Unemployed Versus "Not in the Labor Force": Is There a Difference?

Bruce H. Dunson
Metrica, Inc.

Brice M. Stone
Metrica, Inc.

This paper uses economic measures of behavior to examine the validity of the line drawn between individuals inside and outside the labor force, particularly between the unemployed and those outside the labor force. If labor force states are indistinguishable, the unemployment rate is open to interpretation. Our findings suggest that labor force statuses are distinct for mature adults and less distinct for teenagers. However, among mature adults, the degree of distinctiveness varies by race and ethnicity. Since 1990, there has been increased instability between the labor force statuses of the unemployed and those outside the labor force in some groups.

INTRODUCTION

Although numerous studies have presented evidence that labor force dropouts constitute an increasing proportion of the population (Juhn, Murphy, & Topel, 1991, 2002; Murphy & Topel, 1997), other studies have suggested that jobseekers' increased use of computer databases and electronic bulletin boards has not been incorporated into the inside-the-labor-force statistics. Hence, a proportion of individuals who are counted as outside the workforce are, in fact, inside it and unemployed (Autor, 2001). Although Kuhn and Skuterud (2000) and Kroft and Pope (2014) questioned the significance of the Internet in determining unemployment rates, the increase in online networking and other forms of passive job-search behavior may make the correct classification of people into labor force statuses more complex and difficult.

This paper further examines the validity of the line drawn between people inside and outside the labor force, particularly between the unemployed and those defined as outside the labor force. The importance of this question is well documented. If the conventionally defined labor force statuses are, in fact, not distinct, our understanding of what unemployment is and how to address it becomes more complicated. For example, as illustrated by Juhn et al. (2002), a decreasing unemployment rate may be consistent with a worsening job market if individuals exit rather than remain in the labor force. Previous studies that have modeled the behavioral distinction between being inside and being outside the labor force have inferred behavior based on transition rates between these different labor force statuses. In this study, we extend this approach but use the connection between these transition categories and the outcome of the process, as measured by earnings and measures of labor supply. Our questions are as follows: 1) Can economic measures of behavior capture the distinction between being inside and being outside the labor force that is identified in the transition rates? For example, individuals and firms make choices that result in market equilibrium wages and labor supply schedules. Can we use these market outcome measures of behavior to

differentiate who is versus who is not in the labor force? 2) What do our economic measures of behavior indicate about who is inside or outside the labor force?

For this paper, we used our first statistical test to examine the choices that individuals make that classify them into the conventionally defined labor force statuses. We chose a multinomial probit model to examine whether being inside and being outside the labor force are distinct labor force statuses. We conducted a test to determine whether the independent variables had a statistically significant effect on the probability of individuals being classified as outside the labor force versus unemployed and as outside the labor force versus employed. If the independent variables had no significant effect on the probability of being classified in one labor force status versus another, we concluded that those two labor force statuses were not distinct.

For our second and third tests, we used annual earnings, weeks worked per year, and usual number of hours worked per week as our measures of economic behavior. If people who are in similar labor force states—employed, unemployed, and outside the labor force—are comparable, we might expect them to exhibit analogous underlying behavior along other dimensions. For example, we might expect that people who are in similar age, education, and location groups to earn analogous levels of income compared to individuals in dissimilar groupings. A year later, some of these same individuals are unemployed and some are outside the labor force. However, if we go back to when they were employed, we expect to find that for this sample, mean earnings are similar. If mean earnings are different, we confirm that for this sample, the underlying behavior is different and consistent with the classification of distinct versus not distinct.

Likewise, some individuals are currently unemployed and others are outside the labor force. A year later, they are all employed. Since they are in the same labor force state and a similar demographic grouping, we might expect their mean earnings to be similar and the states to be indistinct. In each case, we analyzed their incomes before and after the labor force transitions were made. A similar analysis was performed using our measures of labor supply. If the mean earnings, weeks worked, or mean hours worked per week were comparable while employed, we suggest that the underlying behavior is also comparable and the labor force states are not distinct. If the labor force states are distinct, we reject the hypothesis that mean earnings or mean indicators of labor supply are equal for this sample and conclude that the labor force states are distinct.

A major assumption is that behavioral patterns persist. That is, behavioral stimuli contributing to a future transition and labor force outcome persist into the future, and behavioral outcomes reflected in present labor force states are reflected in past behavioral stimuli.

According to the literature and the consensus developed over the past 40 years of research, youth labor force statuses are, in fact, distinct. The evidence presented in this paper suggests that the underlying behavior for teens as measured by mean earnings, mean weeks worked, and mean usual hours worked per year is similar to those outside and inside the labor force. Moreover, we interpret this as an indicator that behaviorally, the labor force states for teens are not distinct. The labor force statuses of teens may have been distinct in the 1980s and early 1990s, but, even then, this distinctiveness was less true for blacks and Hispanics. By the first decade of the 21st century, the labor force statuses of all teenagers were not distinct. This paper's second contribution to the literature involves our ability to tease out this effect with the economic variables: earnings and measures of labor supply.

This paper is organized as follows. The section titled "Literature Summary Review" provides a summary of the relevant literature on the subject. The "Test and Methodology" and "Data and Variables" sections describe our statistical tests and models. "Empirical Analysis" presents the empirical analysis of whether being inside the labor force is a distinctive status from being outside the labor force. Finally, conclusions and implications for further research are provided in the "Conclusions" section.

LITERATURE SUMMARY REVIEW

Table 1 presents the major conclusions from the six relevant studies. Three of the studies offered evidence to support the notion that the labor force categories were distinct for teenagers (ages 16-19).

Only Clark and Summers (1982) and Goldsmith, Veum, and Darity (1995) suggested that the distinction between the statuses of being inside and being outside the labor force was meaningless for both male and female teenagers. Flinn and Heckman (1983) concluded that the labor force statuses were distinct for the sample of white male teenagers. Gonul (1992) found distinct labor force statuses for young women but no such distinction for young men. In addition to finding evidence that the labor force statuses were distinct for male and female teenagers and young people, Tano (1991) reported that the distinction was meaningless for mature men and women (ages 25-44). Jones and Riddell (1999, 2006) found that individuals who were marginally attached but outside the labor force and were waiting to be recalled were similar to those who were unemployed.[1]

TABLE 1
LITERATURE SUMMARY REVIEW

Study	Data	Findings
Clark and Summers (1982)	Gross Flow Data, 1965-1976	The distinction is meaningless for teenagers.
Flinn and Heckman (1983)	National Longitudinal Survey of Young Men, 1972	The labor force statuses are distinct for this sample of white male high school graduates.
Tano (1991)	CPS Gross Change Data, 1967-1989	The labor force statuses are distinct for teenage males and females (16-19) and young adults (20-24). This distinction is meaningless for mature males and females (25-44).
Gonul (1992)	National Longitudinal Survey of Youth, 1979	The labor force statuses are distinct for young women. The distinctions are meaningless for young men.
Goldsmith et al. (1995)	National Longitudinal Survey of Youth, 1979	On balance, the distinction is meaningless for all groups.
Jones and Riddell (1999, 2006)	Survey of Job Opportunities, wherein records from one month are linked to individual records in subsequent months	Being marginally attached (those who desire but are not seeking work) and being nonattached are distinct labor force statuses. The waiting subcategory of marginally attached is more similar to the unemployed categories than to the rest of the marginally attached and nonattached categories.

In general, these studies suggest that age and, to a lesser extent, gender are influential factors in the distinction between these labor force statuses. First, the statuses of being outside versus being inside the labor force are more distinct for teenagers than for mature adults. Second, there appears to be a slight difference in these findings by gender; Gonul (1992) found that these two labor force statuses were distinct for young women but meaningless for young men.

Our study focuses more on the perspectives of age, race, and ethnicity and less on the perspective of gender. In addition, our study period overlapped with that of the previous studies in this field for comparison purposes.

TEST AND METHODOLOGY

The multinomial probit model is a well-established technique. Poterba and Summers (1995) used the multinomial methodology to examine the effects of unemployment benefits with classification errors in labor market transitions. Unlike Poterba and Summers, we used the results from the multinomial model as benchmarks with which to compare the results from our behavioral outcomes approach. The dependent variable is labor force status: employed, unemployed, or outside the labor force. The base category is outside the labor force. We tested whether the independent variables had a statistically significant effect on the probability of being classified as outside the labor force versus unemployed and as outside the labor force versus employed. If the independent variables had no distinguishable effect on the probability of being in one labor force status versus another, we concluded that those two labor force statuses are the same. The test is a Wald test, with $\beta_1 \ldots \beta_k$ being the coefficients for the $X_1 \ldots X_k$ independent variables, and J outcome categories with one category, the base. With three labor force states, J = 3. The first hypothesis is that the X_k independent variables significantly affect the likelihood of being unemployed (u) versus outside the labor force (o). If not, and if the β coefficients are not significantly different from zero, unemployed and outside the labor force are not distinct. This corresponds to the test:

$$H_0: \beta_1, u/o = \ldots \beta_k, u/o = 0,^2 \tag{1}$$

where the base category is o, outside the labor force.

The second hypothesis is that employed (e) and outside the labor force (o) are distinct labor force states. The hypothesis is similar to the previous one but with different outcome comparisons. If the X_k independent variables do not significantly affect the chance of being employed versus outside the labor force, these two labor force states are indistinguishable. The equivalent test is:

$$H_0: \alpha_1, e/o = \ldots \alpha_k, e/o = 0. \tag{2}$$

We also examined how the bias associated with the misclassification error in the independent variable might influence our conclusions.

For the second research strategy, we adopted a completely different approach and focused on the observed labor market differences using both earnings and measures of labor supply during the year prior to the transition and the year after the transition as indicators of labor market behavior. The sample for our test is based on those individuals who transition to different labor force categories. As illustrated in Table 2, a person can transition from one of the initial three labor force statuses to another one of the three states, creating a 9-cell matrix. Each cell is a different sample. There are nine transition samples in the three-state model. Because the triggering mechanism that allows us to identify behavioral similarities or differences is a transition, we excluded those who remain in their current labor force status from the sample. For the purposes of this analysis, only those who are off-diagonal are included in the sample.

TABLE 2
TRANSITION-BASED APPROACHES

	E	**U**	**O**
E	EE	EU	EO
U	UE	UU	UO
O	OE	OU	OO

E = employed; U = unemployed; O = outside the labor force.

Our labor force transition variables give information on the labor force state in each one of the two periods. For example, oo consists of individuals who were outside the "labor force" in both periods; ee those who were employed in both time periods; uu those who were unemployed in both periods; ou those who transitioned from "outside the labor force" to unemployed; eu from employed to unemployed; eo

from employed to "outside the labor force"; uo from unemployed to "outside the labor force"; ue from unemployed to employed; and oe from "outside the labor force" to employed. If the states of "inside" and "outside" the labor force are behaviorally distinct, we reject the hypothesis that the earnings of individuals in the two different labor force categories are equal. To test the idea that people who are in comparable labor force states are behaviorally comparable and are expected to be so along other economic dimensions, we estimated standard Mincer earnings equations and labor supply equations with transition categories as independent variables. If those who transition from employment to unemployment are behaviorally similar to those who transition from employment to a status outside the labor force, we might expect their mean earnings to be similar when they were employed. If they are not and we find that mean earnings or mean indicators of labor supply are different, we find that for this sample of labor force movers their labor force status is distinct.

The estimated equation pertaining to Earnings "Before" is:

$$Y_{ib} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 exp_{i0} + \beta_2 exp_{i0}sq + \beta_3 sch_{i0} + \beta_4 year_1 + \beta_5 year_1 eu_{i0} + \beta_6 eu_{i0} + \beta_7 ou_{i0} + \beta_8 uo_{i0} + \beta_9 oe_{i0} + \beta_{10} ue_{i0} + \varepsilon_{i0}, \tag{3}$$

and the estimated equation pertaining to Labor Supply "Before" is:

$$L_{s0} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 wage_{s0} + \beta_2 income_{s0} + \beta_3 year_1 + \beta_4 year_1 eu_{s0} + \beta_5 eu_{s0} + \beta_6 uo_{s0} + \beta_7 ou_{s0} + \beta_8 ue_{s0} + \beta_9 oe_{s0} + \varepsilon_{s0}, \tag{4}$$

where Y_{ib} is mean earnings of individual (i) or mean indicator of labor supply the year before a transition was made, with experience, schooling, and year being the independent variables for the earnings equation, and wage, income, and year being the independent variables for the labor supply equation. The coefficient for eu, β_6, gives the mean difference in earnings between the sample of employed individuals the year before they transitioned to unemployment and the eo group, who transitioned to outside the labor force, while β_5 gives the mean difference in labor supplied. In each instance, if the mean difference is statistically insignificant, we conclude that for these two samples, inside and outside the labor force are indistinct labor force states. The third test uses information on mean earnings after individuals transition from being unemployed to being employed (UE) or from being outside the labor force to being employed (OE). In this instance, individuals were inside the labor force, unemployed (U), and outside (O) the labor force—two distinct labor force states—and transitioned to employment. If the behavior of individuals who are in comparable labor force states is similar, our mean indicators of labor force behavior should be similar. We test this by again estimating our earnings and our labor supply schedules. The variables, however, are after the transition. The estimated equation pertaining to Earnings "After" is:

$$Y2_{i2} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 exp2_{i2} + \alpha_2 exp2_{i2}sq + \alpha_3 sch2_{i2} + \alpha_4 year2_2 + \alpha_5 year2_2 ue_{i2} + \alpha_6 eu_{i2} + \alpha_7 eo_{i2} + \alpha_8 ou_{i2} + \alpha_{10} ue_{i2} + \varepsilon_{i2}, \tag{5}$$

and the estimated equation pertaining to Labor Supply "After" is:

$$L2_{s2} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 wage2_{s2} + \alpha_2 income2_{s2} + \alpha_3 year2_2 + \alpha_4 year2_2 eu_{s2} + \alpha_5 eu_{s2} + \alpha_6 uo_{s2} + \alpha_7 ou_{s2} + \alpha_8 ue_{s2} + \varepsilon_{s2}, \tag{6}$$

where Y_{ia} is the annual earnings of individual (i) after the transition and the independent variables are the same as those from the earnings equations. The coefficient on α_{10} gives the mean difference in earnings between the sample of unemployed people who transitioned to employment and those who transitioned from outside the labor force to employment. If the coefficient, α_{10}, is statistically insignificant, we conclude that these two samples are indistinct. For the labor supply equation, if the relevant coefficient α_8 is statistically insignificant, we again conclude that inside and outside the labor force are indistinguishable states.

