5	44.1	47.2	-3.1
	Male								
Total Hispanics	70.7	63.9	6.8	22.0	17.3	4.7	55.1	52.8	2.3
Chicano	74.0	68.1	5.9	19.7	15.9	3.8	59.4	57.3	2.1
Puerto Rican	67.4	46.7	20.7	33.6	22.3	10.7	44.8	36.3	8.5
Cuban	65.4	64.7	0.7	13.2	29.9	-16.7	56.8	45.4	11.4
Others	65.3	61.3	4.0	23.3	14.8	8.5	50.1	52.3	-2.2

[a]CPS figures are from March 1979, CPS Public Use Tape.

[b]Insufficient number of sample cases.

UNIVERSE: Hispanic civilians age 16-21 on interview date.

employment/population ratios that were similar. The survey differences were, however, not uniform for the Hispanic groups, being most substantial for Puerto Ricans; the NLS obtained a 19 percentage point higher LFPR and an 11 percentage point higher unemployment rate than the CPS for these youth. For the other Hispanic groups, especially Cubans, survey differences were not as pronounced.

The NLS difference in LFPR estimates tended to be greater for males than for females, while the opposite occurred in unemployment estimates. As noted previously, the survey differences were greatest for Puerto Ricans, irrespective of sex.

Implication of Differences

The survey differences suggest, as in the case of other youth, more extensive labor market activity among Hispanics than had been previously estimated. In particular, the NLS-CPS differences are especially acute for Puerto Ricans. Further research is needed to see whether the proxy respondent hypothesis accounts for the estimated employment status differences between the NLS and CPS. Attention should also be focused on determining why the survey differences are greatest for Puerto Rican youth.

Appendix Footnotes

[1]Richard B. Freeman and James L. Medoff, "Why Does the Rate of Labor Force Activity Differ Across Surveys?" in The Youth Labor Market Problem: Its Nature, Causes, and Consequences. Edited by Richard B. Freeman and David A. Wise (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press), 1982.

[2]R. Santos, "Measuring the Employment Status of Youth: CPS-NLS Differences." Proceedings from the Thirty-Third Annual Meetings (Madison, Wisconsin: Industrial Relations Research Association, September 1980), pp. 62-68.

[3]Differences between the surveys are documented in Michael E. Borus, Frank L. Mott, and Gilbert Nestel, "Counting Youth: Comparison of Labor Force Statistics in the CPS and NLS," Report on Youth Unemployment: Its Measurement and Meaning. U.S. Department of Labor, Washington: USGPO, 1978.

[4]CPS employment data are published in U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Earnings. Unemployment data on Hispanics are published by sex and separately for teenagers 16-17 and 18-19 years of age. LFPR and employment/population ratio are available for Hispanics age 16-19 but not by sex and age.

[5]March was the month selected for comparison because 44 percent of the NLS sample was interviewed in this month. Data from the 1979 March CPS public use tapes uses basic weights, and for technical documentation one should contact the Data User Service Division, Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C. For a comparison of the employment status estimates for youth age 16-21 between the NLS and March 1979 public use tape, refer to Gilbert Nestel and R. Santos, "CPS-NLS Differences in Labor Force Characteristics of Youth: Another Look," in Proceedings of the American Statistical Association Annual Meeting, August 1981.

Chapter IV

Unemployed Hispanics

Introduction

The most striking characteristic of the youth labor market is its unemployment: youth age 16-21 comprised about one-fourth of the civilian labor force in 1979 but nearly half of all unemployed persons.[1] In this chapter, unemployment among Hispanic youth is profiled by race, sex and group to reveal its various dimensions. Also examined are the reasons unemployed Hispanic youth give for seeking work, the type of work they seek, their reservation wage and willingness to work, and their job search methods. Data from the 1980 NLS make it possible to determine whether unemployed youth obtain work as well as how long these jobs last.

Profile of Unemployed Youth

A profile of unemployed youth by race and group shows that males and females were almost equally represented except that slightly fewer Hispanic females tended to be without jobs (Table 4.1). Males from the "other" Hispanic groups were the most likely to be unemployed relative to females. Two-fifths of these unemployed youth were age 16-17, and not surprisingly, the same proportion were enrolled in high school. Over half the unemployed Puerto Ricans and youth from the other Hispanic groups were age 16-17, but the most striking feature of unemployed Hispanics in general is the proportion of them who were high school dropouts: two-fifths of the unemployed chicanos and over one-third of the Puerto Ricans. Among unemployed whites and blacks, the proportion of dropouts was under one-fourth.

Table 4.1 Profile of Unemployed Youth by Race and Hispanic Group, 1979[a]

(Percentage distributions)

Characteristic	Total[c]	White	Black	Hispanic[d]	Chicano	Puerto Rican	Others
Sex							
Female	53	54	51	47	49	49	34
Male	47	46	49	53	51	51	66
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Age							
16-17	44	45	40	46	38	54	63
18-19	34	34	35	29	32	23	29
20-21	23	22	26	25	31	23	8
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Region							
Northeast	23	24	18	26	0	84	33
North Central	28	32	22	7	6	4	16
South	35	30	53	22	29	4	20
West	14	14	7	45	65	8	31
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Enrollment status							
High school dropout	24	23	22	36	40	36	21
High school student	45	45	46	44	38	43	72
College student	10	10	9	10	9	15	3
Nonenrolled high school graduate	21	22	22	11	14	6	5
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Ever participated in government sponsored employment and training program							
Yes	20	13	38	29	28	39	27
No	80	87	62	71	72	61	73
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Marital and family status							
Never married	88	86	93	83	78	87	95
Married	10	12	4	13	20	3	5
Separated, widowed, divorced	2	2	3	4	3	10	0
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Has children (total)							
Yes	15	11	25	13	16	15	2
No	86	89	75	87	84	85	98
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Has children (females only)							
Yes	22	17	39	21	25	b	b
No	78	83	61	79	75	b	b
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	b	b

Table 4.1 (continued)

Characteristic	Total[c]	White	Black	Hispanic[d]	Chicano	Puerto Rican	Others
Family income							
Less than $5,000	11	7	19	23	17	34	23
5,000-9,999	16	12	24	27	30	28	24
10,000-14,999	15	15	15	11	10	8	11
15,000-19,999	12	14	8	8	11	4	4
20,000-24,999	9	11	7	3	5	0	0
25,000-29,999	8	9	3	6	4	4	17
30,000-39,999	5	5	3	3	3	3	3
40,000 or more	3	4	1	3	3	1	3
Not available	22	23	21	17	17	19	16
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Poverty status							
Poor	19	12	37	35	29	49	34
Nonpoor	58	65	42	49	54	32	50
Not available	22	23	21	17	17	19	16
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Language other than English spoken in household when child							
Yes	16	13	4	92	88	100	90
No	84	87	96	8	12	0	10
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Household status							
At home with parents	81	78	87	83	78	87	93
Away at college in dorm	3	3	2	1	1	0	0
Has own dwelling	17	19	12	16	22	13	7
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Place of birth							
U.S.-born	96	97	98	77	80	98	45
Foreign-born	4	3	3	23	20	2	55
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Born on mainland U.S. (Puerto Ricans only)							
Yes	-	-	-	-	-	58	-
No	-	-	-	-	-	42	-
Total percent	-	-	-	-	-	100	-
Residence in U.S. at age 14							
Yes	98	99	99	93	94	100	80
No	2	1	1	7	6	0	20
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Residence on mainland U.S. at age 14 (Puerto Ricans)							
Yes	-	-	-	-	-	98	-
No	-	-	-	-	-	2	-
Total percent	-	-	-	-	-	100	-

[a]A profile of Cubans not presented because of an insufficient number of sample cases.
[b]Insufficient number of sample cases.
[c]UNIVERSE: Unemployed civilians age 16-21 on interview date. (N=3,300,000)
[d]UNIVERSE: Unemployed Hispanic civilians age 16-21 on interview date. (N=218,000)

Most unemployed youth have never been married and the vast majority reside at home with their parent(s). More of the unemployed chicanos, about a fifth, were married. Some youth, in spite of living at home, appear to have a need to earn an income. Many of them, for example, came from families with low incomes: families of two-fifths of the unemployed black youth and half the unemployed Hispanics earned annual incomes of $10,000 or less. For whites, the proportion was one-fifth. About 60 percent of the Puerto Ricans reporting family income lived in families with poverty status. In contrast, the proportion of white unemployed youth living in comparable families was only one-sixth[2]. Other young people need to earn income because they have had children. Unemployed minority females also more likely than unemployed white females to have had children: two-fifths of the blacks and one-fourth of chicanos and Puerto Ricans were mothers, in comparison to under one-fifth of whites.

The lower economic status of unemployed minority groups not only underscores why it is so important for them to obtain work but also explains why they were two to three times more likely than whites to have participated in government-sponsored employment and training programs. Nearly two-fifths of the unemployed blacks and Puerto Ricans had been involved in such projects.

The profile of Hispanic youth by their place of birth, residence at age 14, and language they spoke as children other than English revealed nearly the same characteristics found in the overall Hispanic youth population. Among unemployed Hispanics, about two-fifths of Puerto Ricans were born in Puerto Rico and one-fifth of the chicanos were foreign-born.

Reasons for Seeking Work

Half the unemployed youth said their major reason for seeking work was that they needed money (Table 4.2). In other reasons they cited, however, one

Table 4.2 Main Reason Unemployed Looked for Work, by Selected Characteristics, 1979

Characteristic	Lost job	Quit job	Left school	Enjoy working	Help with family expenses	Wanted temporary work	Needed money	To support self	Other
Total[a]	9	10	2	2	3	4	54	4	11
Sex[a]									
Female	7	9	2	3	4	4	54	5	12
Male	11	12	2	1	2	3	54	4	11
Race[a]									
White	9	12	2	2	2	4	56	3	11
Black	7	6	2	3	5	3	53	8	13
Hispanic	12	9	2	1	9	2	50	3	11
Hispanic group[b]									
Chicano	14	10	4	1	14	0	47	1	9
Puerto Rican	8	11	0	0	4	2	59	7	10
Others	12	6	0	0	3	11	53	2	14
Cuban	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c
Age[b]									
16-17	6	7	2	1	12	5	59	2	7
18-19	10	9	4	1	5	0	52	4	16
20-21	31	16	0	0	7	0	30	3	14
Enrollment status[b]									
High school dropout	21	13	5	1	12	0	29	7	13
High school student	6	4	1	1	8	5	64	0	10
College student	0	10	0	0	0	0	80	0	10
Nonenrolled high school graduate	22	21	0	0	6	0	35	3	13
Place of birth[b]									
U.S.-born	12	10	2	1	10	1	50	4	12
Foreign-born	15	6	3	0	6	8	53	0	10

[a]UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 who were unemployed on interview date. (N=3,300,000)
[b]UNIVERSE: Hispanic civilians age 16-21 who were unemployed on interview date. (N=218,000)

could detect race and sex differences. More Hispanics and whites than blacks and more males than females were seeking work because they either lost or quit their previous jobs. Few of the unemployed said they needed work to help with family expenses or to support themselves, but more Hispanics sought work to help defray family expenses than either blacks or whites and more blacks wanted jobs in order to support themselves.

The reasons cited among unemployed Hispanics for seeking work can be examined more closely in Table 4.2. Need for money remains the predominant reason, but nearly half of Hispanics age 20-21 became unemployed through either losing or quitting a job. About 14 percent of unemployed chicanos said they sought work to help defray family expenses. Among Hispanics age 16-17 and high school dropouts, two groups whose attendance in schools is of concern, about the same proportion cited the same reason. No major differences in reasons for seeking work were evident between native- and foreign-born Hispanics.

Job Search Methods

Prior to the date they were interviewed, unemployed youth had been looking for work for an average of about 8 weeks. Although differences by race and sex were not evident,[3] job search methods varied. As listed in Table 4.3, these methods included, among others, contacting an employer directly, looking in the newspaper, and contacting friends and relatives. A job seeker could list multiple methods, but at least half used only one method. Two-thirds contacted prospective employers directly. The second most popular technique, used by one-third of the unemployed, was looking in the newspaper for possible job openings. About one-sixth sought job information from friends and relatives, and another one-sixth used the state employment

Table 4.3 Proportion of Unemployed Using Various Methods of Job Search, by Selected Characteristics

Characteristic	State employment agency	Private employment agency	Contact employer directly	Friends or relatives	Placed or answered ads	Looked in newspaper	School employment service	Other
Total[a]	15	4	65	17	7	35	6	11
Race[a]								
White	15	4	64	17	6	37	6	11
Black	17	5	67	14	9	33	6	10
Hispanic	14	3	64	21	6	28	8	12
Hispanic group[b]								
Chicano	14	2	61	24	5	30	8	14
Puerto Rican	10	2	63	18	7	25	13	11
Others	24	2	78	15	8	24	3	5
Cuban	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c
Age[b]								
16-17	8	1	64	19	5	27	10	9
18-19	16	4	66	17	6	25	5	19
20-21	24	5	62	29	7	35	7	10
Sex[b]								
Female	10	5	63	22	7	31	8	16
Male	17	1	66	20	5	25	8	9
Enrollment status[b]								
High school dropout	21	3	63	21	4	31	0	14
High school student	9	1	66	20	7	26	12	10
College student	3	4	57	15	7	17	24	24
Nonenrolled high school graduate	27	11	66	29	9	39	0	5
Place of birth[b]								
U.S.-born	15	2	64	19	6	31	8	14
Foreign-born	12	5	64	26	6	19	7	7

[a]UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 who were unemployed on interview date. (N=3,300,000)

service. One-tenth or fewer of the unemployed relied on other methods such as private employment agencies, the school employment service, placing or answering ads, and other miscellaneous activities to find employment.[4]

Although contacting a prospective employer directly was the most popular job search method among youth, the use of other methods differed according to race. Whites tended to use newspapers as a source of job information, but Hispanics tended not to, relying more, instead, on friends and relatives than either whites or blacks did. Chicanos sought help from friends or relatives more than any other Hispanic group; foreign-born Hispanics relied on this source more heavily than native-born.

Amount of Work Desired

Slightly over half the unemployed youth sought part-time work (Table 4.4), particularly those who were age 16-17 and likely to be enrolled in school. Older out-of-school youth looked for full-time jobs. Racial distinctions were also apparent, with slightly more blacks than whites or Hispanics seeking full-time work. Differences according to sex, on the other hand, were slight, though out-of-school males tended more than females to seek full-time jobs. Family responsibilities among females may account for this difference.

Surprisingly, foreign-born Hispanic males sought full-time jobs less than those who were born in the U.S. One would have expected them to seek full-time work more because they are most likely not enrolled in school.

Occupations Desired

The occupations sought by unemployed youth vary by race and particularly by sex (Table 4.5). Over one-third of the unemployed males stated that they

Table 4.4 Amount of Work Desired by Unemployed Youth by Sex and Selected Characteristics

Characteristic	Seeking full-time work			
	Female		Male	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Total[a]	46	54	45	55
Age[a]				
16-17	18	82	23	77
18-19	63	37	64	36
20-21	67	33	74	26
Enrollment status[a]				
High school dropout	81	19	93	7
High school student	10	90	14	86
College student	32	68	39	61
Nonenrolled high school graduate	77	23	89	11
Race[a]				
White	42	58	44	56
Black	55	45	49	51
Hispanic	49	51	42	58
Hispanic groups[b]				
Chicano	53	47	47	53
Puerto Rican	c	c	c	c
Others	c	c	c	c
Cuban	c	c	c	c
Place of birth[b]				
U.S.-born	49	51	45	55
Foreign-born	c	c	35	65

[a]UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 who were unemployed on interview date. (N=3,300,000)

[b]UNIVERSE: Hispanic civilians age 16-21 who were unemployed on interview date. (N=218,000)

[c]Insufficient number of sample cases.

Table 4.5 Distribution of Occupations Sought by Unemployed Youth by Race and Sex, 1979

(Percentage distributions)

	Female			Male			Total	
	White	Black	Hispanic	White	Black	Hispanic	F	M
Professionals	4	3	2	2	2	5	4	3
Managers, administrators	1	*	0	1	2	0	1	1
Sales workers	12	7	17	2	3	5	11	2
Clerical workers	29	32	41	5	9	6	30	6
Craftspersons	1	*	0	10	4	11	1	9
Operatives	4	5	2	12	8	10	4	11
Operatives, transportation	*	0	1	4	5	4	*	5
Laborers, except farm	1	2	1	12	12	12	1	12
Farmers, managers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Farm laborers, foremen	*	0	0	*	0	2	*	*
Service workers	23	24	15	11	24	12	23	15
Private household workers	3	1	2	0	1	0	2	*
Anything	23	24	18	39	31	33	23	37
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

*Percentage is between 0.1 and 0.5.

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 who were unemployed on interview date. (N=3,300,000)

were willing to do any type of work, whereas only about one-fifth of the females made a similar claim. Furthermore, half the jobs sought by males were broadly distributed to include service, laborers, operatives and craftspersons. Clerical and services occupations comprised over half the jobs desired by unemployed females, and their third most sought after occupation was sales work.

Racial differences also appeared in occupations desired by unemployed youth. Unemployed black males were almost twice as likely as their white or Hispanic counterparts to seek work in the service occupations and about half as likely as other males to seek work in the crafts. For the most part, Hispanic and white males sought the same types of occupations, but differences did exist between foreign- and native-born Hispanics. As Table 4.6 indicates, two-fifths of the foreign-born but fewer than a third of those youth born in this country would willingly take any job.[5] One-fourth of the native-born males wanted specifically to work as craftspersons or operatives in comparison to fewer than one-tenth of the foreign-born, who more commonly sought jobs in ser ice occupations and as laborers. One-third of these youth versus one-fifth of the native-born pursued such positions (Table 4.6).

Among females, minorities and particularly Hispanics, were more likely than whites to seek clerical work (Table 4.5). Nearly the same proportion of blacks and whites wanted work in service occupations, but Hispanics were less interested in this area and more interested in sales work than either blacks or whites. The differences in occupations desired by unemployed native- and foreign-born Hispanic females are not presented because of the small number of cases.

Table 4.6 Distribution of Occupations Sought by Unemployed Hispanic Males by Place of Birth, 1979

(Percentage distributions)

	U.S.-born	Foreign-born
Professionals	7	0
Managers, administrators	0	0
Sales worekrs	6	4
Clerical workers	4	10
Craftspersons	15	3
Operatives	11	6
Operatives, transportation	6	0
Laborers, except farm	10	17
Farmers, managers	0	0
Farm laborers, foremen	3	0
Service workers	9	20
Private household workers	0	0
Anything	30	41
Total percent	100	100

UNIVERSE: Hispanic male civilians age 16-21 who were unemployed on interview date. (N=116,000)

Reservation Wages

Job seekers not currently working were asked the minimum wage rate they would be willing to take (the reservation wage) in the occupation they sought (Table 4.7). The average was $3.22 an hour. Responses indicated that unemployed males asked for higher wages than females, but race differences were minimal; white and black males sought only slightly higher wages than Hispanic males. Among females, both blacks and Hispanics asked for wages that were slightly higher on average than those of whites. Predictably, high school students and youth age 16-17, irrespective of their race and sex, asked for the lowest wages, which closely reflected the then current federal minimum wage of $2.90 an hour.

Considered by school enrollment status, nonenrolled high school graduates generally had the highest reservation wages among youth, but differences occurred by race and sex. No difference was evident in the reservation wage between dropouts and graduates among Hispanic males, but female dropouts had higher reservation wages than graduates. White females who had dropped out of school asked for slightly higher wages than those still enrolled.

Chicanos among the Hispanic male groups sought slightly higher wages than either blacks or whites; the reservation wage is not presented for other Hispanic groups because the number of sample cases was too small. Only slight differences in reservation wage existed between foreign-born and native-born males.