DATA AND VARIABLES

The analysis in this paper is based on data from the March 1990 and March 2000 Current Population Survey (CPS) (Current Population Survey, 1990, 2000) and a panel dataset that was constructed by matching and linking people in the March 1989, 1990, and 1991 CPS; the March 1999, 2000, and 2001 CPS; and the March 2006, 2007, and 2008 CPS (Madrian & Lefgren, 2000; Eanswythe Grabowski, Unicon Research Corporation, personal communication, 2008).

The final sample consisted of white, black, and Hispanic males and females between the ages of 16 and 45 in the two cross-sectional datasets and between the ages of 16 and over 65 in the three-panel datasets.

In our first model, the control variables included measures that were designed to capture human capital. The education measure is a categorical variable that is coded as follows: less than high school, high school diploma, some college, or college degree or higher. Potential experience is computed as age minus years of education minus five. Other variables included two measures of an individual's reservation income or spousal potential income; the tightness of the labor market, as measured by the unemployment rate in the state of residence; and variables that capture the attributes of location, which include the particular region of the country and the size of the city in which an individual resides.

Table 3 provides the variable definitions and, for illustrative purposes, the mean statistics for a sample of the male civilian population between the ages of 16 and 65 from the 1990 CPS. The sample statistics were computed separately for those in the labor force and those who dropped out. Although differences exist, as previously discussed, these differences do not necessarily imply a bias. For example, we expected that individuals in the labor force, on average, would be younger than labor force dropouts because of health issues and retirement choices associated with age. Furthermore, we might expect individuals in the labor force to possess, on average, more education as a proxy for productivity compared with those who are outside the labor force. This expectation arises because of employers' incentives to maximize profits. We can control for these influences in our estimated equations. The following section presents the results of our empirical investigation of whether being inside and being outside the labor force are distinct labor force statuses.

TABLE 3
SAMPLE STATISTICS FOR MEN BY LABOR FORCE STATUS, RACE, AND ETHNICITY,
MARCH 1990

Variable	Inside the Labor Force			Outside the Labor Force		
	White	**Black**	**Hispanic**	**White**	**Black**	**Hispanic**
Education - <9 years	.060	.058	.269	.194	.256	.424
Education - 9-11 years	.090	.148	.158	.190	.278	.203
Education - 12 years	.368	.436	.312	.349	.330	.260
Education - 13-15 years	.214	.213	.162	.143	.101	.077
Education - 16+ years	.269	.146	.100	.125	.036	.037
Age <20	.030	.038	.056	.046	.053	.093
Age >55	.104	.082	.061	.530	.366	.327
Potential Experience	19.2	18.6	18.1	33.4	29.2	28.5
Potential Experience Squared	514	495	477	1,335	1,119	1,099
Married	.672	.507	.623	.626	.388	.541
Spouse's Education	12.991	12.8	10.7	11.7	11.1	9.1
City Size - 100k or less	.661	.585	.428	.695	.538	.483
City Size - 3 Million or more	.136	.227	.351	.130	.307	.313
Residence - Northeast	.191	.175	.161	.167	.155	.210
Residence - South	.273	.519	.296	.310	.493	.303
Residence - West	.218	.080	.454	.224	.079	.426
Residence - Midwest	.185	.125	.065	.159	.177	.037
State Unemployment Rate	5.59	5.69	5.80	5.71	5.92	5.85
% Unemployment	4.9	10.3	7.2			
Number of Observations	34,750	2,948	4,609	3,936	645	547

Source: Current Population Survey (1990).

EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS

Labor Force Status: Multinomial Probit Model

Table 4 presents the results of a Wald test that was conducted to assess whether the independent variables from our multinomial probit model had a statistically significant effect on the probability of being classified as outside the labor force versus unemployed and as outside the labor force versus employed. If the independent variables had no distinguishable effect on the probability of being in one labor force status versus another, we concluded that those two labor force statuses are the same.

TABLE 4
MULTINOMIAL PROBIT TEST, 1990, 2000

Sample	1990		2000	
	Outside vs Unemployed	**Outside vs Employed**	**Outside vs Unemployed**	**Outside vs Employed**
White Males (25-44)	124.3 (1)	726.6 (1)	65.7 (1)	582.7 (1)
White Females (25-44)	250.6 (1)	1,423.8 (1)	156.4 (1)	1,044.7 (1)
Black Males (25-44)	36.4 (1)	204.7 (1)	18.5 (2)	120.4 (1)
Black Females (25-44)	38.4 (1)	359.8 (1)	19.9 (2)	159.8 (1)
Hispanic Males (25-44)	18.4 (2)	104.5 (1)	22.4 (2)	102.5 (1)
Hispanic Females (25-44)	56.4 (1)	319.2 (1)	52.5 (1)	263.5 (1)
White Males (16-19)	52.9 (1)	104.3 (1)	9.5 (2)	12.9 (2)
White Females (16-19)	23.9 (1)	38.2 (1)	7.9 (2)	14.7 (2)
Black Males (16-19)	12.1 (2)	19.7 (1)	11.1 (2)	8.1 (2)
Black Females (16-19)	11.0 (2)	10.3 (2)	1.4 (2)	4.0 (2)
Hispanic Males (16-19)	16.8 (1)	21.7 (1)	5.4 (2)	5.3 (2)
Hispanic Females (16-19)	1.6 (2)	7.4 (2)	7.0 (2)	2.7 (2)

Sample: The specified demographic category. The teenage sample consists of high school graduates.

(1) Reject the hypothesis at the .01 level for a chi-squared test that all coefficients except intercepts associated with the given pair of alternatives are 0 and the labor forces are distinct.

(2) Cannot reject the hypothesis at the .01 level for a chi-squared test that all coefficients except intercepts associated with the given pair of alternatives are 0 and the alternatives can be combined.

Note: Appendices A and B show the multinomial probit regression results for 1990 and 2000, respectively.

In 1990, the test results for mature white males and females, black males and females, and Hispanic females suggest that being inside and being outside the labor force are distinct labor force statuses. This distinction, however, does not apply for mature Hispanic males. For teenagers (ages 16-19), we found that the results were distinct for white male and female teens and Hispanic male teens. For black male teens, the outside the labor force versus unemployed comparison was not distinct, while the evidence suggests that the employed to outside the labor force comparison was distinct. The results for black and Hispanic female teens were that inside and outside the labor force were not distinct labor force states. For both of those two groups, we were unable to reject the hypothesis that the independent variables had any statistically significant effect on the probability of being in one labor force state versus the other.

A similar analysis was conducted using data from 2000 to investigate how these results may have changed over time. The results are also presented in Table 4. For our sample of mature white males, and separately for our sample of mature white females, the findings are similar to those recorded in 1990. We were able to reject the hypothesis that the coefficients from our multinomial probit model are statistically

insignificant, thus concluding that inside and outside the labor force are two distinct states. For mature black males and black females, more substantive changes between 1990 and 2000 were found. For the 2000 data, the Wald test did not reject the hypothesis that outside and inside were indistinct labor force states. This result contrasts with the findings from 1990 for which this hypothesis was rejected. Finally, for teenagers in 2000, the labor force categories were no longer distinct across all demographic groups.

Labor Force Status: Earnings

We conducted an analysis of the distinctions between labor force statuses based on differences in the earnings of individuals before they transitioned from employment to unemployment compared with the earnings of individuals who were transitioning from being employed to being outside the labor force. If we examine the labor force states before the transition, we might expect to find that mean earnings are not distinct since they were in the same labor force state at that time. Furthermore, for those who transitioned from being outside the labor force to employment or from unemployment to employment, the mean earnings after their transitions should be comparable.

We used an estimating equation based on the well-established Mincer earnings function; however, we used the level of annual earnings from wage and salary data versus the log of earnings as the dependent variable. Our inference of behavior was based on absolute differences in earnings versus the percentage of differences. The independent variables included potential experience, potential experience squared, schooling, the year of the survey, the interaction of year with an indicator of labor force status, the region of the country, the interaction of potential experience with schooling, and our transition variables. The consensus over decades of research suggests that experience has a positive effect on earnings but at a decreasing rate. As the amount of an individual's schooling—a proxy for productivity—increases, so do her earnings. The results of our estimated equations were generally consistent with those of previous research.

In the few instances for which this was not the case, the problem may be attributable to a small sample size and the presence of multicollinearity. For example, the fact that experience squared is simply a multiple of experience produced some results that ran counter to our expectations. Experience had a negative effect on earnings at an increasing rate. In this instance, dropping experience squared from the equation was sufficient to yield the positive experience effect. In other cases, instrumental variables were used to correct for the magnified induced endogeneity between experience and schooling when the sample was restricted to teenagers with 12 years of schooling. The earnings test results are presented in Tables 5 and 6.

TABLE 5
LABOR FORCE STATUS EFFECTS ON EARNINGS BEFORE AND AFTER TRANSITION

Sample	Mean Difference (1989-1991)		Mean Difference (1999-2001)		Mean Difference (2006-2008)	
	Before EU-EO[1]	After UE-OE[2]	Before EU-EO[1]	After UE-OE[2]	Before EU-EO[1]	After UE-OE[2]
Whites						
16-19	975.66***	682.52	3.47	2,952.62	-576.71	-755.09
25-44	6,909.77*	6,341.88*	5,514.57*	7,759.98*	3,337.68	603.91
Blacks						
16-19	-405.04	-1,426.49	-959.42	956.28	-524.39	2,021.95
25-44	173.45	3,709.74*	-7,018.46	4,171.69	1,364.98	-8,274.96**
Hispanics						
16-19	2,081.69	-169.32	1,245.38	2,854.42	2,716.56	-122.49
25-44	942.89	3,200.90***	2,580.89	2,121.77	6,375.88**	1,759.18

Source: Panel data constructed from March 1989, 1990, and 1991 CPS; March 1999, 2000, and 2001 CPS; and March 2006, 2007, and 2008 CPS.

(1) The mean difference in earnings between those transitioning from employment to unemployment (EU) and those transitioning from employment to outside the labor force (EO) before the transition was initiated.

(2) The mean difference in earnings between those transitioning from unemployment to employment (UE) and those transitioning from outside the labor force to employment (OE) after the transition was initiated.

*Statistically significant at the .01 level; **statistically significant at the .05 level; ***statistically significant at the .10 level.

Note: Appendices C, D, and E show the labor force status effects on earnings, by race/ethnicity and age group, from 1989 to 1991, 1999 to 2001, and 2006 to 2008, respectively, both before and after the transition.

TABLE 6
LABOR FORCE STATUS EFFECTS ON EARNINGS BY GENDER BEFORE AND AFTER TRANSITION

Sample	Mean Difference (1989-1991)		Mean Difference (1999-2001)		Mean Difference (2006-2008)	
	Before EU-EO[1]	After UE-OE[2]	Before EU-EO[1]	After UE-OE[2]	Before EU-EO[1]	After UE-OE[2]
Males						
16-19	776.83	26.80	451.61	3,668.53***	-641.19	1,304.67
25-44	5,174.97*	2,941.04***	-847.07	4,286.03	-3,059.88	-12,547.46*
Females						
16-19	1,281.25**	-169.12	3,362.73	-831.94	137.47	716.50
25-44	187.50	2,910.31*	525.03	5,881.40*	4,768.41***	5,026.68***

Source: Panel data constructed from March 1989, 1990, and 1991 CPS; March 1999, 2000, and 2001 CPS; and March 2006, 2007, and 2008 CPS.

(1) The mean difference in earnings between those transitioning from employment to unemployment (EU) and those transitioning from employment to outside the labor force (EO) before the transition was initiated.

(2) The mean difference in earnings between those transitioning from unemployment to employment (UE) and those transitioning from outside the labor force to employment (OE) after the transition was initiated.

*Statistically significant at the .01 level; **statistically significant at the .05 level; ***statistically significant at the .10 level.

Note: Appendices F, G, and H show the labor force status effects on earnings, by gender and age group, from 1989 to 1991, 1999 to 2001, and 2006 to 2008, respectively, both before and after the transition.

First, consistent with the analyses presented in the previous sections, there was an effect of age on labor force status. Based on this test, the labor force statuses were distinct for the more mature age group (i.e., the 25-44 group) but less so for teenagers. For mature whites, this distinction was observed for the 1989-1991 and 1999-2001 periods but not for the 2006-2008 period. For white teens, the results were inconclusive for the 1989-1991 period. In this instance, the findings were significant for the before-transition group but not for the after-transition group. The labor force statuses for white teens were not distinct for the other time periods. Second, these same general patterns were not observed for blacks or Hispanics. For adult blacks and Hispanics, the labor force statuses were inconclusive in the 1989-1991 period, not distinct in the 1999-2001 period, and inconclusive in the 2006-2008 period. However, for black and Hispanic teenagers, no distinction was found.

Table 6 presents our results by gender. Perhaps the most interesting finding here is the change over time in the distinctiveness of labor states between mature males and females. In the 1989-1991 period, the labor force statuses for mature males were distinct, whereas the results for mature females were inconclusive. For females, the labor force statuses were distinct only for those after the transition. However, by the 2006-2008 period, the distinctiveness of the labor force statuses had changed by gender. In the 2006-2008 period, the labor force statuses were inconclusive for males, and the labor force statuses were now distinct only for those after the transition. For females, the labor force statuses were now distinct both before and after the transition.

Our tests for differences are very sensitive to measurement error, which makes it more difficult to reject the null hypothesis of no difference. For example, correcting for the reliability of our schooling variable by 0.08, such that our index was 0.92, not only increased our coefficient for schooling from 4,886 to 36,132 but also increased our indicator of labor force status, EU, from 4,768 to 11,988 because of the correlation between schooling and EU. Finally, the standard errors relative to the coefficients were smaller, with the correction increasing our t-statistic (see Table 7).

TABLE 7
LABOR FORCE STATUS SENSITIVITY TEST SHOWING EARNINGS FOR FEMALES

Variable	Ordinary Least Squares Regression		Errors-in-Variables Regression	
	Coefficient	Std. Error	Coefficient	Std. Error
Experience	3,542	916	40,442	4,954
Experience Squared	-39.6	16.5	-522.4	65.6
Schooling	4,886	642	36,132	4,177
Experience/Schooling Interaction	-164	34.8	-1,755	212.9
Midwest	-1,955	1,665	2,716	1,589
South	159	1,482	5,415	1,477
West	-530	1,565	3,695	1,485
EU	4,768	2,479	11,988	2,381
OE	-16,409	1,246	-15,336	1,104
UO	-9,903	2,271	-9,775	1,997
UE	-5,178	1,904	-1,847	1,731
OU	-15,884	2,652	-6,521	2,641
Year	179	1,094	1,087	970
Year EU	-5,568	3,753	-8,361	3,321
Constant	-53,301	11,668	-593,455	72,279

Source: Panel data constructed from March 1989, 1990, and 1991 CPS; March 1999, 2000, and 2001 CPS; and March 2006, 2007, and 2008 CPS.

Sample: Females aged 25-44, 1989-1991.

The conclusions from this analysis confirm one result based on the multinomial probit analysis. The classification of being inside and being outside the labor force was less meaningful for white teenagers compared with a similar classification of labor force statuses for mature whites. We also found major differences according to race and ethnicity in these findings. Compared with whites, the labor force statuses for both blacks and Hispanics were behaviorally less distinct, and when comparing black and Hispanic mature adults with black and Hispanic teens, the labor force statuses for teens were consistently indistinct across all three time periods.

Labor Force Status: Labor Supply

We continued our investigation into whether being inside and being outside the labor force were distinct labor force statuses using weeks worked within the last year as our indicator of labor force behavior. Numerous authors have identified problems with OLS when the dependent variable is censored. To correct for this censoring, we estimated a Tobit regression.

As in the previous section, the identifying factor in the analysis is that labor force statuses are behaviorally distinct if individuals transitioning from employment to unemployment, compared with those transitioning from being employed to being outside the labor force—or those transitioning from unemployment to employment, compared with those transitioning from being outside the labor force to being employed—exhibit significant differences in their labor force behavior.

We estimated a labor supply function using weeks worked within the last year as our dependent variable. We also excluded self-employed individuals; thus, the behavioral response was based on a sample that included only wage and salary workers. The independent variables were hourly wage, annual income, labor force transition states, and other control variables, such as year, schooling, and region of the country. We initially estimated a basic labor supply function using only our indicator of hourly wage, which was calculated as income from wage and salary last year divided by weeks worked over the last

year. This measure of the wage rate was the average weekly earnings over the last year. The dependent variable was the weeks worked over the last year. This wage measure suffers from the well-known division bias (Borjas, 1980). As illustrated by Borjas, if the hours of work are underreported, the constructed indicator of wages is then artificially high, which generates a spurious negative correlation between hours of work and weekly earnings. Table 8 shows that our model yielded a negative sign for the weekly average wage.

TABLE 8
TOBIT LABOR FORCE STATUS SPECIFICATION TEST SHOWING WEEKS WORKED

Variable	Biased Wage		Corrected Wage		Instrumental Variables Tobit	
	Coefficient	Std. Error	Coefficient	Std. Error	Coefficient	Std. Error
Wage	-.097	.008	.021	.012	.299	1.933
Income	.003	.000	.000	.000	-.006	.046
Year	-5.00	2.29	-1.17	2.88	3.49	32.72
Year EU	7.41	4.71	6.32	6.01	-7.07	93.54
EU	-10.8	3.92	-8.8	5.00	6.7	108.07
OE	-8.45	3.54	-17.92	4.48	-10.86	49.72
OU	-15.8	4.42	-27.0	5.68	-23.3	27.73
UE	-4.88	2.85	-11.73	3.59	-8.10	25.90
UO	-11.2	3.71	-19.6	4.65	-16.1	25.55
Midwest	-2.94	3.44	-.69	4.35	-5.70	35.58
South	.879	2.83	-4.326	3.57	-9.107	33.74
West	1.04	4.36	2.57	5.44	-.42	22.49
Constant	39.0	3.25	45.7	4.14	44.3	12.22

Source: Panel data constructed from March 1989, 1990, and 1991 CPS; March 1999, 2000, and 2001 CPS; and March 2006, 2007, and 2008 CPS.
Sample: Blacks aged 25-44, 1989-1991.

A major concern is how the other independent variables might be affected—specifically, the coefficients and standard errors for our test of being inside versus being outside the labor force. The second column presents our coefficient estimates using our bias-corrected wage variable. The constructed wage variable is income from wage and salary divided by the usual hours worked per week in the last year. This wage variable is a measure of the usual average earnings per week and does not suffer from cross-division by the dependent variable. Of particular interest is how sensitive the other independent variables are to the corrected indicators of wage. Using this new wage specification, we found that those who transitioned from employment to unemployment continued to work significantly fewer weeks than those who transitioned from being employed to being outside the labor force. The coefficient, however, was not as negative in the corrected equation compared with the biased equation by approximately two weeks.

Although our wage variable was corrected for division bias, the divisor or hours variable still might have been subject to measurement error. To test whether there was endogeneity with respect to our new wage variable, which may have biased our findings, we next estimated an instrumental Tobit model. Instrumental variables have been found to be effective as a correction for endogeneity with linear models but less so in a nonlinear context (Amemiya, 1985, 1990). We nevertheless estimated a Tobit instrumental variable model as a further examination of the robustness of our findings. The exogenous instrument was experience, which can be considered to affect labor supply through wages. The results are presented in Table 8. Consistent with similar corrections in a linear context, the estimates were less precise than those

from single equation estimators. Moreover, the Wald test of the exogeneity of the instrumented variable was not significant, which suggests that our nonlinear Tobit may have been a valid, consistent estimator.

Table 9 presents our weeks worked results for teenagers and mature adults by race and ethnicity. For white teens, the results support our findings using the probits. For this demographic, being inside the labor force and being outside the labor force were distinct labor force statuses in the early years, 1989-1991, but they became less distinct in later years. For black teens, the results were inconclusive in the earlier period but became less distinct in the later years. Hispanic teens inside the labor force and those outside the labor force consistently showed similar behavior. Furthermore, these findings highlighted our observations from the analysis using earnings as our indicator of behavior. Weeks worked, as our measure of labor supply, replicated the findings for teenagers using earnings. In the earlier years, the labor force statuses of teens were more likely to be classified as distinct. Over time, this observation changed. By 2006-2008, teenagers who were inside and outside the labor force were behaviorally similar. The group that was most likely to differ with respect to labor force status was mature adults, individuals in their prime years for participating in the labor force. These individuals are less likely to be untried entrants into the labor force, and they are more likely to have a personal incentive to work. In fact, we found that mature adults were more likely to be behaviorally distinct than were teens.

TABLE 9
LABOR FORCE STATUS EFFECTS ON WEEKS WORKED PER YEAR BEFORE AND AFTER TRANSITION

Sample	Mean Difference (1989-1991)		Mean Difference (1999-2001)		Mean Difference (2006-2008)	
	Before EU-EO[1]	After UE-OE[2]	Before EU-EO[1]	After UE-OE[2]	Before EU-EO[1]	After UE-OE[2]
Whites						
16-19	-6.94**	5.80***	3.68	6.48	2.69	1.88
25-44	4.06**	4.69*	1.13	1.33	-1.33	-7.01*
Blacks						
16-19	-6.27	4.99	7.26	-.40	-7.46	-.31
25-44	-8.96**	.79	4.88	-8.10	-16.19*	1.29
Hispanics						
16-19	2.08	-.72	—	-12.17	—	16.54
25-44	-5.87	1.18	-.31†	-.75	-.47	-3.21

Source: Panel data constructed from March 1989, 1990, and 1991 CPS; March 1999, 2000, and 2001 CPS; and March 2006, 2007, and 2008 CPS.

(1) The mean difference in weeks worked between those transitioning from employment to unemployment (EU) and those transitioning from employment to outside the labor force (EO) before the transition was initiated.

(2) The mean difference in weeks worked between those transitioning from unemployment to employment (UE) and those transitioning from outside the labor force to employment (OE) after the transition was initiated.

*Statistically significant at the .01 level; **statistically significant at the .05 level; ***statistically significant at the .10 level.

†Dropped income from equation.

Note: Appendices I, J, and K show the labor force status effects on weeks worked per year, by race/ethnicity and age group, from 1989 to 1991, 1999 to 2001, and 2006 to 2008, respectively, both before and after the transition.

Table 10 provides the results of an examination of the question of labor force distinctiveness that uses usual hours worked per week as the measure of labor supply. The estimation model is OLS because hours last year did not reflect the censoring observed using weeks worked. The wage variable then became the average weekly earnings last year. Notably, for teens, the findings were similar to the weeks-worked results. Again, for white teens over the 1989-1991 period, being inside and being outside the labor force were behaviorally distinct labor force states. This distinction was no longer evident for the 2006-2008 sample. For black teens, we observed that the labor force statuses were inconclusive in the earlier years and behaviorally indistinct by the 2006-2008 period. The results for Hispanic teens were consistent in that being inside and being outside the labor force was behaviorally indistinct.

TABLE 10
LABOR FORCE STATUS EFFECTS ON HOURS WORKED PER WEEK BEFORE AND AFTER TRANSITION

Sample	Mean Difference (1989-1991)		Mean Difference (1999-2001)		Mean Difference (2006-2008)	
	Before EU-EO[1]	After UE-OE[2]	Before EU-EO[1]	After UE-OE[2]	Before EU-EO[1]	After UE-OE[2]
Whites						
16-19	7.59*	4.03***	5.49	-2.89	-1.88	4.60
25-44	4.26*	4.93*	4.42*	5.25*	2.97*	5.00*
Blacks						
16-19	18.60**	-1.76	-2.53	11.91*	2.64	8.58
25-44	2.86	1.60	2.67	-2.45	-.41	3.19
Hispanics						
16-19	-4.71	-4.00	11.11	2.04	—	7.73
25-44	1.83	-3.89	11.73	3.95**	1.74	.61

Source: Panel data constructed from March 1989, 1990, and 1991 CPS; March 1999, 2000, and 2001 CPS; and March 2006, 2007, and 2008 CPS.

(1) The mean difference in hours worked between those transitioning from employment to unemployment (EU) and those transitioning from employment to outside the labor force (EO) before the transition was initiated.

(2) The mean difference in hours worked between those transitioning from unemployment to employment (UE) and those transitioning from outside the labor force to employment (OE) after the transition was initiated.

*Statistically significant at the .01 level; **statistically significant at the .05 level; ***statistically significant at the .10 level.

Note: Appendices L, M, and N show the labor force status effects on hours worked per week, by race/ethnicity and age group, from 1989 to 1991, 1999 to 2001, and 2006 to 2008, respectively, both before and after the transition.

Consistent with our earnings results, labor force statuses for mature whites were behaviorally more distinct relative to the findings for blacks and Hispanics. The results were even more consistent when we considered hours. For mature whites, being inside and being outside the labor force were behaviorally distinct in all three sample periods, whereas this was not the case for blacks and Hispanics.

Table 11 presents the labor supply results using the usual hours worked by gender. The definitive finding here is that the labor force statuses were behaviorally more distinct for adult females than for adult males. Moreover, this result diminished over time for adult males but not for adult females. The findings with respect to earnings and hours by gender were similar. The results suggest differences among

mature adults, with females' labor force statuses being relatively more distinct in later years than males' statuses.

TABLE 11
LABOR FORCE STATUS EFFECTS ON HOURS WORKED PER WEEK BY GENDER BEFORE AND AFTER TRANSITION

Sample	Mean Difference (1989-1991)		Mean Difference (1999-2001)		Mean Difference (2006-2008)	
	Before EU-EO[1]	After UE-OE[2]	Before EU-EO[1]	After UE-OE[2]	Before EU-EO[1]	After UE-OE[2]
Males						
16-19	5.79***	2.32	2.14	2.23	3.37	3.50
25-44	1.08	2.50***	1.43	1.11	-.78	-.59
Females						
16-19	8.04*	2.70	21.25	-9.00	2.73	6.01
25-44	4.94*	3.05*	2.56	4.25*	3.19**	5.03*

Source: Panel data constructed from March 1989, 1990, and 1991 CPS; March 1999, 2000, and 2001 CPS; and March 2006, 2007, and 2008 CPS.

(1) The mean difference in hours worked between those transitioning from employment to unemployment (EU) and those transitioning from employment to outside the labor force (EO) before the transition was initiated.

(2) The mean difference in hours worked between those transitioning from unemployment to employment (UE) and those transitioning from outside the labor force to employment (OE) after the transition was initiated.

*Statistically significant at the .01 level; **statistically significant at the .05 level; ***statistically significant at the .10 level.

Note: Appendices O, P, and Q show the labor force status effects on hours worked per week, by gender and age group, from 1989 to 1991, 1999 to 2001, and 2006 to 2008, respectively, both before and after the transition.

CONCLUSIONS

This paper examined whether being inside and being outside the labor force are two distinct labor force statuses. People are unemployed if they do not have a job and are actively searching for one. If they do not have a job and are not searching, they are outside the labor force. Using three different tests, we showed how segments of the population, although technically classified as outside the labor force, are behaviorally similar to those classified as inside the labor force. Moreover, our economic measures using earnings, weeks worked, and hours worked are somewhat effective in tracking this distinction.

Our multinomial probit analysis and tests found that the labor force statuses for mature adults, with the exception of Hispanic males were distinct in 1990. In 1990, among teenagers, the results for white males and females and Hispanic male teens suggested that being inside and being outside the labor force are distinct labor force statuses. However, for black male teens, only the employed to outside the labor force comparison was distinct, and the black and Hispanic teens were not distinct for both comparison groups.