Willingness to Work

Unemployed youth were asked if they would be willing to work at certain hourly wage rates in the following jobs: washing dishes, working in a factory, working as a cleaning person, working at a check-out counter in a

Table 4.7 Mean Reservation Wage Sought by Unemployed Youth by Sex, Race and Selected Characteristics, 1979

Characteristic	Female			Male			Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	White	Black	Hispanic	
Overall[a]	3.01	3.13	3.09	3.45	3.41	3.32	3.22
Age[a]							
16-17	2.87	2.92	2.92	3.04	3.10	3.07	2.97
18-19	3.14	3.33	3.34	3.66	3.52	3.34	3.37
20-21	3.07	3.14	3.05	4.25	3.90	4.03	3.51
Enrollment status[a]							
High school dropout	3.16	3.17	3.38	3.57	3.74	3.68	3.39
High school student	2.88	3.00	2.81	3.05	3.04	3.05	2.98
College student	3.01	3.02	3.23	3.66	3.70	3.29	3.33
Nonenrolled high school graduate	3.10	3.33	2.59	4.51	3.96	3.69	3.54
Hispanic group[b]							
Chicano			3.10			3.51	3.30
Puerto Rican			c			c	3.09
Cuban			c			c	c
Others			c			c	c
Place of birth[b]							
U.S.-born			3.13			3.28	3.20
Foreign-born			2.95			3.41	3.25

[a]UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 who were unemployed on interview date. (N=3,300,000)

[b]UNIVERSE: Hispanic civilians age 16-21 who were unemployed on interview date. (N=218,000)

[c]Insufficient number of sample cases.

supermarket, working at a hamburger place, cleaning up neighborhoods and working in a national forest or park.[6] The last two work positions are usually public sector jobs, while the others are generally available only in the private sector.

As Table 4.8 indicates, black and Hispanic males were more willing than whites to accept work at the five jobs in the private sector at $2.50 an hour, or sub-minimum wages; nearly two-fifths of blacks and one-third of Hispanics, in contrast to a fifth of whites, would work as dish-washers or cleaning persons at this rate. Differences by race were not as pronounced for males for the jobs of cleaning up neighborhoods and working in parks. Whites were slightly more likely to accept these jobs at sub-minimum wages, especially in national parks.

Among females, blacks were the most willing to accept a sub-minimum wage in the five private sector jobs. Among all females, the most preferred job at this wage was supermarket cashier. Least preferred among black and Hispanic females were the neighborhood cleaning and park jobs; less than one-tenth of Hispanics would clean up neighborhoods at $2.50 an hour, in comparison to about one-fourth of blacks or whites. Two-fifths of the unemployed white females but only about one-fourth of minority women would work in parks or forests. Hispanic females appear to be the least willing to accept certain jobs at $5.00 an hour; over a third would not wash dishes, work as cleaning persons, or work in parks or forests for this wage, and two-fifths would refuse neighborhood clean-up jobs.

As Table 4.9 indicates, foreign-born Hispanic males are more willing than the native-born to work at sub-minimum wages in all seven jobs.[7] For all the occupations listed except cleaning up neighborhoods, two-fifths to over half the unemployed foreign-born would willingly accept jobs that other youths do not want and at lower wages.

Table 4.8 Willingness to Work, by Sex and Race, 1979

(Percentage distributions)

Willingness to work	Females			Males			Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	White	Black	Hispanic	
Washing dishes							
Willing to work at $2.50 per hour	26	38	29	21	38	33	28
Willing to work at $3.50 per hour but not at $2.50 per hour	28	24	22	29	31	33	28
Willing to work at $5.00 per hour but not at $3.50 per hour	17	20	13	26	18	18	21
Not willing to work at $5.00 per hour	28	18	36	23	13	16	23
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Working in a factory							
Willing to work at $2.50 per hour	21	34	30	29	40	33	28
Willing to work at $3.50 per hour but not at $2.50 per hour	29	39	31	26	34	41	31
Willing to work at $5.00 per hour but not at $3.50 per hour	28	15	19	26	16	17	23
Not willing to work at $5.00 per hour	22	12	20	19	10	9	18
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Working as a cleaning person							
Willing to work at $2.50 per hour	25	30	23	23	38	33	26
Willing to work at $3.50 per hour but not at $2.50 per hour	22	24	23	23	27	36	24
Willing to work at $5.00 per hour but not at $3.50 per hour	22	22	18	28	18	14	23
Not willing to work at $5.00 per hour	32	24	36	26	17	17	27
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Table 4.8 (continued)

Willingness to work	Females			Males			Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	White	Black	Hispanic	
Working at a check-out counter at a supermarket							
Willing to work at $2.50 per hour	40	52	50	35	48	46	41
Willing to work at $3.50 per hour but not at $2.50 per hour	36	35	26	22	30	35	31
Willing to work at $5.00 per hour but not at $3.50 per hour	11	7	14	25	13	10	15
Not willing to work at $5.00 per hour	13	6	10	18	9	9	13
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Working at a hamburger place							
Willing to work at $2.50 per hour	31	47	36	29	47	42	35
Willing to work at $3.50 per hour but not at $2.50 per hour	30	30	31	26	34	30	29
Willing to work at $5.00 per hour but not at $3.50 per hour	14	12	11	19	11	11	15
Not willing to work at $5.00 per hour	25	11	22	26	8	17	21
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Cleaning up neighborhoods							
Willing to work at $2.50 per hour	27	24	9	32	28	29	28
Willing to work at $3.50 per hour but not at $2.50 per hour	23	17	21	23	29	27	23
Willing to work at $5.00 per hour but not at $3.50 per hour	21	22	28	25	26	24	23
Not willing to work at $5.00 per hour	29	37	42	20	17	20	26
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Table 4.8 (continued)

Willingness to work	Females			Males			Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	White	Black	Hispanic	
Working away from home in a national forest or park							
Willing to work at $2.50 per hour	43	26	28	49	38	41	42
Willing to work at $3.50 per hour but not at $2.50 per hour	19	23	18	19	26	22	21
Willing to work at $5.00 per hour but not at $3.50 per hour	15	20	19	21	19	25	18
Not willing to work at $5.00 per hour	23	31	35	10	17	12	19
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 who were unemployed on interview date. (N=3,300,000)

Table 4.9 Willingness to Work, by Place of Birth for Hispanic Males, 1979

(Percentage distributions)

Willingness to work	U.S.-born	Foreign-born
Washing dishes		
Willing to work at $2.50 per hour	29	43
Willing to work at $3.50 per hour but not at $2.50 per hour	36	26
Willing to work at $5.00 per hour but not at $3.50 per hour	16	21
Not willing to work at $5.00 per hour	19	10
Total percent	100	100
Working in a factory		
Willing to work at $2.50 per hour	30	41
Willing to work at $3.50 per hour but not at $2.50 per hour	40	43
Willing to work at $5.00 per hour but not at $3.50 per hour	18	13
Not willing to work at $5.00 per hour	12	3
Total percent	100	100
Working as a cleaning person		
Willing to work at $2.50 per hour	27	46
Willing to work at $3.50 per hour but not at $2.50 per hour	39	29
Willing to work at $5.00 per hour but not at $3.50 per hour	15	13
Not willing to work at $5.00 per hour	19	12
Total percent	100	100
Working at a check-out counter in a supermarket		
Willing to work at $2.50 per hour	41	57
Willing to work at $3.50 per hour but not at $2.50 per hour	36	33
Willing to work at $5.00 per hour but not at $3.50 per hour	10	10
Not willing to work at $5.00 per hour	13	0
Total percent	100	100
Working at a hamburger place		
Willing to work at $2.50 per hour	41	47
Willing to work at $3.50 per hour but not at $2.50 per hour	27	37
Willing to work at $5.00 per hour but not at $3.50 per hour	10	13
Not willing to work at $5.00 per hour	22	4
Total percent	100	100

Table 4.9 (continued)

Willingness to work	U.S.-born	Foreign-born
Cleaning up neighborhoods		
Willing to work at $2.50 per hour	26	36
Willing to work at $3.50 per hour but not at $2.50 per hour	26	29
Willing to work at $5.00 per hour but not at $3.50 per hour	22	29
Not willing to work at $5.00 per hour	26	6
Total percent	100	100
Working away from home in a national forest or park		
Willing to work at $2.50 per hour	38	50
Willing to work at $3.50 per hour but not at $2.50 per hour	25	13
Willing to work at $5.00 per hour but not at $3.50 per hour	21	34
Not willing to work at $5.00 per hour	16	3
Total percent	100	100

UNIVERSE: Unemployed Hispanic male civilians age 16-21 on interview date. (N=116,000)

Unemployment Outcomes

Youth can exit from unemployment either through employment or withdrawal from the labor force. The 1980 NLS data make it possible to determine which unemployed youth in the 1979 survey became employed.[8] The proportion of the unemployed youth who found jobs within 30, 60, and 90 days after the interview date is presented by race and sex in Table 4.10. Within 30 days of the interview date, about one-fourth of unemployed white males and females and about one-fifth of Hispanic males obtained a job, but the proportion was less for other unemployed youth. Only about one-sixth of black males and Hispanic females found work... The situation was even more grave for black females, of whom only about one-tenth located jobs.

More unemployed youth found work within 60 days of the interview date, but whites were more successful than either blacks or Hispanics. Half the unemployed white males found work within 90 days, in comparison to two-fifths of both white females and Hispanic males. Only about one-third of black males found jobs, and black and Hispanic females were the least likely to.

The length of time jobs lasted for unemployed youth who obtained work within 90 days after the interview date is presented in Table 4.11, which also specifies whether the new job was government-sponsored. The analysis shows that about half the new jobs unemployed out-of-school youth entered lasted more than 8 weeks and provided more than 20 hours of work per week. Few of the jobs were government-sponsored. The situation differed somewhat for high school youth who found work; fewer than two-fifths of the jobs lasted longer than 8 weeks and entailed more than 20 hours of work per week. Most jobs were not government-sponsored, but among black high school students a fifth of those jobs and, among Hispanics, one-tenth were.

Table 4.10 Proportion of Unemployed Youth Who Obtained Work Within 30, 60, and 90 Days After 1979 Interview Date

Characteristic	Female			Male			Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	White	Black	Hispanic	
Obtained work within 30 days							
No	76	90	82	71	84	78	77
Yes	24	10	18	29	17	22	23
Obtained work within 60 days							
No	65	83	80	58	75	65	67
Yes	35	17	20	42	25	35	33
Obtained work within 90 days							
No	56	79	76	46	67	56	57
Yes	45	21	25	55	33	44	43

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 who were unemployed on interview date. (N=3,300,000)

Table 4.11 Profile of Jobs Obtained Within 90 Oays After the 1979 Interview Date

	Percent of youth employed more than 20 hours/week and longer than 8 weeks	Percent of youth whose jobs are government sponsored
High school students		
Total	37	5
Race		
White	38	1
Black	35	22
Hispanic	33	9
Sex		
Female	33	4
Male	42	5
Out-of-school		
Total	49	4
Race		
White	49	4
Black	48	14
Hispanic	47	5
Sex		
Female	43	5
Male	53	4

UNIVERSE: Unemployed youth age 16-21 who obtained work within 90 days after 1979 interview date. (N=987,500)

Summary and Conclusions

Most unemployed youth live at home with their parents, are not married, are not seeking work to support themselves or their families, and have relatively short unemployment durations. For a substantial proportion of these youth, however, employment represents an important source of income. Many unemployed minority females, for example, have had children, and nearly two-fifths of the black and half of the Puerto Rican youth without jobs are living in poverty. Most likely to seek work in order to help with family expenses are unemployed chicanos.

Unemployed youth generally looked for jobs by contacting prospective employers directly, but Hispanics, especially chicanos, tended to rely on friends/relatives more than other youth. Not surprisingly, most youth sought part-time work; slightly more blacks than Hispanics or whites sought full-time work. Among unemployed males, whites and Hispanics looked for basically the same type of occupations, but Hispanic females more commonly than whites sought clerical work. Service and laborer occupations were more frequently sought by foreign-born rather than native-born Hispanic males.

Racial differences in the average reservation wage were minimal, but chicano males had the highest asking wage and Puerto Rican males the lowest. No difference appeared between wages asked by unemployed native-born and foreign-born Hispanics. Black and Hispanic males and females were more willing than white males to work at certain private sector jobs at sub-minimum wages. Foreign-born Hispanic males are also more willing to work at subminimum wages than other youth, with about half accepting these wages for all jobs except cleaning up neighborhoods. Apparently, these youth will work in jobs other youths refused.

White males obtained work more than any other unemployed youth 90 days after the interview date. Hispanic males and white females were the second most likely group to find work, and black males the third. The young people encountering the most difficulty in locating jobs were Hispanic and black females. Only half the jobs out-of-school youth finally obtained lasted more than 8 weeks and provided 20 hours or more of work per week.

Footnotes

[1]U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Report of the President, 1980 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office), Table A.5.

[2]The poverty lines were taken from the Office of Management and Budget Guidelines and adjusted by the change in the Consumer Price Index between January and October, 1978.

[3]Mean weeks unemployed by race were similar, 8 weeks, and females averaged about one week less of unemployment. By Hispanic group, chicanos also averaged 8 weeks; Puerto Ricans, 7 weeks; Cubans, 6 weeks; and other Hispanics, 9 weeks.

[4]The job search methods preferred by youth in the NLS survey are similar to the ones noted for youth age 16-24 in the Current Population Survey (CPS), March 1979. In the CPS survey, however, "looked in the newspaper" is combined with "placing or answering ads" and "school employment service" is combined in the other method category. Even with the job search category differences and the slight older youth population in the CPS, youth basically prefer to (1) contact an employer directly, (2) place or answer an ad, or (3) use friends/relatives or state employment service as their major source of job search information.

[5]Data on unemployed foreign born females is not presented because of an insufficient number of sample cases.

[6]For a more complete discussion of willingness to work among NLS youth, refer to Michael E. Borus, "Willingness to Work," Chapter 11 in Michael E. Borus, Pathways to the Future, Preliminary Report 1979.

[7]The reservation wage is the lowest wage an unemployed youth would accept in the particular occupation sought. Willingness to work at a subminimum wage is for a specific occupation and gives an indication of desirability of certain types of work.

[8]Youth who were unemployed on the interview date in 1979 were selected for analysis, and summer interviews were excluded to control for the influx of students into the labor market. With the 1980 NLS, it is possible to determine how many days after the 1979 interview date an unemployed youth found work. For a more detailed analysis, refer to R. Santos, "Employment Prospects of Unemployed Youth," Pathways to the Future, op. cit. Final report, March 1982.

Chapter V

Employed Hispanics

Introduction

Although most attention given to the youth labor market revolves around unemployment, over half the youth age 16-21, 14.1 million, were working in the spring of 1979. This chapter examines the employment patterns of these youth according to race and Hispanic group, as well as the overall occupational and industrial distributions of the jobs they held.

School enrollment status of employed youth must be considered when one examines the characteristics of their jobs because young people who are high school students generally work part-time, and those who are out-of-school tend to work full-time. Wages of employed out-of-school youth are studied in this chapter in an analytical model that determines by race and Hispanic group the factors contributing to earnings differences. The effects of not completing high school as well as the influence of foreign birth on hourly wages are major areas of concern among Hispanics.[1] This chapter also presents youths' perceptions about promotion, skill acquisition, and career advancement in their jobs and discusses safety and health considerations related to work.

Employment Profile by Race and Hispanic Group

An employment profile of the Hispanic groups is presented in Table 5.1 and indicates that, similar to other youth, more males than females have jobs and youth 18 and older comprise a larger segment of the employed, irrespective of Hispanic group. High school graduates not currently enrolled in college represent the largest proportion of employed youth; nearly two-fifths of employed blacks and whites have graduated from high school in comparison to less than a third of Hispanics. Dropouts constitute a substantial proportion

Table 5.1 Profile of Employed Youth by Race and Hispanic Group, 1979
(Percentage distributions)

Characteristic	Total[a]	White	Black	Hispanic[b]	Chicano	Cuban	Puerto Rican	Others
Sex								
Female	48	48	46	43	43	44	42	46
Male	52	52	54	57	57	56	59	54
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Age								
16-17	26	27	21	23	22	27	28	23
18-19	36	36	37	38	40	27	36	36
20-21	38	38	42	39	38	45	36	41
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Region								
Northeast	22	23	19	16	2	27	71	22
North Central	33	36	18	9	9	9	6	10
South	28	25	57	28	27	62	19	24
West	17	16	6	48	62	2	3	44
Total percent	100	00	100	100	100	100	100	100
Enrollment status								
High school dropout	12	11	17	29	31	12	38	21
High school student	30	30	28	25	24	26	28	26
College student	19	19	17	15	14	41	8	12
Nonenrolled high school graduate	40	41	38	31	30	21	26	41
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Marital and family status								
Never married	87	87	91	81	80	75	84	82
Married	12	12	7	15	16	22	13	12
Separated, widowed, divorced	2	1	2	4	4	4	3	6
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Has children (total)								
Yes	8	6	18	12	15	8	13	4
No	92	94	82	88	85	92	87	96
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Has children (females only)								
Yes	9	8	22	15	18	7	17	9
No	91	92	78	85	82	93	83	91
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Family income								
Less than $5,000	7	6	12	11	12	13	6	12
5,000-9,999	13	11	22	22	21	20	34	17
10,000-14,999	12	11	17	17	19	20	15	12
15,000-19,999	10	10	10	10	11	12	8	9
20,000-24,999	12	12	6	9	8	17	3	11
25,000-29,999	9	9	4	8	8	4	4	13
30,000-39,999	10	11	5	3	5	0	1	2
40,000 or more	9	10	2	4	2	2	3	9
Not available	20	20	23	16	14	14	26	16
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Table 5.1 (continued)

Characteristic	Total[a]	White	Black	Hispanic[b]	Chicano	Cuban	Puerto Rican	Others
Poverty status								
Poor	8	5	23	18	21	14	18	11
Nonpoor	72	75	54	66	65	72	55	74
Not available	20	20	23	18	14	14	26	16
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Ever participated in government-sponsored employment and training program								
Yes	15	11	42	27	27	9	45	24
No	85	89	58	73	73	91	55	76
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Place of birth								
U.S.-born	96	97	96	71	70	31	95	70
Foreign-born	4	3	4	29	30	69	5	30
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Born on mainland U.S. (Puerto Ricans only)								
Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	64	-
No	-	-	-	-	-	-	36	-
Total percent	-	-	-	-	-	-	100	-
Residence in U.S. at age 14								
Yes	98	99	99	87	84	89	99	87
No	2	1	1	13	16	11	1	13
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Residence on mainland U.S. at age 14 (Puerto Ricans only)								
Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	88	-
No	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	-
Total percent	-	-	-	-	-	-	100	-
Household status								
At home with parents	71	71	78	72	72	79	72	72
Away at college in dorm	5	5	4	1	1	2	4	1
Has own dwelling	24	24	18	26	27	19	24	27
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

[a]UNIVERSE: Employed civilians age 16-21 on interview date. (N=14,100,000)
[b]UNIVERSE: Employed Hispanic civilians age 16-21 on interview date. (N=721,000)

of employed youth among Hispanics; chicanos and Puerto Ricans have the highest proportions who are dropouts--nearly one-third and two-fifths, respectively.

Like their unemployed counterparts, most employed youth have never been married and most reside at home with their parents. More of Hispanics, and especially Cubans, however, were married than other youth, and a larger proportion than of all employed youth had children. Black and Hispanic females were almost twice as likely to have had children as were whites; nearly one-fifth of the employed chicanas and Puerto Rican young women reported having had a child. Employment also appeared to be especially important for minority youth because so many more of them than whites reported living in families classified as poor; about 30 percent of employed blacks and 21 percent of employed Hispanics in comparison to 6 percent of whites lived in these seriously disadvantaged situations.

Prevailing poverty among employed minority youth also explains why blacks were more than four times as likely as whites to have participated in government-sponsored employment and training. Hispanics had been twice as involved in these projects as whites, and among employed Puerto Ricans the proportion slightly exceeded that of blacks. The distribution of foreign-born employed Hispanics was substantial, ranging from 5 percent for Puerto Ricans to 69 percent for Cubans. A closer analysis of employed Puerto Ricans shows that while nearly all are native-born, over a third were born in Puerto Rico. Nearly a third of the employed chicanos were foreign-born.