Previous studies have noted that the composition of the labor force is changing and that workforce dropouts are becoming an increasing share of the population. This is consistent with the observation that an increasing share of the dropouts may still want to work and have behavioral outcomes similar to those who are classified as inside the labor force. We found that the patterns observed in 1990 were no longer

present in 2000. For mature adults, labor force status was significantly more heterogeneous in terms of outcomes. Except for Hispanic males, all adult groups were classified as having distinct labor force statuses in 1990. However, by 2000, only three of the six adult groups could be classified as having distinct labor force outcomes across both the outside the labor force versus unemployed classification and the outside the labor force versus employed classification. Furthermore, by 2000, a comparison of the distinct and indistinct statuses showed that the labor force categories were not distinct for teenagers, in contrast with the findings for teenagers in 1990.

The behavioral test of labor force status using earnings suggested that the distinction between the labor force statuses is less relevant for teenagers than for mature adults; this is particularly true for whites. The results of the earnings test by gender demonstrate that differences exist between teens and mature adults. For both genders, we observed that labor force statuses are more distinct for mature adults than for teenagers. We also observed that since the 1989-1991 period, labor force statuses for females have become increasingly more distinct than those for males.

We next investigated the question of behavioral differences in relation to labor force status using two different measures of labor supply. We found the measures to be more consistent in their patterns for whites than for blacks and Hispanics. However, as a general conclusion, being inside and being outside the labor force were behaviorally distinct states—more so for mature adults than for teenagers. We also illustrated the sensitivity of our results to measurement error. Although previous results comparing linear and nonlinear measurement error models suggested that the results may be approximately the same, differences do exist. We found that replacing our biased wage variable with a better proxy variable yielded an estimated wage effect that was consistent with the theory and was larger than the biased variable. We also observed that our test of being inside versus being outside the labor force was affected by the biased variable and the correlation of the biased variable with the indicator of labor force status. Finally, gender was found to have an effect. For mature adults, being inside and being outside the labor force have become more distinct states for women than for men.

The answer to our question of who is inside and who is outside the labor force is first primarily influenced by age. The distinction between being inside and being outside the labor force is a behaviorally meaningless distinction for teenagers when compared with more mature adults. Second, we identified differences by race and ethnicity. For mature adults (aged 25-44), being inside and being outside the labor force are more often behaviorally distinct states for whites than for blacks and Hispanics.

Finally, gender has an effect. The behavioral distinction between being inside and being outside the labor force is currently a more valid labor force distinction for females than for males. With the historic rise of women in the labor force, the distinction between those working and those not working has become clearer. The differences in mean earnings for women working or unemployed are different from women classified as outside the labor force. This was not the case in the 1980s and 1990s. For men, the pattern is the opposite—we are unable to distinguish between differences in mean earnings by whether a man is working or outside the labor force in later years. With respect to labor supply, the hours worked per week shows a consistent distinction for adult women between those inside and outside the labor force when compared with men. For teens, the distinction is meaningless for our later samples for both males and females.

ENDNOTES

1. See Millimet, Nieswiadomy, Ryu, and Slottje (2003) for a similar summary, although the focal points of our research are different.
2. β_1, u/o is notation for the contrast $\beta_1 u - \beta_1 o$, where β_1 is the effect of the first independent variable X_1 on the probit of the outcome of unemployed versus the outcome of outside the labor force (see Long, 1997, pages 155, 158).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

Amemiya, Y. (1985). Instrumental variable estimator for the nonlinear errors-in-variables model. *Journal of Econometrics, 28,* 273–289.

Amemiya, Y. (1990). Two-stage instrumental variables estimators for the nonlinear errors-in-variables model. *Journal of Econometrics, 44,* 311–332.

Autor, D. H. (2001). Wiring the labor market. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 15,* 25–40.

Borjas, G. J. (1980). The relationship between wages and weekly hours of work: The role of division bias. *Journal of Human Resources, 15,* 409–423.

Clark, K. B., & Summers, L. H. (1982). The dynamics of youth unemployment. NBER chapters. In, *The youth labor market problem: Its nature, causes, and consequences* (pp. 199–234). National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.

Current Population Survey (CPS) (1990). *Monthly survey of about 50,000 households conducted by the Bureau of the Census for the Bureau of Labor Statistics (data file).* http://www.bls.census.gov/cps/cpsmain.htm.

Current Population Survey (CPS) (2000). *Monthly survey of about 50,000 households conducted by the Bureau of the Census for the Bureau of Labor Statistics (data file).* http://www.bls.census.gov/cps/cpsmain.htm.

Flinn, C. J., & Heckman, J. J. (1983). Are unemployment and out of the labor force behaviorally distinct labor force states? *Journal of Labor Economics, 1,* 28–42.

Goldsmith, A. H., Veum, J. R., & Darity, W. (1995). Are being unemployed and being out of the labor force distinct states?: A psychological approach. *Journal of Economic Psychology, 16,* 275–295.

Gonul, F. (1992). New evidence on whether unemployment and out of the labor force are distinct states. *Journal of Human Resources, 27,* 329–361.

Jones, S. R. G. & Riddell, W. C. (1999). The measurement of unemployment: An empirical approach. *Econometrica, 67,* 147–162.

Jones, S. R. G., & Riddell, W. C. (2006). Unemployment and non-employment: heterogeneities in labor market states. *Review of Economics & Statistics, 88,* 314–323.

Juhn C., Murphy, K. M., & Topel, R. H. Commenters: Katz, L. F., & Shimer, R. (2002). Current unemployment, historically contemplated. *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity, (1),* 79–136.

Juhn C., Murphy, K. M., & Topel, R. H. Commenters: Yellen, J. L., & Baily, M. N. (1991). Why has the natural rate of unemployment increased over time? *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity, (2),* 75–142.

Kroft, K., & Pope, D. G. (2014). Does online search crowd out traditional search and improve matching efficiency? Evidence from Craigslist. *Journal of Labor Economics, 32,* 259–303.

Kuhn, P., & Skuterud, M. (2000). Job search methods: Internet versus traditional. *Monthly Labor Review, 123,* 3–11.

Long, J. S. (1997). *Regression Models for Categorical and Limited Dependent Variables* (*Advanced Quantitative Techniques in the Social Sciences* series: Book #7). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Madrian, B. C., & Lefgren, L. J. (2000). An approach to longitudinally matching Current Population Survey (CPS) respondents. *Journal of Economic & Social Measurement, 26,* 31–62.

Millimet, D. L., Nieswiadomy, M., Ryu, H., & Slottje, D. (2003). Estimating worklife expectancy: An econometric approach. *Journal of Econometrics, 113,* 83–113.

Murphy, K., & Topel, R. (1997). Unemployment and nonemployment. *American Economic Review, 87,* 295–300.

Poterba, J. M., & Summers, L. H. (1995). Unemployment benefits and labor market transitions: A multinomial logit model with errors in classification. *Review of Economics & Statistics, 77,* 207–216.

Tano, D. K. (1991). Are unemployment and out of the labor force behaviorally distinct labor force states?: New evidence from the gross change data. *Economics Letters, 36,* 113–117.

APPENDICES A-Q
Supplement Containing Appendices A through Q

Appendix A – Multinomial Probit Regression Results (1990)

White Males, 25-44

Multinomial probit regression

Log likelihood = -7158.0347

Number of obs = 20925
Wald chi2(26) = 1046.95
Prob > chi2 = 0.0000

ooprobit	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
1	(base outcome)					
2						
exp	.0913505	.0194934	4.69	0.000	.0531441	.1295569
exp2	-.0032531	.0005608	-5.80	0.000	-.0043522	-.002154
northeas	.0326038	.0768183	0.42	0.671	-.1179573	.1831648
midwest	.196786	.080459	2.45	0.014	.0390892	.3544828
south	-.271064	.0723921	-3.74	0.000	-.4129499	-.1291782
educl9	-.1237066	.1173994	-1.05	0.292	-.3538052	.106392
educ9_11	-.0855629	.0875482	-0.98	0.328	-.2571542	.0860283
educ13_15	-.1890572	.0766683	-2.47	0.014	-.3393244	-.03879
educ16p	-.256748	.0808548	-3.18	0.001	-.4152205	-.0982755
married	.2629692	.0991339	2.65	0.008	.0686703	.457268
msa3mm	-.1969036	.0822472	-2.39	0.017	-.3581051	-.0357021
cy1990	-.0035881	.0295022	-0.12	0.903	-.0614113	.0542352
marriedsped	-.0033415	.0077701	-0.43	0.667	-.0185705	.0118876
_cons	-.4461407	.2374887	-1.88	0.060	-.9116101	.0193286
3						
exp	.1052793	.0142955	7.36	0.000	.0772607	.1332978
exp2	-.0034289	.000408	-8.40	0.000	-.0042285	-.0026293
northeas	-.0037413	.0612379	-0.06	0.951	-.1237652	.1162827
midwest	.1552111	.0659893	2.35	0.019	.0258744	.2845477
south	.0171676	.0553425	0.31	0.756	-.0913016	.1256369
educl9	-.518417	.0922688	-5.62	0.000	-.6992605	-.3375735
educ9_11	-.6107278	.0718481	-8.50	0.000	-.7515476	-.469908
educ13_15	.0998767	.0604934	1.65	0.099	-.0186882	.2184416
educ16p	.2820206	.0628868	4.48	0.000	.1587647	.4052766
married	.5313644	.0794297	6.69	0.000	.375685	.6870437
msa3mm	.0416632	.0633858	0.66	0.511	-.0825706	.165897
cy1990	-.1192238	.0235352	-5.07	0.000	-.165352	-.0730956
marriedsped	.0238188	.0061813	3.85	0.000	.0117036	.035934
_cons	1.808363	.1832559	9.87	0.000	1.449188	2.167538

White Females, 25-44

Multinomial probit regression

Log likelihood = -14593.86

Number of obs = 22216
Wald chi2(26) = 1589.01
Prob > chi2 = 0.0000

ooprobit	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
1	(base outcome)					
2						
exp	.001448	.0185259	0.08	0.938	-.0348621	.0377582
exp2	-.0000416	.0005341	-0.08	0.938	-.0010885	.0010053
northeas	-.0344346	.064099	-0.53	0.596	-.1616342	.0927651
midwest	.1279147	.0671749	1.90	0.057	-.0037456	.259575
south	-.0496811	.0607364	-0.82	0.413	-.1687222	.06936
educl9	-.2960374	.1045528	-2.83	0.005	-.5009571	-.0911177
educ9_11	-.0999715	.0780356	-1.28	0.200	-.2529184	.0529755
educ13_15	-.0046254	.0596274	-0.08	0.938	-.121493	.1122422
educ16p	-.1163589	.0715623	-1.63	0.104	-.2566184	.0239006
married	-.7380887	.0502487	-14.69	0.000	-.8365745	-.639603
msa3mm	-.3228123	.0701464	-4.60	0.000	-.4602967	-.1853279
cy1990	.0057514	.0248205	0.23	0.817	-.0428959	.0543988
marriedsped	.0185034	.0080527	2.30	0.022	.0027204	.0342864
_cons	-.7469428	.2124517	-3.52	0.000	-1.163341	-.330545
3						
exp	-.0286313	.0105152	-2.72	0.006	-.0492408	-.0080218
exp2	.0012696	.0003075	4.13	0.000	.0006669	.0018723
northeas	-.0643317	.0373023	-1.72	0.085	-.1374428	.0087794
midwest	.1780557	.0389626	4.57	0.000	.1016905	.2544209
south	.1233168	.0342823	3.60	0.000	.0561247	.190509
educl9	-1.196463	.0671679	-17.81	0.000	-1.328109	-1.064816
educ9_11	-.6904669	.0504181	-13.69	0.000	-.7892846	-.5916493
educ13_15	.1965647	.0341558	5.75	0.000	.1296205	.2635088
educ16p	.5556948	.0370421	15.00	0.000	.4830937	.6282959
married	-.6372454	.0312734	-20.38	0.000	-.6985401	-.5759507
msa3mm	-.2895394	.0391032	-7.40	0.000	-.3661803	-.2128985
cy1990	-.0719936	.0141303	-5.09	0.000	-.0996886	-.0442987
marriedsped	.0142076	.0045209	3.14	0.002	.0053468	.0230683
_cons	1.781585	.1205513	14.78	0.000	1.545309	2.017861

Black Males, 25-44

Multinomial probit regression

Number of obs = 1950
Wald chi2(26) = 246.93
Log likelihood = -1101.4201
Prob > chi2 = 0.0000

ooprobit	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
1	(base outcome)					
2						
exp	-.0395094	.0546718	-0.72	0.470	-.1466641	.0676453
exp2	.0004671	.0015209	0.31	0.759	-.0025139	.003448
northeas	.2609537	.2420424	1.08	0.281	-.2134407	.7353482
midwest	.2622987	.2489495	1.05	0.292	-.2256533	.7502306
south	.2729894	.2032198	1.34	0.179	-.1253141	.6712929
educ19	-.1669255	.3061979	-0.55	0.586	-.7670623	.4332113
educ9_11	-.3722098	.1839063	-2.02	0.043	-.7320164	-.0116032
educ13_15	.4706307	.1918164	2.45	0.014	.0946774	.8465839
educ16p	-.4421882	.2954638	-1.50	0.134	-1.021287	.1369101
married	.5687073	.2189686	2.60	0.009	.1395368	.9978779
msa3mm	-.2762466	.1883383	-1.47	0.142	-.6453828	.0928897
cy1990	-.0501717	.0789665	-0.64	0.525	-.2049432	.1045999
marriedsped	-.0182973	.0191873	-0.95	0.340	-.0559037	.0193091
_cons	.3545039	.656402	0.54	0.589	-.9320204	1.641028
3						
exp	.0473616	.0452837	1.05	0.296	-.0413929	.1361161
exp2	-.0017166	.0012684	-1.35	0.176	-.0042027	.0007694
northeas	.4153117	.1927024	2.16	0.031	.037622	.7930014
midwest	.2635543	.2009142	1.31	0.190	-.1302303	.6573389
south	.4374867	.1618724	2.70	0.007	.1202226	.7547508
educ19	-1.087842	.2622239	-4.15	0.000	-1.601792	-.5738927
educ9_11	-.8193064	.1489505	-5.50	0.000	-1.111244	-.5273687
educ13_15	.6184224	.1629854	3.79	0.000	.2989769	.9378679
educ16p	.7947964	.2034499	3.91	0.000	.3960426	1.19355
married	.6421731	.185839	3.46	0.001	.2779353	1.006411
msa3mm	-.4267998	.1508343	-2.83	0.005	-.7224295	-.13117
cy1990	-.2785317	.064258	-4.33	0.000	-.4044751	-.1525883
marriedsped	.021231	.0159895	1.33	0.184	-.0101077	.0525698
_cons	2.350077	.5390227	4.36	0.000	1.293612	3.406542

Black Females, 25-44

Multinomial probit regression

Number of obs = 2771
Wald chi2(26) = 408.25
Log likelihood = -1969.5558
Prob > chi2 = 0.0000

ooprobit	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
1	(base outcome)					
2						
exp	-.0267154	.0496628	-0.54	0.591	-.1240527	.0706218
exp2	.0005025	.0014578	0.34	0.730	-.0023548	.0033597
northeas	.0446399	.194179	0.23	0.818	-.335944	.4252239
midwest	.4657003	.1926502	2.42	0.016	.0881129	.8432877
south	.3469106	.1592519	2.18	0.029	.0347825	.6590386
educ19	-1.194706	.3754648	-3.18	0.001	-1.930604	-.4598085
educ9_11	-.3208635	.1439541	-2.23	0.026	-.6030084	-.0387187
educ13_15	.0531797	.1395459	0.38	0.703	-.2203252	.3266846
educ16p	.2341459	.2215867	1.06	0.291	-.2001562	.6684479
married	-.2048793	.1213563	-1.69	0.091	-.4427332	.0329746
msa3mm	-.1851876	.1470562	-1.26	0.208	-.4734125	.1030373
cy1990	-.0930274	.0583594	-1.59	0.111	-.2074097	.0213549
marriedsped	.0278396	.0192295	1.45	0.148	-.0098496	.0655288
_cons	-.1308193	.5322367	-0.25	0.806	-1.173984	.9123454
3						
exp	-.0140113	.0336326	-0.42	0.677	-.07993	.0519074
exp2	.0015251	.0009762	1.56	0.118	-.0003883	.0034385
northeas	.1562782	.1301541	1.20	0.230	-.0988191	.4113756
midwest	.0907999	.1437606	0.63	0.528	-.1909657	.3725655
south	.4550702	.1113334	4.09	0.000	.2368607	.6732796
educ19	-1.850159	.2331734	-7.93	0.000	-2.307171	-1.393148
educ9_11	-1.175105	.1132147	-10.38	0.000	-1.397002	-.9532084
educ13_15	.5252741	.0980799	5.36	0.000	.3330411	.7175072
educ16p	1.408539	.1478963	9.53	0.000	1.118732	1.698346
married	.0121928	.0841517	0.14	0.885	-.1527416	.1771271
msa3mm	-.1146051	.1044101	-1.10	0.272	-.3192451	.0900348
cy1990	-.1952827	.0432808	-4.51	0.000	-.2801115	-.1104539
marriedsped	.025031	.0138072	1.81	0.070	-.0020307	.0520926
_cons	1.425317	.376054	3.79	0.000	.6882644	2.162369

Hispanic Males, 25-44

Multinomial probit regression

Number of obs = 2838
Wald chi2(26) = 146.95
Log likelihood = -1230.7113
Prob > chi2 = 0.0000

ooprobit	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
1	(base outcome)					
2						
exp	-.0036188	.0472386	-0.08	0.939	-.0962048	.0889672
exp2	-.0002111	.0011635	-0.18	0.856	-.0024916	.0020693
northeas	-.5691467	.1960855	-2.90	0.004	-.9534672	-.1848263
midwest	.4408463	.3302452	1.33	0.182	-.2064224	1.088115
south	.0105699	.1733294	0.06	0.951	-.3291495	.3502893
educ19	-.045373	.1922166	-0.24	0.813	-.4221107	.3313647
educ9_11	.0430373	.1971242	0.22	0.827	-.3433189	.4293936
educ13_15	.0272207	.2499579	0.11	0.913	-.4626877	.5171291
educ16p	-.1371927	.2730446	-0.50	0.615	-.6723503	.3979649
married	.2209483	.1800915	1.23	0.220	-.1320246	.5739212
msa3mm	-.0828724	.1522251	-0.54	0.586	-.3812281	.2154833
cy1990	-.0401040	.140983	-0.27	0.788	-.3321062	.2518966
marriedsped	-.0179083	.0166008	-0.10	0.918	-.0342453	.0308287
_cons	.3651281	.9868798	0.37	0.711	-1.569121	2.299377
3						
exp	-.0099603	.0373073	-0.27	0.789	-.0830813	.0631608
exp2	-.0001184	.0009192	-0.13	0.897	-.00192	.0016831
northeas	-.621085	.1493843	-4.16	0.000	-.9138729	-.3282971
midwest	.5186762	.286588	1.81	0.070	-.0430259	1.080378
south	.0809447	.1423727	0.57	0.570	-.1981007	.3599902
educ19	-.1462251	.1550474	-0.94	0.346	-.4501124	.1576621
educ9_11	-.1353949	.1620694	-0.84	0.403	-.453045	.1822553
educ13_15	.6761262	.1978021	3.42	0.001	.2884411	1.063811
educ16p	-.353092	.2094983	1.69	0.092	-.0575171	.7637011
married	.5429668	.1459466	3.72	0.000	.2569167	.8290169
msa3mm	.1529052	.120866	1.27	0.206	-.0839878	.3897982
cy1990	-.274924	.1252116	-2.20	0.028	-.5203343	-.0295138
marriedsped	.0308045	.0132902	2.32	0.020	.0047562	.0568528
_cons	3.357235	.8221242	4.08	0.000	1.745901	4.968569

Hispanic Females, 25-44

Multinomial probit regression

Number of obs = 3216
Wald chi2(26) = 352.15
Log likelihood = -2469.7695
Prob > chi2 = 0.0000

ooprobit	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
1	(base outcome)					
2						
exp	-.0370805	.0364613	-1.02	0.309	-.1085434	.0343823
exp2	.0009409	.0009226	1.02	0.308	-.0008673	.0027491
northeas	-.301429	.1537221	-1.96	0.050	-.6027108	-.0001393
midwest	.3372254	.2444224	1.38	0.168	-.1418338	.8162846
south	.1784415	.134127	1.33	0.183	-.0844426	.4413256
educ19	-.192788	.1565229	-1.23	0.218	-.4995671	.1139912
educ9_11	-.0753692	.1564578	-0.48	0.630	-.3820208	.2312825
educ13_15	.2161487	.1614462	1.34	0.181	-.1002801	.5325775
educ16p	-.0292173	.2534622	-0.12	0.908	-.5259942	.4675595
married	-.5445698	.1118453	-4.87	0.000	-.7637825	-.3253571
msa3mm	-.3923476	.1249595	-3.14	0.002	-.6372637	-.1474315
cy1990	-.1480005	.1040258	-1.43	0.153	-.3526953	.0550783
marriedsped	.0293061	.0179997	1.63	0.103	-.0059726	.0645848
_cons	.3249856	.6851029	0.47	0.635	-1.017791	1.667763
3						
exp	.0271901	.0234448	1.16	0.246	-.0187609	.0731411
exp2	-.000312	.0006057	-0.52	0.606	-.0014991	.0008751
northeas	-.5457279	.0963048	-5.67	0.000	-.7344818	-.356974
midwest	.3111188	.1542455	2.02	0.044	.0088032	.6134343
south	.0262063	.0870667	0.30	0.763	-.1444412	.1968639
educ19	-.8797262	.0993467	-8.86	0.000	-1.074442	-.6850103
educ9_11	-.5843986	.1022135	-5.72	0.000	-.7847334	-.3840637
educ13_15	.3969296	.1019616	3.89	0.000	.1970886	.5967706
educ16p	.954249	.1334546	7.15	0.000	.6926829	1.215015
married	-.3955949	.0728143	-5.43	0.000	-.5383082	-.2528816
msa3mm	-.2301428	.0758732	-3.03	0.002	-.3788515	-.081434
cy1990	-.0603746	.0708603	-0.85	0.394	-.1992582	.078509
marriedsped	.0095478	.011917	0.80	0.423	-.013809	.0329047
_cons	.9870457	.4586686	2.15	0.031	.0880718	1.88602

White Males, 16-19

Multinomial probit regression
Number of obs = 1279
Wald chi2(14) = 116.52
Log likelihood = -1083.7262
Prob > chi2 = 0.0000

ooprobit	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
1	(base outcome)					
2						
exp	.0252272	.3057577	0.08	0.934	-.5740468	.6245012
exp2	.2894576	.1459816	1.98	0.047	.0033979	.5755175
northeas	-.2134164	.2031175	-1.05	0.293	-.6115194	.1846865
midwest	-.1569739	.2099027	-0.75	0.455	-.5603756	.2544278
south	-.1813133	.1884465	-0.96	0.336	-.5506617	.188035
msa3mm	-.8655626	.2377816	-3.64	0.000	-1.331626	-.3995392
cy1990	.0522545	.0779416	0.67	0.502	-.1003122	.2049211
_cons	-1.431801	.4591887	-3.12	0.002	-2.331795	-.5318081
3						
exp	.1551927	.2174062	0.71	0.475	-.2710724	.5814578
exp2	.2592672	.1073464	2.42	0.016	.048872	.4696623
northeas	-.1312565	.1466847	-0.89	0.571	-.4187533	.1562402
midwest	.0604193	.1509396	0.40	0.689	-.2354168	.3562554
south	-.1462006	.1412261	-1.04	0.301	-.4229907	.1305975
msa3mm	-.6613437	.1540447	-4.29	0.000	-.9632657	-.3594217
cy1990	-.0942413	.0564573	-1.67	0.095	-.2048955	.016413
_cons	.6367679	.330581	1.93	0.054	-.011159	1.284695

White Females, 16-19

Multinomial probit regression
Number of obs = 1265
Wald chi2(14) = 47.42
Log likelihood = -1072.2335
Prob > chi2 = 0.0000

ooprobit	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
1	(base outcome)					
2						
exp	.1607968	.3196557	0.50	0.615	-.4657168	.7873104
exp2	.111581	.1531296	0.73	0.466	-.1885476	.4117095
northeas	-.3917561	.2194319	-1.79	0.074	-.8218348	.0383226
midwest	.001284	.2080532	0.01	0.995	-.4064966	.4090646
south	-.4733548	.1986448	-2.38	0.017	-.8626914	-.0840181
msa3mm	-.196279	.2245626	-0.87	0.382	-.636414	.2438561
cy1990	.0335672	.0795738	0.42	0.673	-.1223886	.1895231
_cons	-1.362162	.4736603	-2.88	0.004	-2.290489	-.4337448
3						
exp	-.3264918	.2170952	-1.50	0.133	-.7519907	.099007
exp2	.3272249	.1076164	3.04	0.002	.1163007	.538149
northeas	-.1761553	.1477411	-1.19	0.233	-.4657224	.1134119
midwest	.1298082	.1495514	0.87	0.385	-.1633072	.4229235
south	-.2629341	.1350552	-1.95	0.052	-.5276375	.0017693
msa3mm	-.2510069	.156727	-1.60	0.109	-.5581862	.0561724
cy1990	-.0300449	.0646208	-0.55	0.582	-.1370997	.0770089
_cons	.5839619	.3225282	1.81	0.070	-.0481818	1.216106

Black Males, 16-19

Multinomial probit regression
Number of obs = 160
Wald chi2(14) = 23.57
Log likelihood = -150.85872
Prob > chi2 = 0.0516

ooprobit	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
1	(base outcome)					
2						
exp	.8029153	.8233135	0.98	0.329	-.8107496	2.41658
exp2	-.0881915	.3688292	-0.24	0.811	-.8110834	.6347003
northeas	.4733378	.6513559	0.73	0.467	-.8032962	1.749972
midwest	1.044364	.65388	1.60	0.110	-.237217	2.325946
south	-.2169635	.5773896	-0.38	0.707	-1.348627	.9146997
msa3mm	-.5432070	.5000465	-1.09	0.277	-1.523365	.4367893
cy1990	-.2769062	.1917535	-1.44	0.140	-.6526161	.0988437
_cons	.0606665	1.170903	0.05	0.959	-2.234262	2.355595
3						
exp	1.551694	.7177948	2.16	0.031	.1448421	2.958546
exp2	-.3728672	.3190308	-1.17	0.242	-.9981861	.2523916
northeas	-.1251475	.580759	-0.22	0.829	-1.263414	1.013119
midwest	.8837882	.5666174	1.56	0.119	-.2271535	1.99473
south	-.2534594	.4918329	-0.52	0.606	-1.217434	.7105154
msa3mm	-.5265418	.44843	-1.20	0.232	-1.415449	.3423549
cy1990	-.3157009	.1602512	-1.97	0.049	-.6297874	-.0016144
_cons	.7939601	.9781548	0.81	0.417	-1.123188	2.711108

Black Females, 16-19

Multinomial probit regression
Number of obs = 210
Wald chi2(14) = 17.66
Log likelihood = -199.01864
Prob > chi2 = 0.2226

ooprobit	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
1	(base outcome)					
2						
exp	1.030423	.7747892	1.33	0.184	-.4881361	2.548982
exp2	-.1990344	.3411266	-0.58	0.560	-.8676302	.4695613
northeas	-1.325096	.6337031	-2.09	0.037	-2.567131	-.0830609
midwest	-.4000177	.6065995	-0.66	0.510	-1.588931	.7888956
south	-.6116653	.4363134	-1.40	0.161	-1.466824	.2434934
msa3mm	.3598054	.4790664	0.75	0.453	-.5791474	1.298758
cy1990	.0367279	.1978297	0.19	0.853	-.3510115	.4244669
_cons	-1.684336	1.202845	-1.40	0.161	-4.04187	.6731971
3						
exp	.0562844	.5629718	0.10	0.920	-1.04712	1.159689
exp2	.1799534	.2640581	0.68	0.496	-.337591	.6974977
northeas	-.6123594	.4455082	-1.37	0.169	-1.48573	.2610226
midwest	-.3985638	.5301464	-0.75	0.452	-1.437632	.6405041
south	-.378665	.3550538	-1.07	0.286	-1.074558	.3172277
msa3mm	-.3069402	.3878741	-0.79	0.429	-1.066768	.4526873
cy1990	.0081158	.1492517	0.05	0.957	-.2844172	.3006438
_cons	-.3572723	.8967426	-0.40	0.690	-2.114856	1.400311