Employment Distribution by Occupation

Youth employment was generally concentrated in selected occupations but the distribution varied among males by race and, for Hispanics, by group and place of birth (Table 5.2). Most employed males held jobs as service workers,

Table 5.2 Occupational Distribution of Employed Males by Race, Hispanic Group and Place of Birth, 1979

Characteristic	Professional	Mgrs., admin.	Sales	Clerical	Crafts-person	Operatives	Transport	Laborers	Farmers	Farm laborers and foremen	Service workers	Total
Total[a]	4	3	5	8	15	16	5	20	0	4	20	100
Race[a]												
White	4	3	5	7	15	16	5	20	0	4	19	100
Black	3	2	3	9	9	14	6	23	0	4	28	100
Hispanic	2	4	2	9	15	22	4	14	0	5	23	100
Hispanic group[b]												
Chicano	3	3	1	7	16	22	4	17	0	7	20	100
Puerto Rican	0	2	4	16	19	22	4	11	0	0	21	100
Cuban[c]	3	0	13	15	6	15	6	21	0	3	18	100
Others	4	10	0	8	14	21	5	5	0	2	34	100
Place of birth[b]												
U.S.-born	3	6	3	8	17	18	4	16	0	3	22	100
Foreign-born	1	0	1	9	12	28	6	11	0	9	23	100

[a]UNIVERSE: Employed civilian males age 16-21 on interview date. (N=7,332,000)
[b]UNIVERSE: Employed civilian Hispanic males age 16-21 on interview date. (N=411,000)
[c]Cuban data is based on a total of 24 unweighted cases.

operatives, and laborers, or they worked in crafts. Service occupations provided over one-fourth of the jobs for blacks and about one-fifth for whites and Hispanics. Cubans were the least likely among Hispanics to work in service occupations, and those youth comprising the other Hispanic group held these positions the most. Native- and foreign-born Hispanics were employed as service workers in equal proportions.

Hispanics tended to work as operatives more than either blacks or whites, with over one-fifth holding these jobs, in contrast to about one-seventh of all other young people. Among foreign-born Hispanics, over one-fourth worked as operatives. Craft occupations were distributed equally among whites and Hispanics, but blacks held fewer of these jobs. Nearly a fifth of the employed Puerto Ricans worked as craftsmen, and more native-born than foreign-born Hispanics were similarly employed.

Chicanos and Cubans worked as laborers more than all employed Hispanics, but Hispanics in general were underrepresented in these occupations in comparison to blacks or whites. Farm labor, which is generally associated incorrectly with Hispanic employment, provided fewer than one-twentieth of the jobs for all male youth, irrespective of their race. Foreign-born Hispanics worked as laborers less frequently than native-born, but they were more often employed as farm laborers.

The distribution of occupations among employed females is recorded by race and additionally by group and place of birth for Hispanics (Table 5.3). Major occupations included clerical, services, sales, and operatives, with clerical work providing over two-fifths of the jobs for blacks and Hispanics but slightly fewer for whites. The majority of jobs for Puerto Ricans were clerical; native-born females worked in these positions slightly more than foreign-born. Proportionately larger numbers of Hispanic rather than black or

Table 5.3 Occupational Distribution of Employed Females by Race, Hispanic Group and Place of Birth, 1979

Characteristic	Professional	Mgrs., admin.	Sales	Clerical	Craftsperson	Operatives	Transport	Laborers	Farmers	Farm laborers and foremen	Service workers	Private household workers	Total
Total[a]	4	2	9	38	1	8	0	3	0	1	27	6	100
Race[a]													
White	5	3	9	37	1	8	0	3	0	1	28	6	100
Black	2	1	7	44	1	11	1	3	0	1	27	3	100
Hispanic	2	0	10	45	1	14	0	1	0	2	19	5	100
Hispanic group[b]													
Chicano	2	0	7	40	1	18	0	1	0	3	24	4	100
Puerto Rican	0	0	18	54	0	5	0	0	0	0	17	5	100
Cuban	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c
Others	3	2	11	48	0	12	0	4	2	2	12	4	100
Place of birth[b]													
U.S.-born	3	0	10	47	1	11	0	2	1	2	20	4	100
Foreign-born	1	0	8	41	0	22	0	0	0	4	17	6	100

[a]UNIVERSE: Employed civilian females age 16-21 on interview date. (N=6,768,000)
[b]UNIVERSE: Employed civilian Hispanic females age 16-21 on interview date. (N=310,000)
[c]Insufficient number of sample cases.

white females held jobs in sales and operative occupations, but proportionately fewer Hispanic young women worked in service occupations. Place of birth did not distinguish among the Hispanic females working in sales, but foreign-born women were twice as likely as native-born to work as operatives. Puerto Ricans had the highest proportion employed in sales and chicanas the highest in the operatives.

The large numbers of Puerto Rican females in both clerical and sales occupations and of chicanas in operative positions are explained by the employment opportunities available in the regions where these two Hispanic groups reside. Clerical jobs and sales work are present in the Northeastern central cities, where many Puerto Ricans live, and chicanas obtain work as operatives in the southwest where textile mills and electronic plants have begun to relocate.[2] One might reasonably expect that the growth of these employment bases, especially in the southwest, should expand the job opportunities for Hispanic women.

Employment Distribution by Industry

Table 5.4 presents the distribution among industries of employed males by race, Hispanic group, and place of birth. The two leading industrial employers, jointly providing half the jobs for all males, were manufacturing and wholesale/retail trade. One-fourth of Hispanics in contrast to about one-fifth of both blacks and whites held manufacturing jobs. Foreign-born Hispanics worked in this area more frequently than native-born--one-third versus one-fifth held these jobs. Proportionately more chicanos were employed in manufacturing, but differences by group were slight except for Cubans. Trade employed slightly more blacks and whites than Hispanics, and among the Hispanic groups, the foreign-born, chicanos, and Puerto Ricans least commonly worked in industry.

Table 5.4 Industrial Distribution of Employed Males by Race, Hispanic Group and Place of Birth, 1979

Characteristic	Ag., forest fish.	Mining	Const.	Manufacturing	Trans. comm. public util.	Wholesale and retail trade	Finance, ins., real estate	Business and repair	Personal	Entertainment and recreation	Professional	Public admin.	Total
Total[a]	6	1	8	21	3	36	2	8	3	2	8	2	100
Race[a]													
White	6	1	9	21	3	37	2	8	3	3	8	2	100
Black	4	0	7	18	5	35	3	6	4	1	14	3	100
Hispanic	6	1	8	25	3	31	2	8	3	2	8	3	100
Hispanic group[b]													
Chicano	9	1	11	27	4	26	1	8	4	2	6	3	100
Puerto Rican	0	0	7	25	3	27	6	12	2	0	16	2	100
Cuban[c]	3	0	0	6	4	52	9	7	0	0	14	5	100
Others	5	1	3	23	1	47	1	6	3	4	5	2	100
Place of birth[b]													
U.S.-born	5	1	10	20	3	32	2	9	3	2	9	3	100
Foreign-born	10	0	3	35	3	29	2	6	4	1	6	1	100

[a]UNIVERSE: Employed civilian males age 16-21 on interview date. (N=7,332,000)
[b]UNIVERSE: Employed civilian Hispanic males age 16-21 on interview date. (N=411,000)
[c]Cuban data is based on a total of 24 observations.

A similar distribution of jobs by industry is presented for females in Table 5.5. Wholesale/retail trade provided most of their jobs, with about two-fifths of white females and about a third of Hispanics and blacks working in this industry. Among all Hispanic females, Puerto Ricans had the lowest proportion, only one-fourth, working in retail trade, and foreign-born Hispanics worked in this trade less than native-born. Like their male counterparts, Hispanic females held manufacturing jobs more than blacks or whites, with chicanas and foreign-born young women the most frequently employed. About one-fifth of Hispanics and whites worked in the professionally-related industries, in comparison to nearly one-third of blacks.

Characteristics of Job Held by School Enrollment Status

School enrollment status determines to a large extent the characteristics of the jobs youth held (Table 5.6). Not surprisingly, employed youth enrolled in either high school or college worked part-time, while high school dropouts and high school graduates generally worked full-time. Large racial differences did not appear in the mean numbers of hours worked per week among students, but on average white females worked fewer hours. Most males not currently enrolled in school worked an average of 40 hours, but blacks worked slightly fewer. With the exception of black female dropouts, females not enrolled in school worked fewer hours than males.

On average employed youth had been working slightly over a year in their current job. Females had less job tenure than males, but other tenure differences were minimal and reflected youths' current school enrollment status; dropouts and high school students had the lowest tenure, whereas college students and nonenrolled high school graduates had the greatest. The

Table 5.5 Industrial Oistribution of Employed Females by Race, Hispanic Group and Place of Birth, 1979

Characteristic	Ag., forest fish.	Mining	Const.	Manufacturing	Trans. comm. public util.	Wholesale and retail trade	Finance ins., real estate	Business and repair	Personal	Entertainment and recreation	Professional	Public admin.	Total
Total[a]	2	0	1	12	2	40	8	2	9	2	21	3	100
Race[a]													
White	1	0	1	11	2	41	8	2	9	2	21	2	100
Black	1	0	0	14	2	30	8	3	6	1	30	6	100
Hispanic	3	1	0	17	1	34	9	4	7	2	19	4	100
Hispanic group[b]													
Chicana	5	1	0	20	1	32	3	5	7	1	19	5	100
Puerto Rican	0	0	0	19	2	24	8	7	14	6	15	5	100
Cuban	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c
Others	2	0	2	11	0	44	16	0	4	2	16	3	100
Place of birth[b]													
U.S.-born	3	1	0	15	1	37	6	5	7	2	17	6	100
Foreign-born	4	0	0	22	1	24	17	0	9	1	21	1	100

[a]UNIVERSE: Employed civilian females age 16-21 on interview date. (N=6,768,000)
[b]UNIVERSE: Employed civilian Hispanic females age 16-21 on interview date. (N=310,000)
[c]Insufficient number of sample cases.

Table 5.6 Selected Job Characteristics by Race, Sex and School Enrollment Status, 1979

Characteristic	Mean usual hours worked		Mean months on job		Proportion in government sponsored jobs		Mean hourly wage	
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male
Total	27.5	32.1	10.5	12.5	4	3	3.24	3.87
High school dropout								
White	35.3	40.5	7.4	10.3	3	3	2.99	4.08
Black	37.4	37.0	4.7	9.4	0	7	2.67	3.49
Hispanic	39.7	40.3	8.4	11.8	1	2	3.09	3.89
Total	35.9	39.9	7.3	10.3	3	3	2.98	3.96
High school student								
White	16.5	20.6	9.3	11.2	3	3	2.65	2.87
Black	18.2	18.9	7.5	10.7	24	20	2.83	3.03
Hispanic	18.5	19.9	7.1	10.7	22	14	2.62	2.99
Total	16.7	20.4	9.0	11.1	6	5	2.67	2.89
College student								
White	19.3	24.4	11.1	14.1	1	1	3.24	3.83
Black	24.3	26.0	10.0	12.9	9	2	3.49	3.39
Hispanic	23.4	26.2	10.6	10.7	2	3	3.51	3.80
Total	20.0	24.6	10.9	13.9	2	1	3.28	3.80
Nonenrolled high school graduate								
White	36.3	42.4	12.1	14.1	3	1	3.66	4.72
Black	36.1	38.6	8.9	11.6	3	5	3.47	4.25
Hispanic	35.8	40.2	10.7	13.4	8	5	3.65	4.55
Total	36.3	42.0	11.8	13.8	3	2	3.64	4.68

UNIVERSE: Employed civilians age 16-21 on interview date. (N=14,100,000)

government appears to provide a substantial number of jobs for minority high school students,[3] but for other groups the proportion that were government-sponsored did not exceed 10 percent. Over a fifth of employed black high school students and female Hispanic students worked in government-sponsored jobs, and among male Hispanic students, the proportion was 14 percent.

Youths' hourly wage rates also closely corresponded to school enrollment status. High school students earned the least and high school graduates not enrolled in college the most. Among male high school students, minorities earned more per hour on average than whites. The Hispanic hourly wage rate fell between the rates of blacks and whites for all four school enrollment statuses.

Mean hourly wage rates for females lagged behind those of males across the race groups, but differences in wage by race were not uniform for all school enrollment statuses. For example, black high school students averaged the highest wage rates, with Hispanics having about the same earnings as whites. Among college students, Hispanics had the highest hourly wage rates, but those of blacks fell between the rate of Hispanics and whites. The hourly wages of Hispanic and white female graduates not enrolled in school were parallel, but black females earned less. Finally, among dropouts the average wage rates of Hispanics were highest, followed by whites and then blacks.

Wages of Out-of-School Males: A Further Look

In order to examine in more depth the hourly wage rates of out-of-school Hispanics, this section estimates separate wage equations by race. The analysis is restricted to employed males because the wage equation was not significant for out-of-school Hispanic females, and factors other than the ones specified in the model account for the wage variation.[4] Wages of males

age 16-21 who were employed on the interview date and who were not currently enrolled in school comprised the universe under study. The natural logarithm of the hourly rate of pay was the dependent variable. Several independent variables were examined for their influence on wage rates: years on the current job, knowledge of the world of work, years out of school (a proxy for experience), coverage under a collective bargaining agreement, working full-time, and completion of high school hypothetically contribute positively to the hourly rate of pay. In addition, wages are expected to be associated positively with commuting distance as measured by traveling time to work. One can hypothesize as well that the size of the labor force in the county influences the hourly rate of pay.

Certain Hispanic-related variables, particularly the assumption that native-born Hispanics have higher wages than foreign-born, are also examined for their influence on wages. The proportion of foreign-born population in a county was hypothesized to wield a negative influence on wages because immigrants generally increase the supply of unskilled labor and thus reduce the wage rate. The effect of membership in the various Hispanic groups on wages is also examined.[5]

The means and standard deviations of the variables used in the equation are presented in Table 5.7. The most striking racial difference among out-of-school males is in the proportion of those who had completed high school: about half of the minorities in comparison to three-fourths of the whites graduated, with Hispanics having the fewest completing school. In addition, both black and white males are more likely than Hispanics to be covered by a collective bargaining agreement. Minority males tended, on average, to require longer commuting times than whites; blacks needed 22 minutes, Hispanics 20, and whites 18 to get to work. Proportionately more whites and

Table 5.7 Means and Standard Deviations of Variables Used in Wage Equations of Nonenrolled Males by Race

Variable	White		Black		Hispanic	
	Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation
Percent born in U.S.	0.97	0.16	0.98	0.15	0.70	0.46
Percent who are high school graduates	0.76	0.43	0.57	0.50	0.47	0.50
Chicano	-	-	-	-	0.67	0.47
Cuban	-	-	-	-	0.02	0.15
Puerto Rican	-	-	-	-	0.16	0.36
Others	-	-	-	-	0.15	0.36
Number of years out of school	2.14	1.14	2.26	1.35	2.45	1.44
Percent of foreign stock in county, 1970	15.37	10.14	15.33	14.82	23.82	11.48
Size of labor force in county, 1970 (expressed in thousandths)	232	478	502	755	719	103
Knowledge of the world of work	6.97	1.74	5.19	2.01	5.36	2.20
Number of years on current job	1.11	1.38	0.87	1.21	1.07	1.40
Full-time work	0.88	0.32	0.78	0.41	0.89	0.31
Commuting time to work (one-way, minutes)	17.66	15.73	22.26	18.21	19.46	14.39
Percent covered by collective bargaining	0.26	0.44	0.28	0.45	0.19	0.39
Hourly rate of pay	4.56	1.69	3.90	1.57	4.28	1.71

UNIVERSE: Civilian males age 16-21 who were out of school and employed on interview date.

Hispanics than blacks also held full-time jobs. Hispanics averaged about 28 cents an hour less than whites, but blacks made 66 cents an hour less than whites.

Wage results The estimated wage equations for males are presented by race in Table 5.8. They explain slightly more of the hourly wages for whites and blacks than for Hispanics. The only variables significantly associated with earnings in all three equations were collective bargaining and years out of school, a proxy variable for experience. Irrespective of race, hourly wage increased substantially for youth whose wages were determined by a collective bargaining agreement and for youth who were out of school longer.

Other variables significantly influenced the wage equation for males but not uniformly by race. For example, current job tenure and commuting time to work contributed to a higher rate of pay for whites but not for blacks and Hispanics. Knowledge of the world of work contributed to earnings for blacks and whites but not for Hispanics. No significant influence on the wage rate for Hispanics, blacks, or whites was produced by the proportion of foreign-born people in a county. Except among Hispanics, youth who graduated from high school earned higher wages than dropouts.

The wage equation for Hispanic males in comparison to those for blacks and whites is thus characterized by its absence of significant variables such as completion of high school and knowledge of the world of work. Only the presence of a collective bargaining agreement, being U.S.-born, and years out of school were factors statistically associated with increased earnings in the multivariate analysis. Collective bargaining raised earnings by 40 percent, and the native-born made 12 percent more than foreign-born. No differences in hourly wages were found among the Hispanic groups.

Table 5.8 Wage Equations of Males by Race

Independent variables	White Coefficient	Black Coefficient	Hispanic Coefficient
U.S.-born	-.001	.016	.123
	(-0.01)	(0.10)	(1.71)+
High school graduate	.122	.164	.084
	(3.77)**	(3.07)**	(1.25)
Chicano	-	-	-
Cuban	-	-	-.246
			(-1.29)
Puerto Rican	-	-	.013
			(0.14)
Others	-	-	.140
			(1.63)
Number of years out of school	.050	.032	.050
	(4.31)**	(1.66)+	(2.31)*
Percent of foreign stock in county	.0001	.0001	-.0002
	(0.50)	(0.69)	(-0.54)
Size of labor force in county	.0005	.0001	.0003
	(1.71)+	(0.30)	(1.03)
Knowledge of the world of work	.026	.050	-.005
	(3.26)**	(3.80)**	(-0.36)
Number of years on current job	.030	.011	.029
	(3.21)**	(0.51)	(1.34)
Full-time work	.042	-.026	.146
	(1.06)	(-0.42)	(1.50)
Cummuting time	.003	.001	.002
	(4.21)**	(0.81)	(1.21)
Collective bargaining	.322	.297	.401
	(11.05)**	(5.29)**	(5.39)**
Constant	5.443	5.324	5.473
	(54.25)	(28.37)	(34.74)
$\overline{R}^2$	.283	.253	.213
N	590	189	168
F	24.26	7.36	4.48

UNIVERSE: Civilian males age 16-21 who were out of school and employed on the interview date.

+ Significant at the 10 percent level.
* Significant at the 5 percent level.
**Significant at the 1 percent level.

A major issue is the effects of dropping out on wages because a large proportion of Hispanic males are high school dropouts. Employed Hispanics do not appear to be rewarded in wages for a high school degree. But education may affect wages in more complex ways, and the way one specifies education in the wage model may affect the results.[6] For example, education (years of school completed) does significantly affect hourly wages for Hispanics if it is entered as a continuous variable. On the other hand, only those with fewer than 9 years of school earned significantly less than those with 12 years of schooling.[7] Hispanic youth with other levels of education did not differ from those who graduated. The specification of the education variable appears to be crucial in analyzing its effect on wage, but the results are presented in terms of the effects of high school completion because it was a central question under study.

Job Perceptions: Economic Value and Safety

Youth employment can be evaluated further from two other perspectives: (1) the economic value of the job, i.e., skill acquisition, level of pay, job security, and chances of promotion and (2) the safety or occupational health risks of the job. Most youth agreed that their current job had economic value in a variety of ways, including skills, pay, security and promotion (see Table 5.9). They were least likely to perceive good promotion prospects in their current job in comparison to other economic attributes.

Differences by sex, race, Hispanic group and birthplace were also evident in the perceptions of youth about the economic value of their jobs. Females viewed their promotion prospects as good less frequently than males, and proportionately more whites and Hispanics than blacks felt their jobs provided good security. Whites were more likely than blacks or Hispanics to consider the pay as good.

Table 5.9 Perceived Economic Value of Job of Employed Youth by Selected Characteristics

	Proportion of youth agreeing with statement about their jobs			
	Learning skills	Good pay	Good job security	Good promotion prospects
Overall[a]	66	70	78	56
Sex[a]				
Female	68	68	77	50
Male	65	71	78	62
Race[a]				
White	66	71	78	56
Black	65	62	70	60
Hispanic	68	65	76	58
Hispanic group[b]				
Chicano	70	67	74	60
Cuban	65	82	91	57
Puerto Rican	60	53	72	49
Others	67	61	80	58
Birthplace[b]				
U.S.-born	66	68	76	58
Foreign-born	73	57	76	57

[a]UNIVERSE: Employed civilians age 16-21 on interview date. (N=14,100,000)
[b]UNIVERSE: Employed Hispanic civilians age 16-21 on interview date. (N=721,000)

Cubans considered their pay good and their jobs secure more often than other Hispanic youth, and Puerto Ricans shared these perceptions the least. Foreign-born youth tended less than native-born to perceive the pay as good, but they were more likely to see the job as providing skills.