Hispanic Males, 16-19

Multinomial probit regression
Number of obs = 198
Wald chi2(14) = 27.90
Log likelihood = -181.42754
Prob > chi2 = 0.0147

ooprobit	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
1	(base outcome)					
2						
exp	.7204071	.8685031	0.83	0.407	-.9818278	2.422642
exp2	.0194873	.3800644	0.05	0.959	-.7254253	.7643998
northeas	-.6996928	.4887731	-1.43	0.152	-1.65787	.2580849
midwest	.758564	.7540458	1.01	0.314	-.7193386	2.236467
south	.0911444	.4422766	0.21	0.837	-.7757017	.9579906
msa3mm	-.7101403	.3692157	-1.92	0.054	-1.43379	.0135092
cy1990	-.3231992	.3626842	-0.89	0.372	-1.032871	.3864728
_cons	.5437913	2.073614	0.26	0.793	-3.520417	4.608
3						
exp	1.417463	.6612998	2.14	0.032	.1213985	2.713587
exp2	-.3633875	.2931828	-1.24	0.215	-.9380152	.2112402
northeas	-.9254427	.3912417	-2.37	0.018	-1.692262	-.1586231
midwest	.8895193	.6357467	1.40	0.162	-.3365213	2.13556
south	.0600018	.3679222	0.16	0.870	-.6611125	.7811162
msa3mm	-.5335542	.2919617	-1.83	0.068	-1.105789	.0386802
cy1990	-.3268496	.3044051	-1.07	0.283	-.9234727	.2697736
_cons	1.459623	1.741836	0.84	0.402	-1.954312	4.873558

Hispanic Females, 16-19

Multinomial probit regression
Number of obs = 203
Wald chi2(9) = 7.80
Log likelihood = -175.25578
Prob > chi2 = 0.4528

ooprobit	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
1	(base outcome)					
2						
exp	.2172353	.2445332	0.89	0.374	-.262041	.6965116
west	.2665137	.523497	0.51	0.611	-.7595217	1.292549
midwest	-10.13337	2.67e+09	-0.00	1.000	-5.23e+09	5.23e+09
south	-.0827884	.5935448	-0.14	0.889	-1.246115	1.080538
_cons	-1.719089	.5306385	-3.24	0.001	-2.759122	-.679057
3						
exp	.4063709	.1620122	2.51	0.012	.0888329	.7239089
west	.0772924	.3497966	0.22	0.825	-.6082962	.7628811
midwest	-.0430122	.6124881	-0.07	0.943	-1.244367	1.156542
south	-.1770335	.3889926	-0.46	0.649	-.9394449	.5853779
_cons	-.4489209	.3492045	-1.29	0.199	-1.133349	.2355073

Appendix B – Multinomial Probit Regression Results (2000)

White Males, 25-44

Multinomial probit regression

Number of obs = 16442
Wald chi2(26) = 755.10
Log likelihood = -5555.5223
Prob > chi2 = 0.0000

ooprobit	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
1	(base outcome)					
2						
exp	.0391435	.0239119	1.64	0.102	-.007723	.08601
exp2	-.0016658	.0006705	-2.48	0.013	-.0029799	-.0003516
northeas	-.2947718	.1000854	-2.95	0.003	-.4909356	-.0986079
midwest	.0104751	.1023313	0.10	0.918	-.1900906	.2110407
south	-.2339433	.0872332	-2.68	0.007	-.4049172	-.0629694
educl9	.6226044	.2686402	2.32	0.020	.0960793	1.14913
educ9_11	.5657556	.2555702	2.21	0.027	.0648472	1.066664
educ13_15	.510648	.2438523	2.09	0.036	.0327064	.9885897
educl6p	.4195074	.2554031	1.64	0.100	-.0810734	.9200883
married	.3241011	.087753	3.69	0.000	.1521084	.4960939
marriedsped	-.0015054	.0024271	-0.62	0.535	-.0062624	.0032515
msa5mm	-.1060309	.1022456	-1.04	0.300	-.3064286	.0943667
cy2000	.0962142	.0445844	2.16	0.031	.0088304	.1835981
_cons	-1.389139	.3780844	-3.67	0.000	-2.130171	-.6481071
3						
exp	.0399959	.0163876	2.44	0.015	.0078768	.072115
exp2	-.0018036	.0004591	-3.93	0.000	-.0027035	-.0009037
northeas	-.196753	.0700204	-2.81	0.005	-.3339905	-.0595154
midwest	.0509133	.0740286	0.69	0.492	-.0941802	.1960067
south	-.0512636	.0625907	-0.82	0.413	-.1739549	.0714275
educl9	.281097	.1750536	1.61	0.108	-.0620017	.6241957
educ9_11	-.0130469	.1665125	-0.08	0.937	-.3354056	.3093918
educl3_15	.5445466	.1534033	3.55	0.000	.2438816	.8452116
educl6p	.9261723	.1613415	5.75	0.000	.6119488	1.244396
married	.7787072	.063585	12.25	0.000	.6540829	.9033315
marriedsped	.0031523	.0017428	1.81	0.070	-.0002635	.005568
msa5mm	.0917181	.0722937	1.27	0.205	-.049975	.2334113
cy2000	-.0900786	.0314773	-2.86	0.004	-.151773	-.0283842
_cons	1.463765	.2531452	5.78	0.000	.9676095	1.959921

White Females, 25-44

Multinomial probit regression

Number of obs = 17049
Wald chi2(26) = 1198.08
Log likelihood = -10560.122
Prob > chi2 = 0.0000

ooprobit	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
1	(base outcome)					
2						
exp	.0296451	.0220605	1.34	0.179	-.0135928	.0728829
exp2	-.0007	.000625	-1.12	0.263	-.001925	.0005249
northeas	.0978594	.0862063	1.13	0.257	-.0712676	.2669685
midwest	.1385158	.0923354	1.50	0.134	-.0424572	.3194906
south	.0029568	.0704379	0.04	0.970	-.1507794	.156692
educl9	.2113048	.3031055	0.70	0.486	-.382771	.8053806
educ9_11	.3522066	.2959322	1.19	0.234	-.2278099	.932223
educl3_15	.329402	.2869116	1.15	0.251	-.2329344	.8917385
educl6p	.274411	.2934111	0.94	0.350	-.3006641	.8494861
married	-.691639	.0629327	-10.99	0.000	-.8149848	-.5682933
marriedsped	-.001592	.002017	-0.79	0.430	-.0055452	.0023613
msa5mm	-.1219723	.0866544	-1.41	0.159	-.2918118	.0478672
cy2000	.0594863	.0400466	1.49	0.137	-.0190036	.1379762
_cons	-1.729089	.3911682	-4.42	0.000	-2.495765	-.9624138
3						
exp	-.0377832	.0118935	-3.18	0.001	-.0610941	-.0144724
exp2	.0014609	.0003461	4.22	0.000	.0007826	.0021393
northeas	.0129139	.0477263	0.27	0.787	-.080628	.1064558
midwest	.1947745	.0494937	3.94	0.000	.0977686	.2917804
south	.085646	.0426714	2.01	0.045	.0020117	.1692804
educl9	-.7819356	.1639028	-4.77	0.000	-1.103179	-.460692
educ9_11	-.4935232	.158462	-3.11	0.002	-.8041031	-.1829433
educl3_15	.396199	.1498437	2.64	0.008	.1025107	.6898471
educl6p	.8193656	.1523936	5.38	0.000	.5206797	1.118051
married	-.5977844	.0367216	-16.28	0.000	-.6697574	-.5258115
marriedsped	-.0021896	.0009914	-2.21	0.027	-.0041326	-.0002466
msa5mm	-.1382317	.0491495	-2.81	0.005	-.2345628	-.0419005
cy2000	-.0763541	.0214924	-3.55	0.000	-.1184786	-.0342297
_cons	1.504066	.2049696	7.34	0.000	1.102333	1.905799

Black Males, 25-44

Multinomial probit regression

Number of obs = 1679
Wald chi2(26) = 148.25
Log likelihood = -916.78683
Prob > chi2 = 0.0000

ooprobit	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
1	(base outcome)					
2						
exp	.0152281	.0683939	0.22	0.824	-.1188214	.1492777
exp2	-.0015785	.0020012	-0.79	0.430	-.0055008	.0023438
northeas	-.1987407	.3152063	-0.63	0.528	-.8165336	.4190522
midwest	-.0571077	.3192525	-0.18	0.858	-.6828311	.5686157
south	-.1859022	.2955176	-0.63	0.515	-.7455065	.3737021
educl9	-.6154679	.6269635	-0.98	0.326	-1.844294	.6133579
educ9_11	-.741232	.4976455	-1.49	0.136	-1.716599	.2341353
educl3_15	-.2880272	.4538506	-0.63	0.526	-1.17757	.6015153
educl6p	-.4727513	.4987929	-0.95	0.343	-1.450367	.5046648
married	.068768	.2213922	0.31	0.756	-.3651528	.5026889
cy2000	.0993202	.1072329	0.93	0.354	-.1108524	.3094928
marriedsped	-.0009474	.0068786	-0.14	0.890	-.0144293	.0125344
msa5mm	.1391318	.2413055	0.58	0.564	-.3338182	.6120818
_cons	-.2053116	.8715894	-0.24	0.814	-1.913595	1.502972
3						
exp	.0571075	.0490237	1.16	0.244	-.0389071	.1531922
exp2	-.0025896	.001406	-1.84	0.065	-.0053453	.000166
northeas	-.3929276	.2364311	-1.66	0.097	-.8563241	.070469
midwest	-.3565301	.2409331	-1.48	0.139	-.8287504	.1155902
south	.1429865	.2146636	0.67	0.505	-.2777463	.5637194
educl9	-.148167	.4864870	-0.30	0.761	-1.101666	.8053315
educ9_11	-.2215441	.4015724	-0.55	0.581	-1.008612	.5655234
educl3_15	.718280	.3746907	1.92	0.055	-.0160923	1.452668
educl6p	.9320155	.401534	2.32	0.020	.1450234	1.719008
married	.5909062	.155819	3.79	0.000	.2855066	.8963058
cy2000	-.1690065	.0761451	-2.22	0.026	-.3182402	-.0197648
marriedsped	.0044129	.0047038	0.94	0.348	-.0048063	.0136322
msa5mm	.4318605	.181171	2.38	0.017	.0767718	.7869491
_cons	1.223237	.6646687	1.84	0.066	-.0794896	2.525964

Black Females, 25-44

Multinomial probit regression

Number of obs = 2260
Wald chi2(26) = 187.05
Log likelihood = -1440.7961
Prob > chi2 = 0.0000

ooprobit	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
1	(base outcome)					
2						
exp	-.0175283	.0569998	-0.31	0.758	-.1292458	.0941892
exp2	.0002811	.0016543	0.17	0.865	-.0029614	.0035235
northeas	.6424075	.3027222	2.12	0.034	.0490831	1.235732
midwest	.471432	.3133587	1.50	0.133	-.1428181	1.085682
south	.5105915	.2895073	1.76	0.078	-.0569324	1.078015
educl9	-.5707461	.6925656	-0.82	0.410	-1.928188	.7866979
educ9_11	.5591043	.424541	1.32	0.188	-.2735848	1.392053
educl3_15	.7257707	.2911481	1.81	0.071	-.0619182	1.513474
educl6p	.7511028	.4468855	1.88	0.093	-.1243848	1.62659
married	-.3559299	.1666269	-2.14	0.033	-.6825126	-.0293471
marriedsped	.000172	.0063582	0.03	0.978	-.0122899	.0126339
msa5mm	-.1132597	.2016020	-0.56	0.574	-.5083941	.2818746
cy2000	.0211315	.0889082	0.24	0.812	-.1531254	.1953884
_cons	-1.76829	.7616903	-2.32	0.020	-3.261176	-.2754047
3						
exp	.0219094	.0373608	0.59	0.558	-.0513321	.095151
exp2	-.0010084	.0010627	-0.93	0.352	-.0031305	.0011137
northeas	.2049742	.1802552	1.14	0.255	-.1483194	.5582678
midwest	.2203361	.185396	1.19	0.235	-.1430334	.5837056
south	.4601279	.1672301	2.75	0.006	.1323629	.7878929
educl9	.1744257	.3850069	0.45	0.651	-.580174	.9290253
educ9_11	.3078095	.2884901	1.07	0.286	-.2576208	.8732398
educl3_15	1.311002	.2671402	4.91	0.000	.7874169	1.834587
educl6p	1.951985	.2911481	6.70	0.000	1.381345	2.522625
married	-.0920294	.1047009	-0.88	0.380	-.2973962	.1133374
marriedsped	.0013228	.0036592	0.35	0.728	-.0061251	.0087708
msa5mm	-.0007919	.1347707	-0.01	0.995	-.2649376	.2633539
cy2000	-.1374253	.0588689	-2.33	0.020	-.2528063	-.0220444
_cons	.1513832	.5012847	0.30	0.763	-.8311168	1.133883