The proportions of employed youth who felt their jobs were dangerous or considered themselves exposed to unhealthy conditions are presented in Table 5.10. Overall, about one-fourth of the youth saw their jobs as perilous and one-fifth perceived unhealthy conditions. Many more of the males than females, however, perceived danger and health hazards on the job. Differences in youths' perceptions of these problems by race, Hispanic group, or birthplace were slight, but Cubans were the least likely to feel their jobs were dangerous.

Conclusions

Over 14 million youth were working during the spring of 1979. Most of these employed youth were not married and did not have family responsibilities, but some youth, especially blacks and Hispanics, had a crucial need for employment. Minorities were more likely than whites to reside in families whose income fell below the poverty threshold, and many employed minority females had had children.

The characteristics of the jobs youth held varied by school enrollment status. As one would expect, students work part-time and earn less than out-of-school youth who generally work full-time. Retail trade and manufacturing provided the most jobs for males, and more Hispanic males than other youth, particularly the foreign-born, held manufacturing jobs. This concentration of Hispanics in manufacturing accounts for their greater proportion working as operatives--occupations held more frequently by the foreign-born. Hispanic

Table 5.10 Perceived Dangers on the Job of Employed Youth by Selected Characteristics

	Proportion of youth agreeing with statement about their jobs	
	Job is dangerous	Exposed to unhealthy conditions
Overall[a]	27	18
Sex[a]		
Female	15	13
Male	37	23
Race[a]		
White	27	18
Black	25	20
Hispanic	25	19
Hispanic group[b]		
Chicano	25	18
Cuban	6	10
Puerto Rican	27	25
Others	28	19
Birthplace[b]		
U.S.-born	25	18
Foreign-born	24	20

[a]UNIVERSE: Employed civilians age 16-21 on interview date. (N=14,100,000)

[b]UNIVERSE: Employed Hispanic civilians age 16-21 on interview date. (N=721,000)

male employment, more than the employment of other youth, appears to be dependent on manufacturing and types of jobs associated with this sector.

The higher proportion of Hispanic males working in manufacturing may partially explain their hourly wage rates compared to those of employed blacks and whites. A large proportion of the wages for Hispanic out-of-school males can be accounted for by being covered by collective bargaining; unionization was associated with increased wages. The extent of collective bargaining is generally highest in manufacturing, a sector in which Hispanics are more likely to hold jobs; thus their wages are closely tied to employment conditions in this industry. The employment of Hispanics in manufacturing may partially explain why completion of high school did not contribute any significant wage returns for out-of-school Hispanic males, but it did for whites and blacks.

The distribution of occupations and industries among employed Hispanic females generally reflects the traditional occupational and industrial distributions of other women, i.e., clerical and service work in retail and professional-related industries. Both black and Hispanic females are more likely to work in clerical and operative occupations than whites. More of employed Hispanics than black or white females, about one-seventh, work in manufacturing. Proportionately more chicanas and foreign-born Hispanics held these positions. The employment of chicana females in operative jobs probably reflects the growing numbers of textile and electronic plants that are relocating to the Southwest.

Most youth consider the economic value of their jobs to be worthwhile and generally perceive them to be providing skills, good pay, security, and favorable chances for promotion. Differences in these perceptions were apparent by race; whites considered their pay adequate more frequently than

minority youth, and Puerto Ricans were the least likely to feel their pay or chances for promotion were good. Foreign-born youth expressed dissatisfaction with pay more than native-born, but they more commonly viewed their jobs as providing learning skills.

About one-fourth of all employed youth perceived their jobs as dangerous, and one-fifth felt exposed to unhealthy conditions. Males were much more likely than females to report health risks on the job. No major differences appeared by race, sex, or birthplace in the perceptions of health risk among youth.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Refer to Geoffrey Carliner, "Returns to Education for Blacks, Anglos and Five Spanish Groups." Journal of Human Resources, II: 172-189, Barry Chiswick, :The Effect of Americanization on the Earnings of Foreign-Born Men." Journal of Political Economy, 86: 897-921, and Lisa J. Neickert and Marta Tienda "Converting Education into Earnings: The Patterns Among Hispanic Origin Men" in Hispanic Workers in the U.S. Labor Market. Marta Tienda, editor. (Washington, D.C., U.S. Oepartment of Labor, Report No. DLETA 21-55-79-27-2) October, 1981.

[2]The patterns of industrialization and their impact on chicana employment in the Southwest are noted in Rosemary Santana Cooney, "The Mexican American Female in the Labor Force," in Cuantos Somos: A Demographic Study of the Mexican American Population, edited by Charles H. Teller et al (University of Texas at Austin: Center for Mexican American Studies, Monograph No. 2, 1977). For discussion of Puerto Rican females refer to Rosemary Santana Cooney and Ulma Ortiz, "Hispanic Female Participation in the Labor Force: A Comparative Analysis of Puerto Ricans, Mexican, and Cubans." in Marta Tienda, editor, Hispanic Workers in the U.S. Labor Market. op. cit.

[3]Further analysis on government-sponsored employment and training programs for youth is presented in Chapter 6 of this report.

[4]The analysis was restricted to out-of-school youth because wages of high school youth are more difficult to interpret due to school responsibilities. Wages of high school youth were analyzed, but the equations were not significant.

[5]The Hispanic wage equation was also analyzed without Hispanic groups to control for multicollinearity with other variables such as birthplace and education. The results were, however, not altered from the original specification.

[6]The different ways to specify education in a wage model are discussed in L.J. Neidert and M. Tienda, "Converting Education into Earnings: Patterns Among Hispanic Men" in Marta Tienda, editor, Hispanic Workers Op. Cit.

[7]Similar results were obtained for Hispanic youth using the 1979 NLS in Steven C. Myers and Randall H. King, "Relative Earnings of Hispanic Youth in the Labor Market," Preliminary Paper presented at the Hispanic Labor Conference, University of California, Santa Barbara, February 4-5, 1982.

Chapter V - Glossary

NOTE: Unless otherwise indicated, all information pertains to the date of interview.

Collective Bargaining	A binary variable coded 1 if the respondent's wages on his/her current job are set by collective bargaining.
Commuting Time	A continous variable measuring the number of minutes it takes the respondent to get from home to work.
Ethnicity	(Chicano, Cuban, Puerto Rican, Other Hispanics) Hispanic ethnicity; coded 1 if respondent is a member of one of the listed Hispanic groups, 0 otherwise. Chicano was comparison category.
Foreign Stock in County, 1970	Foreign stock comprises the foreign born population and the native population of foreign or mixed parentage; thus all first and second generation Americans. Oata is from the 1970 U.S. Census, City-County Oata Book.
Full-Time Work	A binary variable coded 1 if the respondent is employed full-time, 0 otherwise.
High School Graduate	A binary variable coded 1 if the respondent is a high school graduate, 0 if respondent is a high school dropout.
Hourly Rate of Pay	Usual gross rate of compensation per hour at the current job. Hourly wages of less than 25 cents and greater than 10 dollars per hour are excluded.
Knowledge of the World of Work	The actual number of correct responses to a series of questions about the type of work done in an occupation. Each question is in a multiple choice format with 3 possible answers.
Labor Force Size in County	A continuous variable measuring the size of the civilian labor force 16 years old and over in the respondent's county, as of 1970. (Source: City-County Oata Book)
Tenure (Years Worked on Current Job)	A continuous variable measuring the number of years the respondent has been working at his/her current job. The range is 1-6.
U.S.-Born	A binary variable coded 1 if the respondent was born in the U.S., 0 otherwise.
Years Out of School	A continuous variable measuring the number of years since the respondent was last enrolled in regular school.

Chapter VI

Government-Sponsored Employment and Training

Introduction

The responsibility the federal government has to provide and maintain full employment opportunities for individuals who are unable to find work was assumed in 1946 with enactment of the Employment Act.[1] Most of the government-sponsored employment and training activities have been authorized under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA),[2] which was designed to provide training and employment opportunities for economically disadvantaged, unemployed, and underemployed persons to enable them to secure self-sustaining, unsubsidized employment.[3] In recent years, a major CETA emphasis has been to provide employment and training opportunities for youth. This will be continued under the Job Training Partnership Act, the successor to CETA, which begins in the 1984 fiscal year.

Another major federal effort has been the Work Incentive Program (WIN), which provides employment services to welfare recipients. Both CETA and WIN offer a broad range of services encompassing job counseling, placement, skills training and basic education, subsidized employment of various types, and supportive services such as child care or transportation; additionally, WIN provides tax credits to encourage employers to hire and train program participants. Some of the programs in which the NLS respondents participated are outside both the CETA and WIN frameworks, but most are CETA or WIN-type programs. Here participation in these programs is examined for youth who enrolled in such programs after January 1, 1978.

Participation in Government-Sponsored Employment and Training

Between January 1, 1978 and the 1979 interview date, a total of 1,840,000 participants--or about 8 percent of youth age 16-21--had enrolled in government-sponsored employment and training programs.[4] Racial differences appeared: about one-fifth of blacks and one-eighth of Hispanics were involved, in comparison to one-twentieth of whites. The participation rates are presented by race and selected characteristics in Table 6.1.

Females and males tended equally to participate in government-sponsored programs. The rates were highest among blacks and Hispanics age 16-19 and those enrolled in high school. Whites' participation rates were fairly uniform by age and school enrollment status, but the rates of high school dropouts were slightly higher. Except in the case of blacks, youth who met the CETA definition of economically disadvantaged were more likely to participate in government-sponsored programs than those who did not.[5]

Puerto Ricans had the highest participation rates among Hispanic youth, exceeding that of blacks. Cubans and other Hispanics participated slightly more than whites, and foreign-born Hispanics participated less than native-born.

Government-Sponsored Employment Since 1978

The proportion of youth age 16-21 who worked between January 1, 1978 and the 1979 interview, overall about four-fifths, is indicated by school enrollment status and race in Table 6.2. Not surprisingly, high school students are the least likely to have worked; nonetheless, seven out of every ten had jobs. Race and sex differences appear, however, among those with work experience: proportionately more males than females and more whites than Hispanics and more Hispanics than blacks worked in comparison. Black and

Table 6.1 Participation Rates Per 100 Youth Age 16-21 in Government-Sponsored Employment and Training Programs by Selected Characteristics[a]

Characteristic	Race			
	White	Black	Hispanic	Total
Overall participation rate	5	19	13	8
Sex				
Female	5	19	13	8
Male	5	19	14	8
Hispanic group[b]	-	-	13	-
Chicano	-	-	13	-
Puerto Rican	-	-	23	-
Cuban	-	-	7	-
Others	-	-	9	-
Age				
16-17	5	21	15	8
18-19	6	22	16	9
20-21	4	13	9	6
Enrollment status				
High school dropout	8	15	11	9
High school student	5	24	17	9
College student	4	18	9	5
Nonenrolled high school graduate	5	16	13	7
Poverty				
CETA economically disadvantaged	9	21	14	14
CETA not economically disadvantaged	3	23	8	5
Below CPS poverty level	10	24	21	17
Above CPS poverty level	5	18	10	6
Place of birth[b]				
US-born	-	-	15	-
Foreign-born	-	-	9	-

[a]Participation in government-sponsored employment and training program between January 1, 1978 and interview date, 1979.
[b]UNIVERSE: Hispanic civilians age 16-21 on interview date. (N=1,518,000)

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 on interview date. (N=24,580,000)

Table 6.2 Proportion of Youth Age 16-21 Who Worked Between January 1, 1978 and 1979 Interview Oate by Sex, Race, Hispanic Group and School Enrollment Status

Characteristic	High school dropouts	High school students	College students	Graduates, nonenrolled	Total
Total	78	72	91	93	83
Female					
White	68	71	90	90	81
Black	49	53	80	82	65
Hispanic	54	58	80	88	67
Male					
White	94	79	94	99	90
Black	83	66	89	92	78
Hispanic	90	72	84	90	82
Hispanic total[b]	72	65	82	89	74
Female					
Chicano	60	59	81	86	67
Cuban	a	a	a	a	71
Puerto Rican	38	66	a	a	59
Others	60	50	68	100	71
Male					
Chicano	95	76	91	93	87
Cuban	a	a	a	a	81
Puerto Rican	83	71	a	a	78
Others	91	56	a	80	71

[a]Insufficient number of sample cases.

[b]Hispanic civilians age 16-21 on interview date. (N=1,518,000)

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 on interview date. (N=24,580,000)

Hispanic female dropouts reported the least work experience since 1978, with only about one-half having had jobs. Only about two-fifths of Puerto Rican female dropouts had worked since 1978.

Overall, less than one-tenth of the jobs held by youth age 16-21 were government-sponsored, and substantial differences appeared by school enrollment status, race, and sex (see Table 6.3). For example, among high school students, about two-fifths of the blacks who have worked between January 1, 1978 and the 1979 interview date have held one or more government-sponsored jobs; the proportion for Hispanics was about one-fourth, but less than one-tenth for whites. Government-sponsored employment accounted for substantially less employment for youth not enrolled in high school, but whites, except for male dropouts, tended less than Hispanics or blacks to have had government-sponsored work. Among Hispanic groups, Puerto Ricans, especially male high school students, had more government-sponsored jobs, where one or more of the jobs were provided by the government (Table 6.4).

Employment Conditions in Government-Sponsored Jobs

The employment conditions described in this section pertain to the current or last government job held between January 1, 1978 and the 1979 interview date.[6] Information on government-sponsored jobs was available for about 1,638,000 youth age 16-21 by type of occupation, weeks worked, hours worked, and hourly wages. About half of these government-sponsored jobs were provided to students enrolled in high school and half were during the summer months (Table 6.5).[7]

There were striking differences by sex in the type of occupation held in government-sponsored jobs: approximately ten times as many females as males worked in clerical occupations (Table 6.6). On the other hand, males were

Table 6.3 Number of Jobs Which Were Government-Sponsored Between January 1, 1978 and 1979 Interview Date by Sex, Race and School Enrollment Status

(Percentage distributions)

Number of government-sponsored jobs	Female			Male		
	White	Black	Hispanic	White	Black	Hispanic
	Total					
None	95	74	84	95	79	86
One	4	22	14	4	18	12
Two or more	1	4	2	1	3	2
	Dropouts					
None	95	84	86	91	87	91
One	5	16	11	8	11	7
Two or more	0	0	3	1	2	2
	High school students					
None	93	57	72	94	62	76
One	6	36	24	6	31	21
Two or more	1	7	4	0	7	3
	College students					
None	96	73	91	97	89	89
One	4	25	7	3	11	9
Two or more	0	2	2	0	0	2
	Graduates, nonenrolled					
None	95	87	88	96	89	92
One	5	11	10	3	10	7
Two or more	0	2	2	1	1	1

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 on interview date who have worked since January 1, 1978. (N=20,401,000)

Table 6.4 Number of Jobs Which Were Government-Sponsored by Sex, Hispanic Group and Enrollment Status for Hispanic Youth

(Percentage distributions)

Number of government-sponsored jobs	Female				Male			
	Chicano	Cuban	Puerto Rican	Others	Chicano	Cuban	Puerto Rican	Others
	Total							
None	84	97	71	88	87	91	72	90
One	14	3	25	9	12	2	22	9
Two or more	2	0	4	3	1	7	6	1
	Dropouts							
None	89	a	a	a	91	a	85	95
One	9	a	a	a	7	a	12	6
Two or more	2	a	a	a	2	a	3	0
	High school students							
None	73	a	a	a	78	a	56	87
One	22	a	a	a	21	a	36	13
Two or more	5	a	a	a	1	a	8	0
	College students							
None	92	a	a	a	86	a	a	a
One	8	a	a	a	12	a	a	a
Two or more	0	a	a	a	2	a	a	a
	Graduates, nonenrolled							
None	86	a	a	92	93	a	a	90
One	12	a	a	8	7	a	a	7
Two or more	2	a	a	0	0	a	a	3

[a]Insufficient number of sample cases.

UNIVERSE: Hispanic civilians age 16-21 on interview date who have worked since January 1, 1978. (N=1,245,000)

Table 6.5 Current or Last Government Job Held Between January 1, 1978 and 1979 Interview Date by Sex, Race and Enrollment Status

(Percentage distributions)

Enrollment status	Female			Male			Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	White	Black	Hispanic	
High school dropout	8	8	20	24	14	20	15
High school student	39	51	48	42	64	59	48
College student	16	23	10	13	8	11	14
Nonenrolled high school graduate	37	18	22	21	14	10	23
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

UNIVERSE: Civilian youth age 16-21 in government-sponsored employment since January 1, 1978. (N=1,840,000)

Table 6.6 Occupational Distribution of Government-Sponsored Job Held Between January 1, 1978 and 1979 Interview Date by Race and Sex

(Percentage distributions)

Occupation	Female			Male		
	White	Black	Hispanic	White	Black	Hispanic
Professional, technical	4	2	5	6	6	3
Manager, official	0	1	0	0	0	0
Sales	2	0	1	0	0	0
Clerical	45	43	49	2	9	12
Craft	4	4	2	8	11	11
Operative	3	4	3	5	3	11
Laborer	13	8	0	37	26	23
Farmer	0	0	0	1	0	0
Farm laborer	1	0	0	1	0	0
Service	27	37	39	38	45	40
Private household worker	0	1	1	2	0	0
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

UNIVERSE: Civilian youth age 16-21 in government-sponsored employment since January 1, 1978. (N=1,840,000)

much more concentrated in craft, operative and laborer jobs. Service occupations were a large proportion of both groups, although slightly more so for males. Racial differences were not so pronounced. White females tended less than black or Hispanic young women to be service workers. Proportionately more Hispanic females worked in clerical and service occupations and proportionately fewer worked as laborers. Among males, blacks were slightly more likely to work in service occupations than whites or Hispanics, but more whites worked as laborers.

Youth in government-sponsored jobs averaged 29 hours of work per week, earned $2.80 an hour and had been employed about 20 weeks (Table 6.7). Differences in average hourly rate of pay by race and sex were slight. However, there were major differences in mean hours worked and mean weeks worked. White males averaged about two weeks more on government-sponsored jobs than Hispanics and seven weeks more than blacks, but government-sponsored jobs lasted the longest among Hispanic females (31 weeks). Whites also worked on average three to four hours more per week than black and Hispanic youth, but this difference could be accounted for by the higher proportion of minority youth enrolled in high school who were employed by the government.

Government Training: Out-of-School Youth

Information on participation in government-sponsored training between January 1, 1978 and the 1979 interview was available for youth not enrolled in grades 1-12. A total of 182,400 young people, about 2 percent of out-of-school youth age 16-21, had participated in government-sponsored training. The proportions of youth who had received skills training from a government-sponsored program such as CETA, the Job Corps, or other government program were identical for males and females. Black youth participated the

Table 6.7 Mean Weeks, Hours and Hourly Wages in Current or Last Government-Sponsored Job Held Between January 1, 1978 and 1979 Interview Date by Sex and Race

	Mean weeks worked[a]	Mean hours worked[b]	Mean hourly wage rate[b]
Total	19.87	28.91	2.80
Female			
White	22.62	29.70	2.73
Black	19.23	26.83	2.69
Hispanic	31.25	25.15	2.80
Male			
White	20.02	31.37	2.95
Black	13.43	27.18	2.73
Hispanic	18.41	28.05	2.89

[a]Last government-sponsored job.

[b]Current or last government-sponsored job.

UNIVERSE: Civilian youth age 16-21 in government-sponsored employment since January 1, 1978. (N=1,840,000)

most--5 percent--followed by Hispanic youth--2 percent--and whites--1 percent. A detailed analysis of training programs participated in by out-of-school youth is not presented because of the small number of Hispanic cases.[8] However, in the next section, training programs for out-of-school youth and government-sponsored employment are combined so that reasons for participation, services received, and overall satisfaction expressed about the programs can be analyzed.

Reasons for Participation

When asked for the main reason they entered their current or last government-sponsored employment and training program,[9] about two-fifths of youth responded they did so to make money, which was the single most important reason (Table 6.8). Employment-related reasons, however,such as getting a job, getting a better job, or improving employment prospects by obtaining training combined to a higher proportion of the reasons to enter the program. Only slight variations in the motives appeared by race and sex. More Hispanics than other youth participated in order to get job training; about one-fourth of the chicanos entered programs for this reason (Table 6.9). Foreign-born Hispanics were more likely than native-born to seek job training by entering a government program.

Services Received

The services participants received in their current or last program are indicated in Table 6.10. Most youth obtained subsidized employment, and no differences appeared by race or sex in the proportion of youth who received these jobs. The youth also received an array of services in conjunction with employment. Young women were more likely to receive these other services than

Table 6.8 Main Reason for Entering Current or Last Government Employment and Training Program Held Between January 1, 1978 and 1979 Interview Date, by Sex and Race

(Percentage distributions)

Reasons	Sex		Race			Total
	Female	Male	White	Black	Hispanic	
Make money	36	40	37	40	33	38
Get a better job	4	2	4	3	2	3
Get a job	23	23	25	21	25	24
Get job training	18	17	15	19	22	17
Something to do	5	4	3	6	5	4
Program was interesting	4	3	4	3	5	4
Other	10	11	12	8	8	10
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 on interview date, in government-sponsored employment and training programs since January 1, 1978. (N=1,840,000)

Table 6.9 Main Reason for Entering Current or Last Government Employment and Training Program, by Hispanic Group and Place of Birth

(Percentage distributions)

Reasons	Hispanic groups[a]		Place of birth		Total
	Chicano	Puerto Rican	U.S.-born	Foreign-born	
Make money	32	31	32	36	33
Get a better job	2	2	2	0	2
Get a job	26	27	29	9	25
Get job training	24	17	20	29	22
Something to do	4	9	6	2	5
Program was interesting	4	5	4	12	5
Other	8	9	7	12	8
Total	100	100	100	100	100

[a]Cubans and other Hispanics are not presented because of an insufficient number of sample cases.

UNIVERSE: Hispanic civilians age 16-21 on interview date, in government-sponsored employment and training programs since January 1, 1978. (N=197,000)

Table 6.10 Proportion of Participants Receiving Various Services in Current or Last Program Held Between January 1, 1978 and 1979 Interview Date by Sex and Race

Type of service	Sex		Race			Total
	Female	Male	White	Black	Hispanic	
Job counseling	49	46	41	55	54	47
Basic education	23	16	16	22	27	19
English language	2	2	0	2	9	2
GED	14	16	13	16	17	15
College preparatory	18	12	11	20	18	15
Skills training	34	22	26	30	29	28
Subsidized job	89	90	90	88	91	89
Non-CETA job placement	3	4	3	4	3	3
Medical	17	17	16	18	22	17
Child care	6	2	2	7	4	4
Transportation	16	14	15	16	13	15
Other	6	4	5	5	8	5

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 on interview date, in government-sponsored employment and training programs since January 1, 1978. (N=1,840,000)

male participants. Higher percentages of women received basic education, college preparatory and skills training and child care. Over half of the blacks and Hispanics and two-fifths of the whites obtained job counseling. More minority youth than whites also received various remedial education services including basic education and college and GED preparatory assistance. Skill training was provided to over one-fourth of all youth with slightly more minority youth than whites receiving this training. Other services young people obtained varied only slightly by race.

English language training was provided to nearly one-tenth of Hispanic youth in government-sponsored employment and training, and the proportion receiving other services is presented in Table 6.11 by group, place of birth, and sex. Differences in the proportion of youth participating in English language training were slight among Hispanic groups, but, as one would expect, foreign-born were were almost three times more likely than native-born to receive this training. Youth born outside the U.S. were also more likely than native-born to obtain job counseling and other education and training-related skills, but less likely to have subsidized employment. In comparison to chicanos, proportionately more Puerto Ricans received basic education skills but fewer of the other services such as skill training and medical services. Hispanic females received job counseling, skill training, child care and medical services more than males.

Satisfaction with Programs

Youth who participated in government-sponsored employment and training programs overwhelmingly expressed satisfaction with various aspects of program participation and confidence that their involvement improved their job prospects and helped their job performance (Table 6.12). Only slight

Table 6.11 Proportion of Hispanic Participants Receiving Various Services in Current or Last Program Held Between January 1, 1978 and 1979 Interview by Hispanic Group, Place of Birth and Sex

Type of service	Hispanic groups[a]		Place of birth		Sex	
	Chicano	Puerto Rican	U.S.-born	Foreign-born	Female	Male
Job counseling	55	59	52	62	62	47
Basic education	21	35	25	32	27	26
English language	9	12	7	20	9	10
GED	16	22	16	23	16	19
College preparatory	19	15	15	31	19	16
Skills training	32	19	28	32	31	27
Subsidized job	90	90	93	82	91	91
Non-CETA job placement	2	2	3	0	2	3
Medical	25	11	22	20	28	16
Child care	6	2	4	3	8	0
Transportation	15	16	14	11	15	11
Other	5	3	8	5	8	7

[a]Cubans and other Hispanic groups are not presented because of insufficient number of sample cases.

UNIVERSE: Hispanic civilians age 16-21 on interview date, in government-sponsored employment and training programs since January 1, 1978. (N=197,000)

Table 6.12 Perceived Satisfaction and Effectiveness of Current or Last Government Employment and Training Program Held Between January 1, 1978 and 1979 Interview Date by Selected Characteristics

Characteristic	Percent satisfied[b]	Percent believe job chances improved[b]	Percent believe helped job performance[c]
Race			
White	89	72	52
Black	86	74	56
Hispanic	87	71	57
Sex			
Female	87	73	61
Male	89	72	47
Hispanic group[d]			
Chicano	89	77	55
Cuban	a	a	a
Puerto Rican	77	62	a
Others	a	a	a
Place of birth[d]			
U.S.-born	86	71	55
Foreign-born	90	74	62

[a]Insufficient number of sample cases.

[b]UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 on interview date, in government employment and training programs since January 1, 1978. (N=1,840,000)

[c]UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 on interview date who had participated in government employment and training programs since January 1, 1978 and who had been employed after leaving the program. (N=856,000)

[d]Data pertains to Hispanics only.

differences appeared among these youth by race and sex. Males who obtained work after participating in a government-sponsored job or training program were less likely than their female counterparts to view their participation as a factor in improving job performance.

Puerto Ricans had lower percentages satisfied with the program and lower percentages who believed their participation significantly improved job prospects. Both figures were quite high, however. Native-born and foreign-born Hispanics expressed about equal satisfaction and felt job prospects were improved by participation. Foreign-born tended more than native-born, however, to attribute improved job performance to program participation.

Summary and Conclusions

About 8 percent of youth age 16-21--nearly two million young people--participated in government-sponsored employment and training between January 1, 1978 and the 1979 interview date. The government provides jobs and training for some youth more than others: blacks were nearly four times and Hispanics nearly three times more likely than whites to have been enrolled in such programs. The racial differentials were even higher for high school students. Among Hispanic groups, Puerto Ricans participated in such programs in proportions exceeding blacks.

Only 5 percent of employed whites held government-sponsored jobs between January 1, 1978 and the 1979 interview date, as compared to 16 percent for Hispanics and 26 percent for blacks. These accounted for a substantial proportion of the employment among minority high school students: over two-fifths of blacks and one-fourth of Hispanics had been in one or more government-sponsored job. Among male Puerto Ricans, almost half of the

employed high school students had held a government-sponsored job during the period.

The occupational distribution of government-sponsored jobs youth held varied only slightly by race, but more pronounced differences occurred by sex. Females worked predominantly in clerical and service occupations, whereas males were more commonly service workers and laborers. Employment conditions in government-sponsored jobs were fairly uniform by race and sex, although whites worked on average more hours per week than Hispanics or blacks and government-sponsored jobs among black males lasted the shortest time and those among Hispanic females the longest. Most youth, including Hispanics, earned the average wage of $2.80 an hour.

As one would expect, the service most youth received from participating in government-sponsored employment and training programs was a subsidized job, but they also received job counseling, skill training, basic educational skills, medical services, and transportation. On the whole, black and Hispanic youth received job counseling and remedial educational services more than whites. Nearly one-tenth of Hispanic youth received training in English, but among foreign-born the proportion was about one-fifth. More foreign-born than native-born also obtained skill training.

Most youth expressed satisfaction with program participation and believed it improved their employment prospects; Puerto Ricans, however, had the lowest proportions, although still high. Moreover, many who found employment after being involved in a program felt their participation helped their performance on the job. Males tended less than females to attribute improved job performance to participation, but no major differences in these perceptions appear by race.

Footnotes

[1]Edwin Mansfield, Economics (W.W. Norton and Co., 1980, 3rd Edition), p. 84.

[2]For a more detailed discussion of government-sponsored programs for youth, refer to Joan E. Crowley, "Government-Sponsored Employment and Training," Pathways to the Future, edited by Michael E. Borus (Ohio State University Center for Human Resource Research, May 1981). I extend appreciation to Dr. Crowley for advice on this chapter.

[3]U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Report of the President, 1980 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office), p. 20.

[4]If a youth identified a job held since January 1, 1978 as provided by the government, except for jobs which were part of the school program or college work study programs, the job was considered government-sponsored. The maximum number of jobs held since 1978 for which information was analyzed could not exceed five. Less than one percent of the employed youth in 1978 held more than five jobs. In addition, youth not enrolled in grades 1-12 were asked for participation in government skill training.

[5]A person is considered disadvantaged if the participant lives in a household in which income is below the CETA definition of poverty.

[6]Information on all government-sponsored jobs held since January 1, 1978 was available. The analysis was restricted, however, to the current or last government-sponsored job held.

[7]Programs for which a participant began and terminated between May and September are considered summer programs. Among males, the proportion in summer programs for blacks, 64 percent; Hispanics, 51 percent; and whites, 49 percent. For females, the proportions were blacks, 57 percent; Hispanics, 43 percent; and whites, 38 percent.

[8]For a further analysis of training programs, refer to Crowley, "Government-Sponsored Employment and Training," Op. cit.

[9]Government-sponsored employment and training programs are combined in this section. The information on reasons for entering, services received, and program satisfaction is taken from the current or last government-sponsored job. Otherwise, the data is from the current or last training program.

Chapter VII

Attitudes Toward Work and Military Service

Introduction

The earlier chapters gauged how youth fare in the labor market by the proportion of the work force able to find work as well as by the employment conditions of those who are working. Youths' attitudes toward work are important in evaluating their job experience and future labor force participation. Among these questions are what types of work they want to do as adults, what they would do if their jobs did not provide sufficient income to meet family needs, and what they think are the effects on the family of women working. How youth feel about the military as an employment alternative and a source of training is also an important career consideration. This chapter examines young peoples' attitudes, particularly those of Hispanic youth, toward work and military service. The last section discusses the extent of illegal activities, police contacts, and marijuana/drug use among young people because these factors can also influence employment: some may be lured away from seeking work by profitable illegal activities, and a police record or habitual drug use or chemical dependency are formidable employment barriers.

Expectations at Age 35

Youths' occupational aspirations reveal their expectations for later life.[1] When they were asked what they would like to be doing at age 35, most youth said they would like to be working (see Table 7.1). One would expect them to view their employment prospects at age 35 optimistically. Males were more likely to expect to work than females, and their responses did not differ by race. More black females expected to be working than Hispanics or whites.

Table 7.1 Work Expectations at Age 35 of Youth by Race and Sex, 1979

(Percentage distributions)

Expectations at age 35	Female			Male			
	White	Black	Hispanic	White	Black	Hispanic	Total
Expected activity[a]							
Working	68	81	71	91	91	93	80
Family	29	13	26	2	2	2	14
Other	3	6	3	7	7	5	5
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Occupation preferred[b]							
Professional, technical	47	46	40	40	42	38	44
Manager, official	9	8	7	17	16	15	13
Sales	3	1	4	1	1	*	2
Clerical	22	25	28	1	3	2	12
Craft	2	1	1	22	21	23	12
Armed forces	*	*	1	1	3	1	1
Operative	2	4	3	7	9	10	5
Laborer	1	*	1	3	2	2	2
Farmer	*	-	-	3	*	2	1
Farm laborer	*	-	*	1	*	1	*
Service workers	12	12	14	4	2	5	8
Private household worker	*	1	*	-	-	-	*
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Occupational prospects[b]							
Excellent	27	21	20	27	26	21	26
Good	47	49	45	48	41	47	47
Fair	21	26	28	20	27	25	22
Poor	5	4	7	5	6	6	5
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

*Percentage is between 0.1 and 0.5

[a]UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 on interview date. (N=24,580,000)

[b]UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 on interview date who chose an occupation at age 35. (N=22,049,000)

Youth were also asked for their occupational preferences at age 35. Over half (57 percent) aspired to high-status occupations in professional/technical and managerial work. Hispanics, particularly female Hispanics, tended slightly less than other youth to aspire to high-status occupations. Of those seeking other than high-status occupations, males and females differed in the type of occupations desired: males wanted craft occupations but females wanted clerical work. Race differences among males preferring crafts were not evident, but among females, slightly more minorities than whites preferred clerical work. The majority of youth considered their prospects of getting into their preferred occupation at age 35 as either excellent or good, but whites viewed their prospects more favorably than did either blacks or Hispanics.[2]

The expectations of Hispanic youth are listed in Table 7.2 by sex and place of birth. Two-fifths of foreign-born females but only one-fifth of native-born females expected to be rearing a family at age 35 instead of working. Males showed no differences by birth place in expectations for working; over nine-tenths thought they would be working at age 35. Native and foreign-born males also shared similar aspirations for high-status occupations, but foreign-born males tended more to prefer to be operatives and less to work in craft occupations. Among females, the foreign-born preferred high-status occupations slightly less than the native-born. Compared with the native-born, foreign-born young women were also more likely to want clerical and operative work but less likely to desire service occupations. Native and foreign-born Hispanics did not perceive the prospects of getting into their preferred occupations differently: almost half of all Hispanic young people thought their prospects were good, and one-fifth thought their prospects excellent.

Table 7.2 Work Expectations at Age 35 for Hispanic Youth by Sex and Place of Birth, 1979

(Percentage distributions)

Expectations at age 35	Female		Male	
	U.S.-born	Foreign-born	U.S.-born	Foreign-born
Expected activity[a]				
Working	76	57	92	93
Family	20	41	2	2
Other	4	2	6	5
Total percent	100	100	100	100
Occupation preferred[b]				
Professional, technical	41	39	36	40
Manager, official	8	4	16	12
Sales	4	6	*	1
Clerical	26	35	2	2
Craft	1	1	26	18
Armed forces	1	*	1	1
Operatives	1	6	9	14
Laborer	1	-	2	1
Farmer	-	-	1	4
Farm laborer	*	-	*	3
Service worker	16	8	5	4
Private household worker	1	-	-	-
Total percent	100	100	100	100
Occupational prospects[b]				
Excellent	20	20	21	23
Good	44	47	47	47
Fair	30	23	25	27
Poor	6	10	7	3
Total percent	100	100	100	100

*Percentage is between 0.1 and 0.5
[a]UNIVERSE: Hispanic civilians age 16-21 on interview date. (N=1,518,000)
[b]UNIVERSE: Hispanic civilians age 16-21 on interview date who choose an occupation at age 35. (N=1,315,000)

Inadequate Family Income: Options

All NLS youth respondents were asked to suppose that their earnings at age 35 were not enough to support a family and to consider a series of alternatives to help the family, such as going on welfare or getting more education. Table 7.3 shows these alternatives and youths' responses. Most said they would be willing to get additional education or enter a job training program. Minorities tended slightly more than whites to be willing to get additional education, but no race differences appeared among youth willing to enter a job-training program. As for choosing welfare or food stamps as a means to support a family, more young people chose food stamps than welfare. Among minority females and black males, about a third said they would go on welfare, as did about one-fourth of Hispanic and white males and white females. Among minority females and black males, half or more would be willing to apply for food stamps in comparison to about two-fifths of whites and Hispanic males.

In addition to being asked what they would do if their income was not adequate to support a family, youth were asked if they would still work if money was not a problem. The strong work commitment among youth is evidenced by their responses noted in Table 7.3. Fourth-fifths said they would work. Hispanic and white females were slightly less inclined to work if money was not a problem.[3]

Employment of Women

Since World War II, women have accounted for the largest increase in the U.S. labor force, and most of the increase in their labor force participation rate (LFPR) has taken place among married women.[4] The widespread entrance of

Table 7.3 Hypothetical Responses of Youth to Inadequate Family Income by Race and Sex, 1979

(Percentage distributions)

Response	Female			Male			
	White	Black	Hispanic	White	Black	Hispanic	Total
Get more education if paid enough to live on while learning							
Probably would	86	94	91	85	93	90	87
Probably would not	14	6	9	15	7	10	13
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Enter a job-training program if paid enough to live on while in training							
Probably would	95	96	96	94	95	95	95
Probably would not	5	4	4	6	5	5	5
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Go on welfare							
Probably would	25	36	32	24	32	28	26
Probably would not	75	64	68	76	68	72	74
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Apply for food stamps							
Probably would	44	63	48	41	53	40	45
Probably would not	56	37	52	59	47	60	55
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Work commitment[a]							
Work anyway	78	81	74	84	84	84	81
Not work	22	19	26	16	16	16	19
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

[a]Response is not to inadequate family income but whether one would work if money was not a problem.

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 on interview date. (N=24,580,000)

married women with children into the work force has challenged the traditional role assigned to women as wives and mothers. The attitudes of youth toward women's roles in the household and the workplace can be ascertained through their responses to the following five statements:

1. A woman's place is in the home, not in the office or shop.
2. A wife who carries out her full family responsibilities doesn't have time for outside employment.
3. The employment of wives leads to more juvenile delinquency.
4. It is much better for everyone concerned if the man is the achiever outside the home and the woman takes care of the home and family.
5. Women are much happier if they stay at home and take care of their children.

Each youth was asked whether he or she either strongly disagreed, disagreed, agreed, or strongly agreed with each of the five statements. The extent of their agreement is presented in Table 7.4 by race and sex.[5] Most youth do not have traditional views toward the employment of women, in the sense that a traditional view expresses agreement with these five statements; but males, particularly Hispanics, expressed more traditional views than females. For example, 60 percent of Hispanic males agreed with the statement that everyone is better off if the man works and the woman stays at home.

Youths' attitudes toward employment of women can be analyzed further through the construction of a traditionality scale, ranging from 5 to 20.[6] For each of the five statements, one can assign a score of 1 to 4 based on the extent of agreement, ranging from 1 for strongly disagreeing to 4 for strongly agreeing. The higher the score, the more traditional one's views are toward the employment of women. The average traditionality scores, based upon the responses to the five statements about the employment of women, are presented in Table 7.5 by sex, race, Hispanic group and birthplace.

Table 7.4 Attitudes of Youth Toward Women Working by Race and Sex, 1979

(Percentage distributions)

Response	Female			Male			
	White	Black	Hispanic	White	Black	Hispanic	Total
A woman's place is in the home, not in the office or shop.							
Strongly agree	3	4	6	6	7	13	5
Agree	10	9	11	21	19	30	16
Disagree	46	46	42	56	55	45	50
Strongly disagree	40	41	41	16	19	12	29
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
A wife who carries out her full family responsibilities doesn't have time for outside employment.							
Strongly agree	4	4	8	6	7	11	5
Agree	17	14	25	25	31	35	22
Disagree	61	59	51	62	53	49	60
Strongly disagree	18	22	17	7	9	5	13
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
The employment of wives leads to more juvenile delinquency.							
Strongly agree	3	4	6	6	5	9	5
Agree	19	17	23	25	22	26	22
Disagree	56	57	54	55	58	52	56
Strongly disagree	22	22	17	14	15	12	18
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
It is much better for everyone concerned if the man is the achiever outside the home and the woman takes care of the home and family.							
Strongly agree	5	8	10	10	14	19	8
Agree	27	30	31	36	35	41	32
Disagree	50	45	43	47	40	34	47
Stongly disagree	17	17	15	7	11	5	12
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Women are much happier if they stay at home and take care of their children.							
Strongly agree	3	5	8	3	7	14	4
Agree	18	22	28	27	33	40	24
Disagree	61	55	50	62	53	41	59
Strongly disagree	18	18	14	8	8	5	13
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 on interview date. (N=24,580,000)

Table 7.5 Mean Score of Traditional Attitudes of Youth Toward Women Working[a], by Sex and Selected Characteristics

Characteristic	Female	Male
Race		
White	10.2	11.4
Black	10.2	11.6
Hispanic	10.9	12.6
Hispanic group[b]		
Chicano	10.9	12.8
Cuban	10.1	11.5
Puerto Rican	10.6	12.9
Others	11.3	12.5
Birthplace[b]		
U.S.-born	10.4	12.2
Foreign-born	12.4	13.6

[a]Traditionality index ranges from a score of five to twenty; the higher the score, the more traditional one's view toward employment of women. For each of five statements about employment of women, a score is assigned from one to four, ranging from one for strongly disagreeing to four for strongly agreeing.