Hispanic Males, 25-44

```
Multinomial probit regression              Number of obs   =    3039
                                           Wald chi2(26)   =  141.66
Log likelihood = -1490.0964                Prob > chi2     =  0.0000
```

ooprobit	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
1	(base outcome)					
2						
exp	.0060408	.0436516	0.14	0.890	-.0795148	.0915965
exp2	-.0005504	.0011031	-0.50	0.618	-.0027124	.0016116
northeas	-.2541495	.1921285	-1.32	0.186	-.6307145	.1224155
midwest	-.1740582	.2426915	-0.72	0.473	-.6497247	.3016084
south	-.1809343	.1607507	-1.13	0.260	-.4959999	.1341314
educl9	.7848775	.3837938	2.05	0.041	.0326556	1.537099
educ9_11	.938793	.381218	2.46	0.014	.1916194	1.685967
educl3_15	.4621257	.3671083	1.26	0.208	-.2573934	1.181645
educl6p	.760228	.4312906	1.76	0.078	-.085086	1.605542
married	.2144429	.1622905	1.32	0.186	-.1036407	.5325265
marriedsped	.001761	.0045809	0.38	0.701	-.0072173	.0107394
msa5mm	-.1486186	.1638942	-0.91	0.365	-.4698453	.1726081
cy2000	.0274288	.1085351	0.25	0.800	-.1852961	.2401537
_cons	-.8626537	.7220517	-1.19	0.232	-2.277849	.5525417
3						
exp	-.0246018	.0318942	-0.77	0.440	-.0971133	.0379097
exp2	-.0000956	.0008107	-0.12	0.906	-.0016845	.0014934
northeas	-.363772	.1428028	-2.55	0.011	-.6436603	-.0838837
midwest	.0082671	.1788585	0.05	0.963	-.3422893	.3588234
south	.0313751	.1212513	0.26	0.796	-.2062731	.2690233
educl9	.3932108	.2465826	1.59	0.111	-.0900822	.8765039
educ9_11	.3397169	.2469814	1.38	0.169	-.1443578	.8237917
educl3_15	.4303656	.2283381	1.88	0.059	-.0171689	.8779
educl6p	.0575696	.2073763	2.90	0.003	.2943225	1.420817
married	.8026032	.120702	6.65	0.000	.5659747	1.039332
marriedsped	.0000821	.0034271	0.02	0.981	-.0066949	.0067991
msa5mm	.0437084	.1221041	0.36	0.720	-.1956114	.2830281
cy2000	-.0007079	.0826059	-0.01	0.993	-.1626124	.1611967
_cons	1.735726	.5213653	3.33	0.001	.7138691	2.757584

Hispanic Females, 25-44

```
Multinomial probit regression              Number of obs   =    3964
                                           Wald chi2(26)   =  309.90
Log likelihood = -2973.2789                Prob > chi2     =  0.0000
```

ooprobit	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
1	(base outcome)					
2						
exp	.0338581	.0348273	0.97	0.331	-.0344022	.1021184
exp2	-.0008189	.0009065	-0.90	0.366	-.0025956	.0009578
northeas	.3697374	.1485419	2.49	0.013	.0786006	.6608742
midwest	.2471986	.1969934	1.25	0.210	-.1389013	.6332985
south	.0277386	.1347313	0.21	0.837	-.2363298	.291807
educl9	.2912383	.4239499	0.69	0.492	-.5397083	1.122145
educ9_11	.4426195	.4197486	1.05	0.292	-.3800727	1.265312
educl3_15	.4084591	.4101787	1.00	0.319	-.3954764	1.212395
educl6p	.539075	.4357493	1.24	0.216	-.3149779	1.393128
married	-.5642807	.1081098	-5.22	0.000	-.776172	-.3523893
marriedsped	-.0044814	.0038215	-1.17	0.241	-.0119714	.0030087
msa5mm	-.2906631	.1290543	-2.25	0.024	-.5436049	-.0377214
cy2000	.144087	.0915401	1.57	0.115	-.0353284	.3235024
_cons	-2.266441	.6594049	-3.44	0.001	-3.558851	-.9740312
3						
exp	-.0000877	.0203052	-0.00	0.997	-.0398852	.0397099
exp2	.0006304	.0005358	1.18	0.239	-.0004198	.0016806
northeas	-.0215049	.0942682	-0.23	0.820	-.2062671	.1632573
midwest	-.0226133	.1188854	-0.19	0.849	-.2556244	.2103978
south	.021216	.0802938	0.26	0.792	-.136157	.178589
educl5	-.7915907	.2185369	-3.62	0.000	-1.219915	-.3632661
educ9_11	-.5764014	.2163924	-2.66	0.008	-1.000523	-.15228
educl3_15	.205909	.206271	1.00	0.318	-.1983747	.6101927
educl6p	.5368453	.2229862	2.41	0.016	.0998004	.9738902
married	-.4864796	.0686207	-7.09	0.000	-.6209738	-.3519854
marriedsped	-.0027943	.0021047	-1.33	0.184	-.0069195	.0013308
msa5mm	-.0377185	.0796857	-0.47	0.636	-.1938997	.1184627
cy2000	-.1201181	.0546168	-2.20	0.028	-.2271651	-.0130711
_cons	1.316727	.3688239	3.57	0.000	.5938452	2.039608

White Males, 16-19

```
Multinomial probit regression              Number of obs   =     443
                                           Wald chi2(14)   =   20.05
Log likelihood = -338.95807                Prob > chi2     =  0.1286
```

ooprobit	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
1	(base outcome)					
2						
exp	-1.125623	.8348448	-1.35	0.178	-2.761889	.5106425
exp2	.5242705	.3364129	1.56	0.119	-.1350066	1.183628
northeas	.7524608	.4423812	1.70	0.089	-.1145084	1.619514
midwest	.7844429	.4530728	1.73	0.083	-.1035635	1.672449
south	.6679839	.3768331	1.77	0.076	-.0705954	1.406563
msa5mm	-.0981771	.5216551	-1.72	0.085	-1.920602	.1242481
cy2000	.1335984	.1902228	0.70	0.482	-.2392314	.5064283
_cons	-1.38755	1.015521	-1.34	0.181	-3.347935	.6328347
3						
exp	-.2858193	.6633529	-0.43	0.667	-1.585967	1.014329
exp2	.2999484	.2589458	1.16	0.247	-.207576	.8074729
northeas	.0790234	.3112092	0.25	0.800	-.5309355	.6889822
midwest	.1310829	.3143302	0.42	0.677	-.484993	.7471586
south	.0921039	.2631449	0.35	0.726	-.4236507	.6078583
msa5mm	-.4513302	.3206461	-1.41	0.159	-1.079765	.1771244
cy2000	.0366721	.1374727	0.27	0.790	-.2327694	.3061136
_cons	.4238876	.7432518	0.57	0.568	-1.032859	1.880634

White Females, 16-19

```
Multinomial probit regression              Number of obs   =     448
                                           Wald chi2(14)   =   20.59
Log likelihood = -359.50268                Prob > chi2     =  0.1126
```

ooprobit	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
1	(base outcome)					
2						
exp	-.8243124	.8151313	-1.01	0.312	-2.42194	.7733155
exp2	.3388258	.3325201	1.02	0.308	-.3129172	.9905689
northeas	-.3427203	.5128208	-0.67	0.504	-1.347831	.66239
midwest	.670452	.4281758	1.57	0.117	-.1687572	1.509661
south	-.0555274	.305279	-0.14	0.865	-.6106584	.6996037
msa5mm	-.8313197	.6088569	-1.37	0.172	-2.024657	.362018
cy2000	.2221266	.1915678	1.16	0.246	-.1533394	.5975925
_cons	-1.853101	.9681170	-1.91	0.056	-3.750577	.0443751
3						
exp	-.3196662	.5859898	-0.55	0.585	-1.469185	.8298527
exp2	.2820301	.2296188	1.23	0.219	-.1680145	.7320748
northeas	-.2117173	.2851562	-0.74	0.458	-.7706133	.3471786
midwest	.2760958	.2758695	1.00	0.317	-.2645905	.8167901
south	-.3127356	.2446974	-1.28	0.201	-.7923336	.1668625
msa5mm	-.2039651	.3031206	-0.67	0.501	-.7980705	.3901403
cy2000	.0340296	.1234535	0.28	0.783	-.2079340	.2759939
_cons	.1825252	.647087	0.28	0.778	-1.085742	1.450792

Black Males, 16-19

```
Multinomial probit regression              Number of obs   =      62
                                           Wald chi2(10)   =   13.76
Log likelihood = -56.648311                Prob > chi2     =  0.1844
```

ooprobit	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
1	(base outcome)					
2						
exp	-.3177407	2.067945	-0.15	0.878	-4.370838	3.735357
exp2	.3593911	.8979327	0.40	0.689	-1.400525	2.119307
midwest	1.758348	1.099451	1.60	0.110	-.3965358	3.913232
south	.9978421	.6979117	1.43	0.153	-.3700396	2.365724
cy2000	-.9358807	.3868247	-2.42	0.016	-1.694043	-.1777184
_cons	2.012184	1.969635	1.02	0.307	-1.848229	5.872598
3						
exp	1.835802	1.779972	1.03	0.302	-1.652879	5.324484
exp2	-.5402663	.747491	-0.72	0.470	-2.005322	.9247891
midwest	1.313127	1.028321	1.28	0.202	-.702346	3.3286
south	.7349353	.5472364	1.34	0.179	-.3376278	1.807499
cy2000	-.4530605	.3050837	-1.49	0.138	-1.051013	.1448925
_cons	.2821	1.654603	0.17	0.865	-2.960862	3.525062

Black Females, 16-19

```
Multinomial probit regression              Number of obs   =      71
                                           Wald chi2(8)    =    5.25
Log likelihood = -71.97195                 Prob > chi2     =  0.7311
```

ooprobit	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
1	(base outcome)					
2						
exp	.3851659	.4736964	0.81	0.416	-.5432424	1.313574
northeas	.499689	1.0194	0.49	0.624	-1.498298	2.497676
midwest	.3918459	.9492769	0.41	0.680	-1.468703	2.252394
south	.6108096	.8910649	0.69	0.493	-1.135646	2.357265
_cons	-1.566573	1.021009	-1.53	0.125	-3.567714	.4345678
3						
exp	-.0034265	.4001545	-0.01	0.993	-.7877140	.780861
northeas	1.065489	.879717	1.21	0.226	-.658725	2.789702
midwest	.0203034	.8652165	0.02	0.981	-1.67549	1.716097
south	.9438796	.785666	1.20	0.230	-.5959976	2.483757
_cons	-.5813534	.8683135	-0.67	0.503	-2.283217	1.12051

Hispanic Males, 16-19

Multinomial probit regression

Log likelihood = -68.542753

Number of obs = 98
Wald chi2(10) = 10.93
Prob > chi2 = 0.3628

ooprobit	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
1	(base outcome)					
2						
exp	-1.993028	1.932435	-1.03	0.302	-5.780532	1.794476
exp2	.8396538	.7916671	1.06	0.289	-.7119852	2.391293
midwest	1.467008	.8576158	1.71	0.087	-.2138885	3.147904
south	1.565042	.7754531	2.02	0.044	.0451818	3.084902
cy2000	.1431049	.5183115	0.28	0.782	-.872767	1.156977
_cons	-1.187571	2.539375	-0.47	0.640	-6.164655	3.789513
3						
exp	.8759361	1.461601	0.60	0.549	-1.98875	3.740622
exp2	-.080211	.5743763	-0.14	0.889	-1.205968	1.045546
midwest	-.1348248	.6247754	-0.22	0.829	-1.359362	1.089712
south	.3838582	.5457095	0.70	0.482	-.6857127	1.453429
cy2000	.2402807	.325823	0.74	0.461	-.3983117	.8788911
_cons	-1.089077	1.685742	-0.65	0.518	-4.393071	2.214917

Hispanic Females, 16-19

Multinomial probit regression

Log likelihood = -79.445785

Number of obs = 98
Wald chi2(4) = 7.40
Prob > chi2 = 0.1164

ooprobit	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
1	(base outcome)					
2						
exp	-.4550024	.4579869	-0.99	0.320	-1.35264	.4426354
midwest	2.211198	.8925193	2.48	0.013	.4618918	3.960503
_cons	-1.10698	.6988852	-1.58	0.113	-2.47677	.2628097
3						
exp	.0778449	.3038696	0.26	0.798	-.5177286	.6734185
midwest	1.265932	.7792965	1.62	0.104	-.2614606	2.793325
_cons	.0013943	.505614	0.00	0.998	-.989591	.9923796

Appendix C – Labor Force Status Effects on Earnings, by Race/Ethnicity and Age Group, 1989 to 1991

I. Before Transition

Whites, 16-19
Sample Size: 488, R^2: 0.2099

incl	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
expl	1050.422	182.4421	5.76
_Iregion_2	-788.0179	325.93	-2.42
_Iregion_3	-1303.212	339.6199	-3.84
_Iregion_4	-988.3155	377.662	-2.62
year	-86.15733	263.5517	-0.33
yeareu	-818.4792	774.2679	-1.06
eu	975.6603	571.8372	1.71
uo	508.5396	713.9027	0.71
ou	-1286.502	551.0071	-2.33
ue	1170.075	494.2084	2.37
oe	-1367.591	294.5419	-4.64
_cons	2571.131	346.5793	7.42

Blacks, 16-19
Sample Size: 78, R^2: 0.3349

incl	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
expl	78.50187	207.4284	0.38
_Iregion_2	593.4254	505.6939	1.17
_Iregion_3	44.50723	467.1227	0.10
_Iregion_4	0	(omitted)	
year	-107.1586	317.8847	-0.34
yeareu	1683.218	1131.129	1.49
eu	-405.04	997.3293	-0.41
uo	-882.7382	574.4948	-1.54
ou	-938.2928	630.7999	-1.49
ue	-90.38898	548.6355	-0.16
oe	-1460.202	405.9194	-3.60
_cons	1468.321	560.6613	2.62

Hispanics, 16-19
Sample Size: 31, R^2: 0.4724

incl	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
expl	1303.256	921.2415	1.41
_Iregion_2	-4516.742	3494.482	-1.29
_Iregion_3	-2204.545	1936.705	-1.14
_Iregion_4	-1510.325	1796.155	-0.84
year	792.2879	1459.506	0.54
yeareu	-2565.977	3024.325	-0.85
eu	2081.69	2180.258	0.95
uo	7483.258	3494.482	2.14
ou	0	(omitted)	
ue	82.35694	1888.448	0.04
oe	-238.4766	1580.308	-0.15
_cons	1910.231	2300.689	0.83

Whites, 25-44
Sample Size: 2736, R^2: 0.2545

incl	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
expl	1083.918	394.3433	2.75
expll	-8.276109	7.048444	-1.17
expschl	-51.40014	15.02397	-3.42
schl	2005.491	277.1144	7.24
_Iregion_2	-2747.514	592.094	-4.64
_Iregion_3	-2706.854	578.4739	-4.68
_Iregion_4	-2147.421	620.4293	-3.42
year	-523.5296	477.9224	-1.10
yeareu	2251.598	1119.519	2.01
eu	6909.518	959.4684	7.20
uo	-3700.786	1100.63	-3.36
ou	-6998.522	1054.307	-6.64
ue	2708.378	684.9771	3.95
oe	-7326.421	587.6863	-12.47
_cons	-17665.19	5021.151	-3.52