[b]Hispanics age 16-21 only.

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 on interview date. (N=24,580,000)

Hispanic males had the most traditional views among youth, having an average score of 12.6 points. White and black males had nearly identical mean scores, lower than Hispanic males but higher than females. Among females, the scores were more similar by race, but Hispanic women had more traditional views than other women. Foreign-born males were the most traditional among Hispanics, with a score of 13.6. By Hispanic group and sex, Cuban males and females had the lowest scores.

The more traditional views among Hispanics toward the employment of women support the traditional stereotype of the Hispanic family.[7] A more detailed analysis of all racial groups shows, however, that the traditional views of Hispanics may derive from other factors, such as the large numbers of immigrants, low educational attainment, and traditional Catholic upbringing, as opposed to being Hispanic, per se. Using the traditionality index as a dependent variable, we can gauge the effects of these factors and others by means of a regression analysis.

One can reasonably expect that years of schooling completed (educational attainment) and having a mother who worked for pay in 1978 would reduce traditionality. Religious affiliation and attendance are expected, in contrast, to be positively associated with traditionality; Protestant is the comparison religion in the analysis and attendance can be measured by a frequency scale. The native-born are expected to be less traditional than the foreign-born. Additional differences among the various Hispanic groups are also examined for their influence on traditionality.

Tables 7.6 and 7.7 list the independent variables by race as well as the associated means and standard deviations for males and females, respectively. The traditionality results are presented for males and females in Tables 7.8 and Table 7.9, respectively. The model explained the most

Table 7.6 Means and Standard Deviations of Variables Used in the Traditionality Index Equation of Males by Race

Variable	White		Black		Hispanic	
	Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation
Percent born in U.S.	0.97	0.17	0.97	0.16	0.70	0.46
Educational attainment	11.27	1.62	10.74	1.65	10.37	2.10
Mother worked in 1978	0.61	0.49	0.61	0.49	0.51	0.50
Ethnic group:						
Chicano	-	-	-	-	0.58	0.49
Cuban	-	-	-	-	0.07	0.26
Puerto Rican	-	-	-	-	0.14	0.35
Others	-	-	-	-	0.20	0.40
Religion:						
Protestant	0.48	0.50	0.78	0.41	0.07	0.25
Catholic	0.33	0.47	0.06	0.24	0.85	0.36
Jewish	0.02	0.14	0.001	0.03	0.003	0.06
Other religion	0.11	0.31	0.10	0.29	0.05	0.21
No religion	0.05	0.22	0.05	0.22	0.03	0.17
Religious attendance	1.89	1.67	2.10	1.64	2.04	1.61

UNIVERSE: Male civilians age 16-21 on interview date.

Table 7.7 Means and Standard Deviations of Variables Used in the Traditionality Index Equation of Females by Race

Variable	White		Black		Hispanic	
	Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation
Percent born in U.S.	0.97	0.17	0.97	0.18	0.74	0.44
Educational attainment	11.41	1.59	11.10	1.62	10.44	2.19
Mother worked in 1978	0.63	0.48	0.58	0.49	0.47	0.50
Ethnic group:						
Chicano	-	-	-	-	0.60	0.49
Cuban	-	-	-	-	0.05	0.22
Puerto Rican	-	-	-	-	0.15	0.35
Others	-	-	-	-	0.20	0.40
Religion:						
Protestant	0.50	0.50	0.78	0.42	0.07	0.25
Catholic	0.32	0.47	0.08	0.28	0.88	0.32
Jewish	0.02	0.14	-	-	0.003	0.05
Other religion	0.12	0.32	0.11	0.31	0.03	0.18
No religion	0.04	0.20	0.03	0.16	0.01	0.11
Religious attendance	2.16	1.71	2.63	1.62	2.42	1.64

UNIVERSE: Female civilians age 16-21 on interview date.

Table 7.8 Results of the Traditionality Equations for Males by Race

Independent variables	White Coefficient (t-value)	Black Coefficient (t-value)	Hispanic Coefficient (t-value)
U.S. born	-.713 (-2.20)*	.123 (0.24)	-1.136 (-4.45)**
Educational attainment	-.330 (-9.68)**	-.296 (-6.03)**	-.352 (-6.61)**
Mother worked in 1978	-.881 (-7.83)**	-.889 (-5.37)**	-.476 (-2.15)*
Ethnic group:			
Chicano	-	-	-
Cuban	-	-	-1.425 (-3.35)**
Puerto Rican	-	-	.218 (0.67)
Others	-	-	-.263 (-0.95)
Religion:			
Protestant	-	-	-
Catholic	-.286 (-2.30)*	-.969 (-2.89)**	-.202 (-0.48)
Jewish	-1.287 (-3.15)**	-.859 (-0.33)	-.371 (-0.19)
Other religion	.228 (1.24)	.139 (0.50)	.365 (0.58)
No religion	-.008 (-0.03)	-.500 (-1.31)	.584 (0.78)
Religious attendance	.116 (3.41)**	.036 (0.72)	.150 (2.23)*
Constant	16.262 (31.96)	15.185 (19.93)	16.950 (24.95)
$\bar{R}^2$	.080	.069	.148
N	2212	1012	635
F	25.01	10.41	10.98

UNIVERSE: Male civilians age 16-21 on interview date.
+ Significant at the 10 percent level.
* Significant at the 5 percent level.
**Significant at the 1 percent level.

Table 7.9 Results of the Traditionality Equations for Females by Race

Independent variables	White coefficient (t-value)	Black coefficient (t-value)	Hispanic coefficient (t-value)
U.S. born	-.439 (-1.44)	.174 (0.37)	-1.440 (-5.66)**
Educational attainment	-.192 (-5.85)**	-.420 (-8.73)**	-.383 (-7.83)**
Mother worked in 1978	-.529 (-4.90)**	-.691 (-4.36)**	-1.018 (-4.93)**
Ethnic group:			
Chicano	-	-	-
Cuban	-	-	-.636 (-1.30)
Puerto Rican	-	-	.094 (0.31)
Others	-	-	.520 (1.96)*
Religion:			
Protestant	-	-	-
Catholic	-.417 (-3.52)**	-.427 (-1.47)	-.120 (-0.30)
Jewish	-1.541 (-3.97)**	-	-1.881 (-0.94)
Other religion	.058 (0.34)	.826 (3.28)**	.093 (0.14)
No religion	.305 (1.14)	.619 (1.28)	-.223 (-0.22)
Religious attendance	.119 (3.80)**	.025 (0.52)	.303 (4.81)**
Constant	12.984 (27.59)	14.979 (20.51)	15.534 (23.48)
$\overline{R}^2$	.040	.098	.234
N	2527	1079	692
F	14.32	17.70	20.19

UNIVERSE: Female civilians age 16-21 on the interview date.
+ Significant at the 10 percent level.
* Significant at the 5 percent level.
**Significant at the 1 percent level.

variation in the traditionality scores among Hispanics, 23 percent for females and 15 percent for males. For white females, the model explained the least variation of the groups, 4 percent.

As expected, educational attainment and having a mother who worked in 1978 reduced traditional views for all the groups under study. Among males, white and black Catholics and white Jews were less traditional than Protestants. Religious affiliation was not significant for either Hispanic males or females. Among other females, white Catholics and Jews were less traditional than Protestants, and among blacks, those of other religions were more traditional than Protestants. Traditionality increased with higher frequency of attendance at religious services among whites and Hispanics of both sexes, but no significant differences appeared among blacks between those who attended religious services often or little. Native-born Hispanics were less traditional than foreign-born. Chicanos were not significantly different from the other Hispanic groups, except for Cuban males, who were less traditional, and the small group classified as "other" Hispanics in the female equation, who were more traditional.

One can see the role of being Hispanic as opposed to other factors, such as being foreign-born and having low educational attainment, by estimating the expected traditionality index of an Hispanic male if he had some of the typical characteristics of a white male youth: completed 11.3 years of schooling, a religious attendance scale of 1.9, U.S. born, and Protestant. An Hispanic male would have an expected traditionality score of 12.1 whereas a white male with the same characteristics would have an expected score of 12.0.

Attitudes toward Military Service

The military represents an alternative source of employment as well as

training for young people. Youth were asked if they thought it was a good thing for young people to serve in the military,[8] and most responded that it was either definitely or probably good (see Table 7.10). Women viewed military service slightly more positively than males, but racial differences were not apparent. Except for Cuban females, positive attitudes among Hispanic groups toward the military were similar. Foreign-born Hispanic males, however, had slightly more positive attitudes toward the military than did the native-born.

Although most young people feel that military service is good, their responses were quite different when they were asked whether they would enlist in the future.[9] Most have no intentions of enlisting; only one-fifth of the males and one-tenth of the females expressed a positive intention to enlist (see Table 7.11). Intentions to enlist also varied by race, Hispanic group and place of birth. For example, about 17 percent of the white males intended to enlist, but the rate was double that among black and Hispanic males. Moreover, half of the Puerto Rican males intended to enlist. Among Hispanics, foreign-born males had slightly higher enlistment intentions than native-born males. Only 6 percent of the white females expressed positive enlistment intentions, but the rate of minority females exceeded even that of white males.

A regression analysis was used to examine the factors associated with positive intentions to enlist by race and sex.[10] The dependent variable was whether or not youth had positive intentions to enlist. Tables 7.12 and 7.13 specify the independent variables used in the enlistment model in more detail for males and females, respectively. One expects school enrollment status to have a significant influence on enlistment intention for the following reasons: enrollment is highly correlated with age, and high school students

Table 7.10 Proportion of Youth Who Viewed Military Service as a Good Thing, 1979

Characteristic	Female			Male		
	Yes	No	Mean score[a]	Yes	No	Mean score[a]
Total[b]	80	20	2.90	75	25	2.82
Race[b]						
White	80	20	2.89	75	25	2.82
Black	81	19	2.94	74	26	2.80
Hispanic	80	20	2.91	77	23	2.87
Hispanic group[c]						
Chicano	80	20	2.92	77	23	2.86
Cuban	96	4	3.10	78	22	2.86
Puerto Rican	76	24	2.84	76	24	2.86
Others	77	23	2.86	77	23	2.88
Place of birth[c]						
Native-born	79	21	2.87	73	27	2.79
Foreign-born	83	17	3.01	85	15	3.02

[a]Youth were asked if they thought it was a good thing for a young person to serve in the military. A youth could respond by saying definitely, probably, probably not, or definitely not a good thing. Score could range from four, definitely, to one, definitely not.

[b]UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 on interview date. (N=24,580,000)

[c]UNIVERSE: Hispanic civilians age 16-21 on interview date. (N=1,518,000)

Table 7.11 Proportion of Youth With Positive Intentions to Enlist in the Military, 1979

Characteristic	Female			Male		
	Yes	No	Mean score[a]	Yes	No	Mean score[a]
Total[b]	9	91	1.50	21	79	1.88
Race[b]						
White	6	94	1.45	17	83	1.82
Black	22	78	1.76	38	62	2.17
Hispanic	18	82	1.64	34	66	2.08
Hispanic group[c]						
Chicano	17	83	1.63	32	68	2.05
Cuban	2	98	1.43	25	75	1.81
Puerto Rican	27	73	1.79	52	48	2.36
Others	15	85	1.58	32	68	2.07
Place of birth[c]						
Native-born	16	84	1.62	33	67	2.06
Foreign-born	19	81	1.67	38	62	2.12

[a]Youth were asked if in the future they would enlist: definitely, probably, probably not, and definitely not. An enlistment score was assigned ranging from four, definitely to one, definitely not.

[b]UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 on interview date. (N=24,580,000)

[c]UNIVERSE: Hispanic civilians age 16-21 on interview date. (N=1,518,000)

Table 7.12 Means and Standard Deviations of Variables Used in the Enlistment Intention Equations of Males by Race

Variable	White		Black		Hispanic	
	Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation
Percent intending to enlist	0.18	0.38	0.38	0.49	0.34	0.48
Knowledge of the world of work	6.80	1.85	4.99	2.00	5.36	2.12
Percent born in U.S.	0.97	0.18	0.97	0.16	0.70	0.46
Percent married	0.06	0.25	0.02	0.15	0.09	0.29
Percent not in poverty	0.74	0.44	0.50	0.50	0.57	0.49
Percent where poverty status not available	0.19	0.39	0.21	0.41	0.17	0.38
Enrollment status:						
High school students	0.39	0.49	0.46	0.50	0.41	0.49
Dropouts	0.12	0.33	0.21	0.41	0.27	0.45
Graduates, nonenrolled	0.26	0.44	0.20	0.40	0.17	0.38
College students	0.22	0.42	0.13	0.34	0.14	0.34
Percent with college aspirations	0.63	0.48	0.58	0.49	0.56	0.50
Ethnic group:						
Chicano	-	-	-	-	0.58	0.49
Cuban	-	-	-	-	0.08	0.26
Puerto Rican	-	-	-	-	0.14	0.35
Others	-	-	-	-	0.15	0.36
Percent wanting additional job training	0.67	0.47	0.80	0.40	0.77	0.42
Percent unemployed in county, 1970	4.27	1.65	4.36	1.50	5.20	1.73
Number of weeks unemployed, 1978	3.11	7.77	6.18	11.75	4.25	9.33

UNIVERSE: Male civilians age 16-21 on interview date.

Table 7.13 Means and Standard Deviations of Variables Used in the Enlistment Intention Equations of Females by Race

Variable	White		Black		Hispanic	
	Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation
Percent intending to enlist	0.06	0.23	0.22	0.41	0.17	0.38
Knowledge of the world of work	6.58	1.87	5.17	2.02	5.17	2.04
Percent born in U.S.	0.97	0.17	0.96	0.18	0.73	0.44
Percent married	0.19	0.39	0.11	0.31	0.25	0.43
Percent not in poverty	0.69	0.46	0.44	0.50	0.53	0.50
Percent where poverty status not available	0.24	0.43	0.22	0.41	0.21	0.41
Enrollment status:						
High school students	0.34	0.47	0.39	0.49	0.33	0.47
Dropouts	0.11	0.32	0.17	0.37	0.29	0.46
Graduates, nonenrolled	0.34	0.47	0.26	0.44	0.23	0.42
College students	0.21	0.41	0.18	0.38	0.15	0.36
Percent with college aspirations	0.66	0.47	0.66	0.47	0.60	0.49
Ethnic group:						
Chicano	-	-	-	-	0.59	0.49
Cuban	-	-	-	-	0.06	0.23
Puerto Rican	-	-	-	-	0.16	0.36
Others	-	-	-	-	0.17	0.37
Percent wanting additional job training	0.62	0.49	0.79	0.41	0.77	0.42
Percent unemployed in county, 1970	4.34	1.63	4.46	1.69	5.23	1.68
Number of weeks unemployed, 1978	2.72	6.72	5.66	10.68	3.45	8.19

UNIVERSE: Female civilians age 16-21 on interview date.

are the youngest age group with the least family responsibilities and thus more likely to have positive intentions. Furthermore, being from poor families, having more weeks of unemployment in 1978, residing in areas with high unemployment rates, and desiring employment training outside regular schooling are expected to increase enlistment intentions. Because of family responsibilities, married youth are expected to have lower enlistment intentions than unmarried youth. Youth with high knowledge of the world of work (KWW) scores are expected to have lower enlistment intentions. In the case of Hispanics, one must also examine the influence of place of birth as well as differences among the Hispanic groups.

Tables 7.14 and 7.15 present the results of the enlistment intentions regressions. Among males, school enrollment status, which is highly correlated with age, significantly affected enlistment intentions. Nonenrolled high school graduates and college students were less likely to have positive enlistment intentions than high school students (the youngest age group). No significant differences in enlistment intentions appeared between high school students and dropouts. Similarly, lower scores on KWW and a desire for additional job training outside of school increased enlistment intentions for all three groups.

Hispanic males differed from blacks and whites in that aspirations to attend college or not being from a family with income below the poverty line did not significantly increase their intentions to enlist. They differed from whites for whom being married reduced the enlistment intention, and they differed from blacks for whom higher unemployment in the county decreased enlistment intentions and for whom increased weeks of unemployment did not increase the intentions. Puerto Rican males had significantly higher intentions to join than did chicanos.

Table 7.14 Results of Enlistment Intention Equations for Males by Race

Independent variables	White Coefficient (t-value)	Black Coefficient (t-value)	Hispanic Coefficient (t-value)
Knowledge of the world of work	-.019 (-4.10)**	-.028 (-3.32)**	-.020 (-2.11)*
U.S.-born	-.052 (-1.17)	.057 (0.62)	-.069 (-1.54)
Married	-.087 (-2.60)**	-.032 (-0.32)	-.004 (-0.06)
Not in poverty	-.070 (-2.22)*	-.111 (-3.09)**	.008 (0.17)
Poverty status not available	-.053 (-1.51)	-.008 (-0.20)	.065 (1.13)
High school students	-	-	-
Dropouts	-.006 (-0.21)	-.005 (-0.13)	-.072 (-1.37)
Graduates, nonenrolled	-.119 (-5.81)**	-.135 (-3.24)**	-.196 (-3.63)**
College students	-.115 (-5.07)**	-.143 (-2.81)**	-.209 (-3.34)**
College aspirations	-.042 (-2.22)*	-.818 (-2.42)*	-.033 (-0.73)
Chicano	-	-	-
Cuban	-	-	-.032 (-0.42)
Puerto Rican	-	-	.197 (3.29)**
Others	-	-	.059 (1.07)
Additional job training	.100 (5.93)**	.082 (2.19)*	.108 (2.38)*
Percent unemployed in county, 1970	.0001 (0.29)	-.003 (-2.68)**	.0006 (0.51)
Number of weeks unemployed, 1978	.002 (2.28)**	-.001 (-0.81)	.004 (1.92)+

Table 7.14 (continued)

Independent variables	White	Black	Hispanic
	Coefficient (t-value)	Coefficient (t-value)	Coefficient (t-value)
Constant	.428 (6.88)	.672 (5.90)	.421 (3.78)
$\overline{R}^2$	.084	.088	.094
N	2192	978	624
F	17.73	8.86	5.33

UNIVERSE: Male civilians age 16-21 on interview date.
+ Significant at the 10 percent level.
* Significant at the 5 percent level.
**Significant at the 1 percent level.

Table 7.15 Results of Enlistment Intention Equations for Females by Race

Independent variables	White Coefficient (t-value)	Black Coefficient (t-value)	Hispanic Coefficient (t-value)
Knowledge of the world of work	-.0004 (-0.14)	-.012 (-1.79)+	-.010 (-1.30)
U.S. born	-.092 (-3.39)**	-.022 (-0.33)	-.092 (-2.63)**
Married	-.053 (-3.89)**	-.103 (-2.32)*	-.142 (-3.81)**
Not in poverty	-.036 (-1.99)*	-.005 (-0.15)	-.008 (-0.24)
Poverty status not available	-.042 (-2.16)*	-.040 (-1.16)	-.025 (-0.60)
High school students	-	-	-
Dropouts	-.015 (-0.84)	-.008 (-0.18)	-.013 (-0.30)
Graduates, nonenrolled	-.026 (-2.13)*	-.090 (-2.69)**	-.046 (-1.13)
College student	-.056 (-4.14)**	-.082 (-2.16)	-.122 (-2.62)**
College aspirations	.006 (0.49)	-.049 (-1.59)	.042 (1.22)
Chicano	-	-	-
Cuban	-	-	-.160 (-2.40)*
Puerto Rican	-	-	.123 (2.77)**
Others	-	-	-.026 (-0.66)
Additional job training	.026 (2.74)**	.056 (1.80)+	.042 (1.24)
Percent unemployed in county, 1970	-.0003 (-1.08)	.0001 (0.19)	.0003 (0.30)
Number of weeks unemployed, 1978	.002 (2.83)**	.001 (0.73)	.004 (2.26)*

Table 7.15 (continued)

Independent variables	White	Black	Hispanic
	Coefficient (t-value)	Coefficient (t-value)	Coefficient (t-value)
Constant	.205 (5.24)	.341 (3.77)	.277 (3.50)
$\overline{R}^2$	.026	.029	.064
N	2529	1068	702
F	6.52	3.69	4.20

UNIVERSE: Female civilians age 16-21 on interview date.
+ Significant at the 10 percent level.
* Significant at the 5 percent level.
**Significant at the 1 percent level.

Among young women, being married reduced the intention to enlist for all three groups. Hispanics were like whites in that being native-born and unemployed more during 1978 increased the intention to enlist, while being a college student as compared to a high school student reduced it. Among the Hispanic females, Puerto Ricans were more likely and Cubans less likely to intend to enlist than chicanas.

Illegal Activities, Police Contacts, and Drug Use

The labor force participation of youth may also be influenced by involvement in illegal activities, police contacts, and use of drugs. An arrest record may be an insurmountable employment barrier, and participation in illegal but profitable activities may reduce work incentives. Drug addiction can interfere with employment responsibilities. The 1980 NLS provided information on the proportion of total income during the last year which came from illegal activities and on whether a youth had ever been stopped by the police, booked or charged, or convicted. Information was also available on the proportion of youth who had used marijuana or hashish or other drugs or chemicals in the last year to get high.[11] Table 7.16 presents the extent of these activities by race and sex.

Most youth do not have any police contacts or income from illegal sources. Overall, less than one-seventh of youth reported such income and about one-fifth reported police contact. Males are about two times more likely to report income from illegal sources than are females and three times more likely than females to have police contacts. Hispanics had the lowest proportion reporting illegal income. Racial differences were only slight among those youth reporting police contacts.

Table 7.16 Proportion of Youth Reporting Illegal Sources of Income, Police Contacts, Use of Marijuana and Other Drugs, by Sex and Race, 1980

Reported activity[a]	Female			Male			
	White	Black	Hispanic	White	Black	Hispanic	Total
Earned any income in 1979 from illegal activitites							
No	90	87	93	80	73	82	85
Yes	10	13	7	20	27	18	15
Ever been stopped by police, booked/ charged or convicted							
No	88	91	88	66	61	64	77
Yes	12	9	12	34	39	36	23
Ever smoked marijuana/hash to get high in 1979							
No	49	60	63	45	49	53	48
Yes	51	40	37	55	51	47	52
Ever used drugs/ chemicals to get hign in 1979							
No	76	91	87	73	85	83	77
Yes	24	9	13	27	15	17	23

[a]Information on illegal income, police contacts, and marijuana/drug use is from the 1980 interview. Characteristics of youth are from the 1979 interview date.

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 on 1979 interview date. (N=24,580,000)

More youth reported smoking marijuana or hashish to get high within the previous year than they reported police contacts and sources of illegal income. As expected, young people used marijuana or hashish more often than other drugs or chemicals. For example, half of the youth had smoked marijuana or hash in the last year as compared to about a fifth who used other drugs or chemicals to get high. Hispanics were less likely to report using marijuana and black and Hispanic females used marijuana less than males. Other drugs and chemicals besides marijuana were generally more popular among white males and females than they were among blacks or Hispanics, perhaps because of their lower income relative to whites.

Table 7.17 presents the extent of illegal income, police contacts, and use of drugs for Hispanic youth by group, place of birth, and employment status in the 1979 survey week. Chicanos tended more than other groups to have illegal sources of income, and police contacts were more frequent among chicanos and Puerto Rican males. The use of marijuana or hashish ranked lowest for Cubans. Foreign-born Hispanic youth were much less likely than native-born to have illegal sources of income, police contacts, or to use marijuana or drugs to get high. Foreign-born youth may be less prone to deviant behavior because of cultural factors.

No clear association was noted between illegal sources of income, police contacts, or drug use and employment status at the 1979 survey among Hispanics.[12] Young men who were not in school or the labor force, however, reported higher proportions with illegal income and use of drugs than did those in most of the other groups. Those Hispanic males who were unemployed were more likely to report police contacts and marijuana use.

Table 7.17 Proportion of Hispanic Youth Reporting Police Contacts, Illegal Sources of Income, and Marijuana/Drug Use, by Selected Characteristics, 1980

Characteristic	Reported activity[a]							
	Illegal income		Police contact		Marijuana/Hashish		Drugs	
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male
Hispanic group								
Chicano	9	21	13	37	39	49	13	16
Cuban	0	14	0	23	36	30	0	11
Puerto Rican	8	15	12	41	43	42	14	18
Others	4	12	10	33	27	52	15	22
Place of birth								
Foreign-born	5	7	6	26	18	27	5	7
U.S.-born	8	22	14	40	44	57	16	22
Employment status, 1979 survey week								
Employed	8	19	12	36	44	49	17	19
Unemployed	9	17	15	48	47	54	12	16
Out of the labor force (OLF)	7	16	11	29	29	43	11	15
OLF in-school	4	14	6	25	30	43	11	11
OLF out-of-school	10	24	16	47	28	37	9	25

[a]Information on illegal income, police contacts, and marijuana/drug use is from the 1980 interview. Characteristics of youth are from the 1979 interview date.

UNIVERSE: Hispanic civilians age 16-21 on 1979 interview date. (N=1,518,000)

Conclusion

Youth express positive attitudes toward work--they expect to be working at age 35, desire high status occupations, and consider their employment prospects good. Attitudes among youth differed, however, by their sex and, to a lesser degree, by their race. Females and males not desiring professional or managerial careers tended to look toward traditional sex-stereotypical occupations. Whites also viewed their prospects for being employed in their desired occupations more positively than did blacks or Hispanics. Among Hispanics, more foreign-born females than native-born expected to be raising a family as opposed to working at age 35. More foreign-born Hispanic males desired craft occupations at age 35 than the native-born.

Youths' positive attitudes toward work are also indicated in their responses to the possibility of having an inadequate family income. Most said they would prefer in such circumstances to get additional education or to enter job training than to use welfare remedies. Most youth would also continue working if income was not a problem, but this was less true among Hispanic females.

Overall, proportionately more males than females viewed women in the traditional roles of mothers and wives, and Hispanic males had the most traditional views of all youth. These traditional views can largely be accounted for, however, by the fact that substantial numbers of the youth are foreign-born and have low educational attainment. As foreign cultural influences diminish and educational attainment increases, a moderation in the traditional view of women may be expected. The increasing LFPR of married Hispanic women appears to indicate that such a reversal in traditional attitudes is taking place.[13]

Most youth consider military service worthwhile, although most do not plan to enlist. Males tended more than females to have positive enlistment intentions, and minorities were more likely to report them than whites. Among males, blacks and Hispanics were similar in their positive intentions, but these minorities had twice the rate of whites. Place of birth did not significantly affect enlistment intentions among Hispanic males. Puerto Ricans had higher positive enlistment intentions than chicanos. The desire for additional training outside regular schooling appears to enhance the positive enlistment intentions of all youth.

Finally, most youth do not have illegal sources of income or police contacts; among those who do, males were two to three times as likely as females to be involved in these activities. Race differences were minimal, with black males reporting slightly higher incidences of illegal income or police contacts. The use of marijuana and hashish was popular among youth, but less so among Hispanics. Youth generally did not use other drugs and chemicals to get high; however, whites did so more often than blacks or Hispanics. The most striking difference among Hispanic youth in illegal sources of income, police contacts and drug use occurred by birthplace; foreign-born youth were less likely than native-born to engage in these activities.

Footnotes

[1]For a more detailed discussion of occupational aspirations in the 1979 NLS, refer to David Shapiro and Joan E. Crowley, "Aspirations and Expectations of Youth in The United States. Part II: Employment Activity," Youth and Society, Vol. 13 (Sept. 1982).

[2]Expectations at age 35 varied only slightly among the Hispanic groups and are not presented in this chapter. Puerto Ricans, however, had the highest proportion among the female groups expecting to work at age 35. Cuban males had the highest proportion seeking high status occupations.

[3]Responses to inadequate family income are not presented for Hispanics by group or birthplace because differences were slight. No differences were noted between foreign and native-born in attitudes toward food stamps or welfare. Foreign-born Hispanic females, however, had the lowest proportion, 69 percent, who would work if money was not a problem.

[4]For a description of the LFPR trends of married women, refer to U.S. Department of Labor, 1975 Handbook on Women Workers (Washington, D.C.: Women's Bureau, 1975), pp. 15-18, 76-83.

[5]For a detailed discussion of traditionality among NLS youth, refer to Joan E. Crowley, "Attitudes Toward Women's Role," Appendix 11A in Michael E. Borus, editor, Pathways to the Future 1979 (Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University Center for Human Resource Research), May 1981.

[6]The methodological consideration of the traditionality index is discussed in J. Crowley, "Attitudes Toward Women's Role," op. cit.

[7]For a review and critique of some traditional views of the chicano family, refer to Miguel Montiel, "The Chicano Family: A Review of Research," Social Work, Vol. 18, No. 2 (March 1973).

[8]For an in depth discussion of enlistment intentions among NLS youth, refer to Choongsoo Kim, "The All-Volunteer Force: 1979 NLS Studies of Enlistment Intentions to Serve, and Intentions to Reenlist" (Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, The Center for Human Resource Research), July 1981.

[9]Enlistment intentions are asked of civilian youth age 16-21. Among youth age 17 and older, some are already in the military and for this age group enlistment intentions are understated.

[10]Ordinary least square analysis was used because of its ease of interpretation and because the analysis was run weighted. Probit was also used and it produced results similar to OLS. Both OLS and probit showed identical variables having a significant influence on enlistment intentions. Weeks unemployed in 1978 was, however, not significant in the probit analysis for Hispanic males.

[11]Information on illegal activities, police contacts, and drug use is from the 1980 NLS youth survey, but the characteristics of youth are as of the 1979 interview date. A more detailed discussion of the NLS results on illegal

activities and other deviant behavior can be found in Joan E. Crowley, "Oelinquency and Employment" in Pathways to the Future, Vol. II, Michael E. Borus, editor, Ohio State University, Center for Human Resource Research, September 1981.

[12]Employment status of youth is from the 1979 interview date and information on illegal activities, police contacts, and drug use is from the 1980 NLS.

[13]Rosemary Santana Cooney, "Changing Labor Force Participation of Mexican American Wives: A Comparison with Anglos and Blacks," Social Science Quarterly, Vol. 56, No. 2 (Sept. 1975): 252-261.

Chapter VII - Glossary

NOTE: Unless otherwise indicated, all information pertains to the date of interview.

Additional Job Training	A binary variable coded 1 if the respondent would like to get occupational or job training other than that provided by regular schooling (high school or college), 0 otherwise.
College Aspirations	A binary variable coded 1 if the respondent would like to enroll in college.
Educational Attainment	A continuous variable measuring the highest grade completed by the respondent. The range is 0-18.
Enlistment Intention	A binary variable coded 1 if the resopndent has positive enlistment intentions, 0 otherwise.
Enrollment Status	(Dropout, High School Student, College Student, Graduate, Nonenrolled) Respondent's enrollment status; coded 1 if respondent has value on any of the above variables, 0 otherwise. High school student was comparison category.
Ethnicity	See previous glossary.
Knowledge of the World of Work	See previous glossary.
Married	A binary variable coded 1 if the respondent is married or separated, 0 otherwise.
Mother Worked in 1978	A binary variable coded 1 if respondent's mother worked in 1978, 0 otherwise.
Percent Unemployed in County	A continuous variable measuring the percent unemployed in the respondent's county in 1970. (Source: City-County Data Book)
Poverty Status Not in Poverty	A series of binary variables: coded 1 if the respondent was not living in poverty in 1978, as defined by the Current Population Survey; coded 0 if respondent was living in poverty then or if information on 1978 poverty status was not available.
Poverty Status Not Available	Coded 1 if information on the respondent's 1978 poverty status was not available, 0 otherwise. In poverty was comparison category.
Religion	(Catholic, Jewish, Protestant, Other Religion, No Religion) Respondent's religious unbringing coded 1

	if respondent has value on any of the above variables, 0 if no value. Protestant was comparison category.
Religious Attendance	A continuous variable measuring the frequency of attendance at religious services. Coded 0 if not at all, 1 if several times a year or less, 2 if about once a month, 3 if two or three times a month, 4 if about once a week, 5 if more than once a week.
U.S.-Born	See previous glossary.
Weeks Unemployed in 1978	A continuous variable measuring the number of weeks the respondent was unemployed in 1978. If the respondent did not report any weeks unemployed, a zero value was assigned.

Chapter VIII

Hispanic Employment Opportunities: The Challenge Ahead

Introduction

The economic outlook for Hispanic youth is far from encouraging. Economic recession in the eighties has increased the vulnerability of all workers to unemployment, and employment growth in manufacturing and other major sectors of the economy has been thwarted. At the same time, the Hispanic population has increased. The country will thus be challenged to channel the talents of Hispanic youth into the economic mainstream.

This chapter focuses on the creation of employment opportunities for Hispanic youth. The job prospects of these young people are closely tied to youth employment policies in general as well as to national economic policies, but the findings presented in this report accent the need for specific employment policies directed to Hispanic youth. The policies suggested here are intended not as a blueprint for creating Hispanic employment, but rather to produce discussion. In 1980 the Vice President's Task Force on Youth Employment pointed out, in fact, the need for such discussion when it concluded that the causes of youth unemployment in general are myriad and too complex to be solved by any single policy or initiative.[1] The detailed findings from the NLS can, however, be used in the development of policies to address some of the employment problems of Hispanic youth.

Employment Opportunities: The Options

A variety of policy options have been suggested to remedy the job obstacles encountered by youth.[2] In general, these options are based on the following approaches: (A) the human capital approach: upgrading and training young workers, improving job search techniques and language skills and

increasing educational levels, (B) a market approach: lowering the minimum wage rate, reducing both age restrictions in hiring and other restrictions that unnecessarily protect young workers; and reducing the job competition from illegal aliens by strict enforcement of immigration laws, (C) special youth characteristics approach: developing programs or policies that reflect the unique youth culture such as gangs, illegal markets and overall attitudes toward employment, (D) the affirmative action approach: strictly enforcing antidiscrimination laws to protect minorities, especially young workers, and developing special programs to recruit and train young minority workers. Although these employment approaches have been discussed for their impact on white and black youth employment, their effects on Hispanic youth have not been fully explored. The next sections discuss the potential effects of these policies in the context of the NLS findings on Hispanic employment.

A. The Human Capital Approach

Upgrading the skills of workers through improving education, vocational training, language skills, or job search techniques is generally viewed as the human capital approach to employment, where unemployed youth increase their employability.

(1) Educational Attainment. Because nearly two-fifths of chicano and Puerto Rican unemployed youth in the labor force are high school dropouts, considerable attention should be given to school completion campaigns. Nearly two out of every five Hispanic males drop out of school for economic reasons--home responsibilities, good job offers or financial difficulties.[3] Providing jobs to in-school youth could reduce the dropout rate.

Keeping Hispanic youth in school will not, however, completely solve their employment problems. Graduating from high school improves the

employment status of all youth, but whites fare much better than blacks or Hispanics. For example, chicano high school graduates not enrolled in college have an unemployment rate twice that of whites. Completion of high school also does not appear to influence significantly the wages of employed out-of-school Hispanic males, but among blacks and whites, completion of high school does affect wages. Thus, employment efforts for Hispanic youth will thus have to go beyond mere educational remedies.[4]

(2) Language Ability. Nearly every Hispanic youth was raised in a household where Spanish was spoken. No data were available to determine the level of proficiency or whether the youth spoke Spanish; consequently, the effect of language retention on employment could not be ascertained. One-fifth of Hispanic youth, however, stated that problems with English had prevented them from getting a good job. The nature of the English problem is nevertheless far from clear: language may be an artificial barrier, for example, where the formal job requirement mandates passing a written English test but the job itself requires performing only a manual task. For youth with limited English, language improvement efforts should be incorporated into a bilingual approach. Knowing Spanish can be an asset, as it is in the Southwest and Northeast, where knowledge of both English and Spanish is a vital employment prerequisite in retail stores and service occupations.

(3) Skill acquisition and training needs. Black and Hispanic youth tended more than whites to have participated in government-sponsored employment and training programs. Puerto Ricans were the most likely among Hispanics to participate in government programs. The long term evaluations of government employment and training programs will have to wait until further NLS data are collected, but the immediate effects are quite clear. In 1978, government-sponsored jobs were held by one-fourth of the employed Hispanic

high school students. Nearly half of the employed Puerto Ricans held a government job in that year.

(4) Job search information. Another way to reduce youth unemployment is to give young people more knowledge of the labor market and teach them effective job search methods. Hispanic youth had lower Knowledge of the World of Work scores than whites. Improved information about occupations could help Hispanics make wiser career decisions, although once employed it did not affect the wage rates of Hispanic males.

The most popular job search method among unemployed youth, including Hispanics, was direct contact with an employer. Since most youth appear to make direct job applications, improving their skills on the initial job contact with the employer could prove important in getting jobs. Hispanic youth could benefit from learning pre-employment skills such as filling out applications and conducting themselves effectively in interviews. Because unemployed Hispanics, especially chicanos, rely more on friends and relatives in their efforts to find work, they may, in fact, constrain their range of employment opportunities.

B. The Market Approach

Market-oriented policies reduce employment difficulties young persons encounter by encouraging a high level of economic activity, altering the legal minimum wage, relaxing restrictive age requirements, and stemming job competition from illegal aliens. The findings presented here can not adequately assess all these market approach options, but they can provide greater insight into how to create employment opportunities for Hispanics.

(1) Aggregate demand approach options. Monetary and fiscal policies aimed at maintaining adequate employment levels for both adults and youth are

difficult to evaluate by means of the initial NLS surveys. It is safe to assume, however, that an effective level of aggregate demand reduces some of the difficulties encountered by youth in finding employment, but not all of them. Black teenage unemployment, for example, remains high during economic recovery.[5]

Furthermore, putting sole faith in aggregate demand policies will probably not produce the necessary jobs in segmented and isolated labor markets in urban barrios or rural Southwest communities. Favorable market forces obviously ease the job-finding process for Hispanic youth, but the presence of isolated labor markets, discrimination, and lack of skills weakens their benefits.

(2) Altering the wage structure. The minimum wage has usually been considered the most formidable institutional barrier to youth employment, but the conclusions of numerous minimum wage studies are not uniform.[6] The NLS findings do not directly test the impact of minimum wages on youth employment, but the youths' reservation wages as well as willingness of unemployed youth to work in certain occupations do shed light on the minimum wage issue. Young people, especially those in high school, appear to have realistic wage expectations, an average reservation wage equal to the federal minimum wage.

Unemployed youth are also willing to work in certain occupations at wages below the 1979 federal minimum of $2.90 an hour. Their acceptance of subminimum wages ranged from over one-fourth (for washing dishes) to two-fifths (for cashier at a supermarket and park work). In five private sector jobs, black and Hispanic males were more willing than whites to accept subminimum wages, but whites were more willing than minorities to work at subminimum wages in two public sector jobs. Foreign-born Hispanic males had the highest proportion of all youth groups willing to work in the occupations studied at subminimum wages.

The high level of acceptance among minorities of work at subminimum wages should not, however, signal the implementation of a subminimum wage for youth. The willingness of youth to accept subminimum wages only signals their willingness to work and does not suggest all the possible consequences of having a subminimum wage. In the case of Hispanics, specific research will be needed in low wage areas such as south Texas, where the minimum wage is the prevailing market rate, before any adjustments should be made. For example, in changing minimum wage provisions to accommodate younger workers, caution must be exercised because Hispanic adult workers may suffer substantially.

For many chicanos in Texas and other southwestern states, the presence of a minimum wage is the only defense against depressed wages in the free market. Moreover, increases in the minimum wage during various periods over the past 20 years represent to many chicano workers the only pay hikes during their employment.[7]

(3) Relaxing institutional restrictive practices. In addition to the legal minimum wage, other institutional practices hinder young peoples' employment opportunities. Federal regulation and state laws in particular restrict certain occupations deemed hazardous to youth. Other provisions such as licensing laws may specify a minimum age, educational level, U.S. citizenship, apprenticeship experience, English competency, skill competency, and good moral character before one is allowed to practice a trade, profession, or skilled craft. Many of these provisions are not intended to protect the public interest, but to restrict competition and protect the professional trade.[8] Whether youth, and in particular Hispanic youth, are widely prevented from obtaining work through institutional barriers is difficult to assess with the NLS data.

Certain findings related to institutional restrictions are, nonetheless, worth noting. Most youth feel their young age is a barrier to employment. Whether age reflects lack of experience or represents an artificial employment barrier cannot be determined, but the evidence shows that employment problems are compounded for the youngest age group. Teenagers experience the highest unemployment rate, and it does not follow that the mere aging process removes employment barriers: unemployment declines for older youth, but Hispanics and blacks continue to have disproportionately higher jobless rates than whites.

The profile of Hispanics also showed an alarming high school dropout rate. The widespread use of a second language in the household and a large presence of foreign-born youth may indicate difficulties with English among Hispanics. Consequently, the relationship between job performance and employment requirements like high school completion, language proficiency, or the citizenship requirement should be ascertained. Otherwise, capricious employment requirements will serve as insurmountable barriers to Hispanic youth.

(4) Job competition and immigration policies. Both legal and illegal immigration is alleged to intensify job competition, especially in the youth labor market. Undocumented workers are believed to take jobs from youth. Some labor market analysts claim that the employment problems of Hispanics will not disappear until illegal aliens do.[9] Despite the calls by advocates of strict immigration policies for "border fencing," few studies have been able to estimate the number of illegal aliens in the U.S. or their impact on the youth labor market.

The NLS findings are also constrained in evaluating the impact of undocumented workers on the youth labor market. The NLS birthplace data on youth, however, shows a continuing flow of recent arrivals to the U.S.; over

one-fourth of Hispanic youth were foreign-born. While an analysis of wages of out-of-school Hispanic males showed that the proportion of foreign-born population in a county did not produce a significant impact, it also showed that foreign-born males earned about one-seventh less than native-born males. Foreign-born males are also more willing to work in certain occupations at subminimum wages than native-born Hispanics.

C. Special Characteristics of Hispanic Youth

The effectiveness of both the market approach and the human capital approach to youth employment is questionable if certain unique characteristics of Hispanics are not taken into account: the Hispanic population is not homogeneous. Furthermore, the characteristics of foreign-born Hispanics are quite different from the native-born. Cultural factors can also affect attitudes toward work. These differences within the Hispanic population are worth considering.

(1) Diversity of Hispanic group. Hispanics are often viewed as a homogeneous group and they do share many similar cultural traits, but there are socioeconomic differences. Chicanos and Puerto Ricans are more likely, for example, to be at a lower socioeconomic level than Cubans or other Hispanic groups. In many cases, the socioeconomic levels of Puerto Rican youth are identical to blacks and those of Cubans to whites.

(2) Foreign-born vs. Native-born Both native-born and foreign-born Hispanics are likely to have been raised in Spanish-speaking households, but their similarity often ends there. For example, half of the foreign-born chicanos reported that a problem with English had prevented them from getting a good job in comparison to only 4 percent of the native-born chicanos. Foreign-born Hispanics were also more likely than native-born to feel that

race or nationality discrimination prevented then from getting a good job. Although the school dropout rate was high for all Hispanics, the foreign-born had twice the rate of native-born. Foreign-born Hispanics were also more likely than the native-born to have low incomes. Although nearly all of the Puerto Rican youth are U.S.-born, those born on the island have higher dropout rates and are more likely to be poor than those born on the mainland.

(3) Traditional values. The impact of cultural values on employment is difficult to assess. Findings from the NLS suggest some cultural influences. In the attitudes toward employment of women, for example, Hispanic males had the most traditional views among youth. Their views can, however, be attributed to the presence of many foreign-born youth and to low educational attainment. Furthermore, Hispanics, and especially the females, have slightly lower occupational aspirations for age 35 than other youth. Hispanic females also have the lowest labor force participation rate among youth. Hispanic females in college, however, had a rate equal to other females. Increased educational attainment among Hispanic females will more than likely increase the participation of young women in the work force.

Like other youth, most Hispanics viewed military service as a worthwhile experience, yet most are not planning to enlist. Hispanic youth, however, had more positive intentions to enlist than whites, and males had more positive intentions to enlist than females, with Puerto Ricans having the highest enlistment intentions. It appears that although youth view military duty as a good thing, minority youth are the ones most likely to enlist.

(4) Illegal activities, drugs, police contacts. The employment status of Hispanic youth is generally believed to be influenced by illegal activities, drug use, and other deviant behavior as measured by police contact. For some youth, illegal activities may deter employment. The NLS,

however, showed that for most youth, the effects of such activities are quite minimal. Moreover, Hispanics were no more likely to engage in illegal activities or drugs than other youth.

D. Affirmative Action

As long as racial discrimination is present in the labor market, efforts to expand employment opportunities will have only limited effectiveness. The NLS results show that about one-seventh of Hispanic youth felt that racial or ethnic discrimination had prevented them from getting good jobs. Furthermore, an analysis of the employment status of Hispanics suggests that not all of their difficulties can be accounted for by their low educational attainment or other human capital characteristics. Strong enforcement of antidiscrimination laws and affirmative action efforts appear to be needed in order to insure equality of opportunity for Hispanics.

The Employment Outlook

The employment needs of Hispanic youth require careful attention. Too many Hispanics are simply not educationally prepared to adjust to a changing job market. Too many young Hispanics are entering factories to work as operatives with dim prospects of occupational mobility. For young Hispanics, high school dropout rates will have to be arrested and career opportunities enchanced. If opportunities are not provided to Hispanic youth, a growing labor force with productive talent will be lost to the nation.

Early intervention into the employment problems of young Hispanic workers should also generate some other benefits. Many of the economic hardships encountered by adult Hispanics can be more easily corrected at the earlier stage of the work career with fewer resources and less stress on political and

social institutions. The social costs of early labor market remedial efforts are worthwhile investments. The alternative is to delay preventive efforts and encounter more costly social and economic problems when this growing population reaches adulthood.

Footnotes

[1]U.S. Department of Labor, A Summary Report of The Vice President's Task Force on Youth Employment, p. 48.

[2]Employment approaches in this chapter are presented in R. Santos, "Youth Employment Policies: An Hispanic Perspective" (Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass.: Center for Public Service), April 1980.

[3]Russell W. Rumberger, "Experiences in High School and College," in Pathways to the Future, edited by Michael E. Borus (Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, Center for Human Resource Research), May 1981, p. 283.

[4]Collective bargaining coverage, for example, can have a significant impact on the wages of Hispanics. Trade union protection appears to be an important factor in improving the economic position of Hispanics.

[5]U.S. Department of Labor, 1978 Employment and Training Report of the President (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office), pp. 69-70.

[6]For an excellent review of the minimum wage issue, refer to Sar A. Levitan and Richard S. Belous, More Than Subsistence: Minimum wages for the Working Poor (John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore), 1979.

[7]Gordon F. Bloom and Herbert R. Northup, Economics of Labor Relations (Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, 1977), pp. 497-98.

[8]Karen Greene, Daniel H. Kruger, and Benjamin Shimberg, Occupational Licensing in the United States (Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service), 1973.

[9]For discussion of immigration policies, refer to "Immigration Issues in an Era of Unsanctioned Migration: A Symposium," edited by Walter Fogel in Industrial and Labor Relations Review, April 1980, Vol. 33, No. 3.

References

Adams, V. Arvil and Mangum, G. 1979. The Lingering Crisis of Youth Unemployment. Kalamazoo: Upjohn Institute.

Bloom, G.F. and Northup, H.R. 1977. Economics of Labor Relations. Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin.

Borus, M.E., Mott, F.L., and Nestel, G. 1978. Counting Youth: Comparison of Labor Force Statistics in the CPS and NLS, in Report on Youth Unemployment: Its Measurement and Meaning. U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.

Borus, M.E. 1981. Willingness to Work, in Pathways to the Future, Preliminary Report 79, edited by M.E. Borus. The Ohio State University Center for Human Resource Research.

Briggs, V.M., Fogel, W. and Schmidt, F. 1977. The Chicano Worker. Austin, Texas: University of Texas, Austin.

Bullock, P. 1973. Aspiration vs. Opportunity: "Careers" in the Inner City. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations.

Cardenas, G. and Santos, R. 1979. Barrier to Hispanic Youth Employment: A Literature Review. In Hispanic Youth Employment. U.S. Department of Labor, Office of Youth Program. Knowledge Development, Report 10.1.

Cardenas, G. and Santos, R. 1980. Hispanic Population in CETA: A Preliminary Assessment. Paper presented at the National Symposium on Hispanics and CETA.

Carliner, G. 1976. Returns to Education for Blacks, Anglos, and Five Spanish Groups, Journal of Human Resources 11: 172-183.

Chiswick, B. 1978. The Effect of Americanization on the Earnings of Foreign-Born Men, Journal of Political Economy 86: 897-921.

Cooney, R.S. 1975. Changing Labor Force Participation of Mexican American Wives: A Comparison with Anglos and Blacks, Social Science Quarterly 56, No. 2: 252-261.

Cooney, R.S. 1977. The Mexican American Female in the Labor Force , in Cuantos Somas: A Demographic Study of the Mexican American Population, edited by C.H. Teller, et al., University of Texas at Austin: Center for Mexican American Studies, Monograph No. 2.

Cooney, R.S. and Ortiz, U. 1981. Hispanic Female Participation in the Labor Force: A Comparative Analysis of Puerto Ricans, Mexicans, and Cubans, in Hispanic Workers in the U.S. Labor Market, edited by Marta Tienda. University of Wisconsin, Department of Rural Sociology.

Crowley, J.E. 1981. Attitudes Toward Women's Role, in Pathways to the Future, edited by M.E. Borus. The Ohio State University Center for Human Resource Research.

Crowley, J.E. 1981. Delinquency and Employment, in Pathways to the Future, Vol. II, edited by M.E. Borus. The Ohio State University Center for Human Resource Research.

Crowley, J.E. 1981. Government-Sponsored Employment and Training, in Pathways to the Future, edited by M.E. Borus. The Ohio State University Center for Human Resource Research.

Flores, E.T. and Cardenas, G. 1978. Chicano Drug Dealing in Marijuana The Probationers Interpretative Past, Self-Perception, Moral Evaluations and Possible Future. Austin, Texas: University of Texas.

Fogel, W. 1980. Immigration Issues in an Era of Unsanctioned Migration: A Symposium, Industrial and Labor Relations 23, No. 3.

Freeman, R.B. and Medoff, J.L. 1982. Why Does the Rate of Labor Force Activity Differ Across Surveys? in The Youth Labor Market Problems: Its Nature, Causes, and Consequences, edited by R.B. Freeman and D.A. Wise. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Garcia, S.B. 1979. Language Usage and the Status Attainment of Chicano Males. Unpublished Master's Thesis. University of Wisconsin, Department of Sociology.

Greene, K., et al. 1973. Occupational Licensing in the United States. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service.

Greenfield, S. and Vrooman, J. 1979. The Human Capital Model and Discrimination: The Roles of Schooling, Experience, and Functional Literacy in Texas. Austin, Texas: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Heller, C.S. 1966. Mexican-American Youth: Forgotten Youth at the Crossroads. New York: Random House.

Kim, C. 1981. The All-Volunteer Force: 1979 NLS Studies of Enlistment Intentions to Serve, and Intentions to Reenlist. Center for Human Resource Research, The Ohio State University.

Kuvlesky, W.P. 1975. Mexican American Youth and The American Dream. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.

Levitan, S.A. and Belous, R.S. 1979. More than Subsistence: Minimum Wages for the Working Poor. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Long, J. 1977. Productivity, Employment, Discrimination, and the Relative Economic Status of Spanish Origin Males, Social Science Quarterly 58: 347-373.

Mansfield, E. 1980. Economics. New York: W.W. Norton and Company.

Mata, A.G. 1978. The Drug Street Scene: An Ethnographic Study of the Youth in South Chicago, Ph.D. dissertation. Notre Dame University.

Montiel, M. 1973. The Chicano Family: A Review of Research, Social Work 18, No. 2.

Moore, J.W. 1978. Homeboys: Gangs, Drugs, and Prison in the Barrios of Los Angeles. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Myers, S.C. and King, R.H. 1982. Relative Earnings of the Hispanic Youth in the U.S. Labor market. Preliminary paper presented at the Hispanics Labor Conference. University of California, Santa Barbara.

Neidert. L.J. and Tienda, M. 1981. Converting Education into Earnings: Patterns Among Hispanic Origin Men, in Hispanic Origin Workers in the U.S. Labor Market, edited by M. Tienda. University of Wisconsin, Department of Rural Sociology.

Nestel, G. and Santos, R. 1981. CPS-NLS Differences in Labor Force Characteristics of Youth: Another Look. Proceedings of the American Statistical Association Annual Meeting.

Newman, M.J. 1978. A Profile of Hispanics in the U.S. Work Force, Monthly Labor Review 101: 3-14.

Poston, D.L., Jr., et al. 1976. Earnings Differences Between Anglo and Mexican American Male Workers in 1960 and 1970, Social Science Quarterly 57: pp 618-631.

Reimers, C.W. 1981. Labor Market Discrimination Against Hispanic and Black Men. Princeton University, Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs and Department of Economics.

Rumberger, R.W. 1981. Experiences in High School and College, in Pathways to the Future, edited by M.E. Borus. The Ohio State University Center for Human Resource Research.

Santos, R. 1977. An Analysis of Earnings Among Persons of Spanish Origin, Ph.D. dissertation. Michigan State University.

Santos, R. 1982. Employment Prospects of Unemployed Youth, in Pathways to the Future, Final Report, edited by M.E. Borus. The Ohio State University Center for Human Resource Research.

Santos, R. 1980. Measuring the Employment Status of Youth: CPS-NLS Differences, Proceedings from the Thirty-Third Annual Meetings. Madison, Wisconsin: Industrial Relations Research Association.

Santos, R. 1980. Youth Employment Policies: An Hispanic Perspective. Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass : Center for Public Service.

Seindenstat, P. 1978. A Labor Market Success Model of Young Male Hispanic Americans. Wilmington: Latin American Community Center.

Shapiro, D. and Crowley, J.E. 1982. Aspirations and Expectations of Youth in

the United States. Part II: Employment Activity, Youth and Society 13 (forthcoming).

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1980. Census of Population and Housing; Advance Reports. PHS 80-V-1. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1979. Persons of Spanish Origin in the United States: March 1979, Advance Report. Series P-20, No. 347. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Labor. 1980. A Profile of Hispanic Youth. Youth Knowledge Development Report 10.2. Office of Youth Programs. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Labor. 1980. A Summary Report of the Vice President's Task Force on Youth Employment. Washington, D.C.: 1-70.

U.S. Department of Labor. 1979. Employment and Earnings. Washington, D.C.

U.S. Department of Labor, and U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. 1978. Employment and Training Report of The President. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Labor. 1980. Employment and Training Report of The President. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Labor. 1981. Employment and Training Report of The President. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Labor. 1980. Monthly Labor Review. Current Labor Statistics: Household Data. Washington, D.C.

U.S. Department of Labor. 1975. Handbook on Women Workers. Washington, D.C.: Women's Bureau.

The Center has also been active in manpower planning both in the U.S. and in the developing countries. A project for the Ohio Advisory Council for Vocational Education identified the highly fragmented institutions and agencies which supply vocational and technical training in Ohio. Subsequent projects for the Ohio Occupational Information Coordinating Committee have followed graduates of these programs. These data and information on occupational distributions of employers collected for the Occupational Employment Statistics Program are being integrated into a comprehensive planning model which will be accessible to trainees and employers and linked to a national network.

Another focus of the Center's research is industrial relations and collective bargaining. In a project for the U.S. Department of Labor, staff members are working with unions and management in a variety of industries to evaluate several current experiments for expedited grievance procedures. The procedural adequacies, safeguards for due process, and cost and timing of the new procedure are being weighed against traditional arbitration techniques.

Senior staff also serve as consultants to many boards and commissions at the national and state level. Recently the Center's staff have produced papers and prepared testimony for the Department of Labor, the Vice President's Task Force on Youth Unemployment, the Joint Economic Committee of Congress, the National Commission for Employment and Unemployment Statistics, the National Commission for Employment Policy, the White House Conference on the Family, the Ohio Department of Corrections, the Ohio Board of Regents, the Ohio Governor's Task Force on Health, and the Ohio Governor's Task Force on Welfare.

The Center maintains a working library of approximately 10,000 titles, including a wide range of reference works and current periodicals, as well as an extensive microfilm and microfiche collection. Through their facilities linked to the University computer, the Center's data processing staff provide statistical, technical, and programming support both for in-house researchers and the over 250 users of the National Longitudinal Surveys data tapes. They maintain the NLS tapes, data base, documentation, and associated software.

For information on specific Center activities, write: Director, Center for Human Resource Research, 5701 North High Street, Worthington, Ohio 43085.

OSU

The Ohio State University

The Center for Human Resource Research
5701 North High Street
Worthington, Ohio 43085

Center for Human Resource Research

The Center for Human Resource Research is a policy-oriented multidisciplinary research organization affiliated with The Ohio State University. Established in 1965, the Center is concerned with a wide range of contemporary problems related to developing and conserving human resources. Its more than thirty senior staff members come from disciplines including economics, education, English, health sciences, industrial relations, management science, psychology, public administration, social work, and sociology. This multidisciplinary team is supported by approximately 70 graduate research associates, full-time research assistants, computer programmers, and other personnel.

The Center has become preeminent in the fields of labor market research and manpower planning. With continuing support from the United States Department of Labor, the Center has been responsible since 1965 for the National Longitudinal Surveys of Labor Market Experience. Staff have assisted in population and human resource planning throughout the world, having conducted major studies in Bolivia, Ecuador, Kenya, Sierra Leone, Venezuela, and Zaire. At the request of the National Science Foundation, a review of the state of the art in human resource planning was conducted. Other studies have assessed the impact of labor and education policy on labor supply and evaluated employment statistics collection methods. Senior personnel are also engaged in several other areas of research—collective bargaining and labor relations, evaluation and monitoring of the operation of government employment and training programs, and the projection of health education and facility needs.

The Center for Human Resource Research has received over two million dollars annually from government agencies and private foundations to support its research in recent years. Providing support have been the U.S. Departments of Labor, State, Defense, Education, Health and Human Services; Ohio's Health and Education Departments and Bureau of Employment Services; the Ohio cities of Columbus and Springfield; the Ohio AFL-CIO; the George Gund Foundation; the Rockefeller Foundation; and the Ford Foundation. The breadth of the Center's research interests is best illustrated by a brief review of a few of its current projects.

The Center's largest project is the National Longitudinal Surveys of Labor Market Experience. This project has involved repeated interviews over a fifteen-year period with four groups of the United States population: older men, middle-aged women, and young men and women. The data are collected for 20,000 individuals by the U.S. Bureau of the Census, and the center is responsible for data analysis. Since 1979, the NLS has followed an additional cohort of 13,000 young men and women between the ages of 14 and 21. This cohort includes for the first time those serving in the armed forces at the time of the initial interview. In addition to being the definitive U.S. national data set on the labor market activities of young adults, this continuing survey includes unique batteries of questions on such socially important issues as delinquency, alcohol and drug use, fertility, and prenatal care. For this cohort, field work is handled by the National Opinion Research Center. To date the Center's staff have prepared dozens of research monographs, special reports, and books on the NLS, and they also prepare and distribute data tapes for public use.

The Quality of Work Life Project, another ongoing study, began in 1975 as an attempt to improve the productivity and the meaningfulness of work for public employees in the cities of Springfield and Columbus. Center staff also served as third party advisers and researchers exploring new techniques for attainment of management-worker cooperation and worker health in a number of central Ohio private sector industries.

(Continued on inside back cover)