Blacks, 25-44
Sample Size: 428, R^2: 0.2766

incl	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
expl	1763.286	983.8998	1.79
expll	-15.67586	16.52607	-0.95
expschl	-72.22794	41.51681	-1.74
schl	2393.171	740.7673	3.23
_Iregion_2	1678.591	1740.52	0.96
_Iregion_3	-2017.538	1461.166	-1.38
_Iregion_4	6364.701	2246.877	2.83
year	481.2353	1151.207	0.42
yeareu	6757.012	2585.277	2.61
eu	173.4516	2196.151	0.08
uo	-6748.783	1849.041	-3.65
ou	-8521.948	1973.672	-4.32
ue	-384.6283	1583.711	-0.24
oe	-6081.498	1653.729	-3.68
_cons	-28159.37	12616.7	-2.23

Hispanics, 25-44
Sample Size: 253, R^2: 0.2841

incl	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
expl	1278.718	920.1209	1.39
expll	-11.98822	16.9519	-0.71
expschl	-60.77321	32.30357	-1.88
schl	1978.674	667.8745	2.96
_Iregion_2	-3921.575	2421.397	-1.62
_Iregion_3	-2905.558	1583.187	-1.84
_Iregion_4	-3316.358	1470.68	-2.25
year	445.3673	1212.057	0.37
yeareu	6520.152	2812.051	2.32
eu	942.8899	2405.528	0.39
uo	-1110.549	2435.185	-0.46
ou	-6810.233	2503.827	-2.72
ue	836.0457	1678.282	0.50
oe	-4835.829	1426.592	-3.39
_cons	-18207.18	12155.41	-1.50

Whites, 16-19
Sample Size: 505, R²: 0.1233

inc2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
exp2	1307.034	553.1146	2.36
exp22	-218.5536	275.0317	-0.79
_Iregion_2_2	-930.3078	379.0578	-2.45
_Iregion_2_3	-1371.05	406.6732	-3.37
_Iregion_2_4	-1373.022	400.6381	-3.43
year2	-342.7561	285.1701	-1.20
year2ue	-713.3081	1018.174	-0.70
eu	1365.394	513.5339	2.66
eo	-684.2248	342.7473	-2.00
uo	-2488.353	790.2618	-3.15
ou	-408.262	637.0407	-0.64
ue	682.5178	753.7355	0.91
_cons	2960.174	360.3788	8.21

Blacks, 16-19
Sample Size: 68, R²: 0.3088

inc2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
exp2	1381.624	500.3566	2.76
_Iregion_2_2	811.3948	1036.142	0.78
_Iregion_2_3	646.5601	962.2967	0.67
_Iregion_2_4	932.5248	2289.721	0.41
year2	-39.28905	718.6613	-0.05
year2ue	-267.6774	2735.455	-0.10
eu	-464.1908	1387.792	-0.33
eo	-2833.858	958.0683	-2.96
uo	-2280.366	1005.058	-2.27
ou	-1062.632	1262.081	-0.84
ue	-1426.486	2101.316	-0.68
_cons	1439.165	1079.315	1.33

Hispanics, 16-19
Sample Size: 37, R²: 0.0939

inc2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
exp2	817.1509	787.3892	1.04
_Iregion_2_2	-2349.768	4465.678	-0.53
_Iregion_2_3	255.6217	2586.438	0.10
_Iregion_2_4	277.2906	2455.573	0.11
year2	-846.6052	1446.276	-0.59
eu	-377.9355	2566.565	-0.15
eo	189.7363	1964.677	0.10
ou	-2461.36	4190.559	-0.59
uo	-3984.07	4589.661	-0.87
ue	-169.3211	2524.34	-0.07
_cons	2349.768	2300.548	1.02

Whites, 25-44
Sample Size: 2734, R²: 0.2270

inc2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
exp2	882.3045	360.5632	2.45
exp22	-8.822607	6.38823	-1.38
expsch2	-40.52991	13.55031	-2.99
sch2	1397.709	250.9342	5.57
_Iregion_2_2	-1502.905	529.5667	-2.84
_Iregion_2_3	-2338.351	519.4529	-4.50
_Iregion_2_4	-578.5691	561.6296	-1.03
year2	-15.00408	422.3375	-0.04
yearue	-1140.155	1053.931	-1.08
eu	11873.13	559.8584	20.84
eo	75.76562	517.4615	0.15
uo	-3432.685	961.3521	-3.57
ou	-1966.088	953.7768	-2.06
ue	6341.882	806.5141	7.86
_cons	-14830.51	4612.734	-3.22

Blacks, 25-44
Sample Size: 448, R²: 0.2702

inc2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
exp2	303.0152	643.554	0.47
exp22	3.882323	10.94997	0.35
expsch2	-23.83463	27.0005	-0.88
sch2	938.2242	480.3734	1.95
_Iregion_2_2	3077.128	1147.455	2.68
_Iregion_2_3	1018.725	969.5934	1.05
_Iregion_2_4	3948.773	1524.498	2.59
year2	540.0213	748.7005	0.72
yearue	-1002.375	1731.166	-0.63
eu	6755.665	1141.343	5.92
eo	-850.0933	1088.504	-0.78
uo	-3469.539	1304.543	-2.66
ou	-3778.364	1413.071	-2.67
ue	3709.743	1439.168	2.58
_cons	-9554.26	8205.261	-1.16

Hispanics, 25-44
Sample Size: 261, R²: 0.2405

inc2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
exp2	455.2049	826.0856	0.55
exp22	-9.289252	14.87863	-0.62
expsch2	-1.493627	29.09416	-0.05
sch2	282.0018	598.5931	0.47
_Iregion_2_2	-3170.527	2011.612	-1.58
_Iregion_2_3	-3277.659	1370.518	-2.39
_Iregion_2_4	302.2514	1308.138	0.23
year2	-1790.635	1064.918	-1.68
yearue	560.1513	2715.804	0.21
eu	8066.691	1413.906	5.71
eo	-669.3136	1260.179	-0.53
uo	-4592.869	2189.977	-2.10
ou	1014.529	2235.909	0.45
ue	3200.899	1892.719	1.69
_cons	-906.2483	10918.96	-0.08

Appendix D – Labor Force Status Effects on Earnings, by Race/Ethnicity and Age Group, 1999 to 2001

I. Before Transition

Whites, 16-19
Sample Size: 122, R²: 0.2226

incwag	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
expl	4106.372	2148.388	1.91
expl1	-1309.79	905.1783	-1.45
_Iregion_2	967.0454	1209.647	0.80
_Iregion_3	-1052.071	1137.651	-0.92
_Iregion_4	303.7088	1232.147	0.25
eu	3.469761	1687.386	0.00
oe	-3521.711	944.3776	-3.73
uo	-3048.435	1573.301	-1.94
ue	-1658.99	1422.351	-1.17
ou	-3275.674	1651.091	-1.98
year1	458.8738	807.3658	0.57
yearleu	-1136.179	2673.417	-0.42
_cons	3101.989	1536.811	2.02

Blacks, 16-19
Sample Size: 26, R²: 0.7042

incwag	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
expl	3655.859	4562.447	0.80
expl1	-1729.853	1721.781	-1.00
_Iregion_2	2103.543	1684.332	1.25
_Iregion_3	-2817.924	1566.749	-1.80
_Iregion_4	0	(omitted)	
ou	-959.4154	2917.228	-0.33
oe	-5011.84	1877.51	-2.67
uo	-3151.291	1690.456	-1.88
ue	-3360.607	1614.374	-2.00
ou	-3146.568	1734.912	-1.81
year1	1684.183	1123.815	1.50
yearleu	415.817	3496.883	0.12
_cons	4285.032	3722.645	1.15

Hispanics, 16-19
Sample Size: 19, R²: 0.6430

incwag	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
expl	192.4815	4703.058	0.04
expl1	413.1607	1887.197	0.22
_Iregion_2	-1863.865	4420.609	-0.42
_Iregion_3	-2557.91	3187.924	-0.80
_Iregion_4	-5145.671	2493.818	-2.06
eu	1245.375	3240.8	0.38
oe	-2843.557	2873.163	-0.99
uo	-3660.649	3847.739	-0.95
ue	-1935.604	4404.247	-0.44
ou	0	(omitted)	
year1	1777.864	1989.062	0.89
yearleu	2061.065	4754.759	0.43
_cons	4455.916	3503.771	1.27

Whites, 25-44
Sample Size: 2092, R²: 0.1524

incwag	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
expl	2189.72	809.4386	2.71
expl1	-17.10812	14.39776	-1.19
sch1	4196.641	576.2709	7.28
expsch1	-108.2438	30.51104	-3.55
_Iregion_2	-1590.953	1287.667	-1.24
_Iregion_3	-2030.259	1248.215	-1.63
_Iregion_4	-814.2749	1266.528	-0.64
eu	5514.566	1967.181	2.80
oe	-10029	1120.931	-8.95
uo	-5952.229	2139.699	-2.78
ue	3838.562	1387.393	2.77
ou	-7725.277	2344.427	-3.30
year1	407.4291	950.3954	0.43
yearleu	3397.851	2616.542	1.30
_cons	-44021.42	10481.27	-4.20

Blacks, 25-44
Sample Size: 329, R²: 0.2157

incwag	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
expl	2402.507	2184.733	1.10
expl1	-22.93602	36.23796	-0.63
sch1	4681.999	1623.439	2.88
expsch1	-141.8088	92.01689	-1.54
_Iregion_2	-2167.344	3347.101	-0.65
_Iregion_3	-3022.387	2713.442	-1.11
_Iregion_4	4302.104	6034.803	0.71
eu	-7018.46	4385.816	-1.60
oe	-18156.38	2950.361	-6.15
uo	-13120.66	4301.046	-3.05
ue	-10149.83	3341.362	-3.04
ou	-15230.66	4591.191	-3.32
year1	3437.427	2319.874	1.48
yearleu	9666.195	6030.182	1.60
_cons	-40251.3	27769.48	-1.45

Hispanics, 25-44
Sample Size: 381, R²: 0.0985

incwag	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
expl	3625.035	1853.653	1.96
expl1	-40.08061	33.36093	-1.20
sch1	4893.739	1283.653	3.81
expsch1	-205.301	64.67894	-3.17
_Iregion_2	-221.508	3887.798	-0.06
_Iregion_3	-3695.811	3105.377	-1.19
_Iregion_4	-1886.32	2867.48	-0.66
eu	2580.89	4935.564	0.52
oe	-4196.147	2632.109	-1.59
uo	-6796.467	4511.914	-1.51
ue	-374.7005	3045.588	-0.12
ou	-12966.84	4717.666	-2.75
year1	2587.869	2212.486	1.17
yearleu	-2679.126	6575.15	-0.41
_cons	-52438.16	23711.68	-2.21

II. After Transition

Whites, 16-19
Sample Size: 186, R^2: 0.1712

incwag_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
exp2	5050.617	3237.845	1.56
exp22	-1490.689	1166.016	-1.28
_Iregion_2_2	-97.19073	972.5945	-0.10
_Iregion_2_3	324.4394	957.2741	0.34
_Iregion_2_4	-1140.915	1038.237	-1.10
eu	2147.631	1508.428	1.42
eo	-1968.652	772.6588	-2.55
uo	-3932.677	1451.815	-2.71
ue	2952.616	2172.559	1.36
ou	135.4233	1588.245	0.09
year2	869.5199	690.2357	1.26
year2ue	2168.097	2853.091	0.76
_cons	960.0446	2178.405	0.44

Blacks, 16-19
Sample Size: 30, R^2: 0.5207

incwag_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
exp2	3694.841	2517.708	1.47
_Iregion_2_2	6730.756	4499.825	1.50
_Iregion_2_3	3469.875	2344.84	1.48
_Iregion_2_4	145.1131	3515.804	0.04
eu	-9506.082	6299.111	-1.51
eo	-4135.685	2519.334	-1.64
uo	-5907.667	3288.995	-1.80
ue	956.282	3947.288	0.24
ou	-1624.658	2820.662	-0.58
year2	-3178.517	1940.415	-1.64
year2ue	-1114.944	6271.445	-0.18
_cons	-1435.838	4962.955	-0.29

Hispanics, 16-19
Sample Size: 27, R^2: 0.6501

incwag_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
exp2	312.1471	1738.257	0.18
_Iregion_2_2	-3370.832	3905.141	-0.86
_Iregion_2_3	-4472.32	3129.242	-1.43
_Iregion_2_4	-9512.229	3073.851	-3.09
eu	3554.199	3610.796	0.98
eo	-4496.175	2848.699	-1.58
uo	-5005.022	3160.86	-1.84
ue	2854.421	2894.212	0.99
ou	-1233.043	3273.893	-0.38
year2	-1641.048	1994.208	-0.82
year2ue	0	(omitted)	
_cons	11398.15	3231.138	3.53

Whites, 25-44
Sample Size: 2043, R^2: 0.1096

incwag_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
exp2	1899.094	926.6812	2.05
exp22	-20.1627	16.20061	-1.24
sch2	3460.849	668.2042	5.18
expsch2	-78.09965	35.33683	-2.21
_Iregion_2_2	-2393.243	1451.943	-1.65
_Iregion_2_3	-582.0017	1418.735	-0.41
_Iregion_2_4	-758.833	1421.396	-0.53
eu	11287.8	1649.304	6.84
eo	-3950.858	1255.299	-3.15
uo	-9229.599	2413.311	-3.82
ue	7759.977	2026.543	3.83
ou	-8365.954	2723.331	-3.07
year2	2385.088	1080.514	2.21
year2ue	-2389.854	2778.881	-0.86
_cons	-39915.1	12094.13	-3.30

Blacks, 25-44
Sample Size: 331, R^2: 0.1826

incwag_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
exp2	-264.8992	1515.265	-0.17
exp22	8.717044	23.46055	0.37
sch2	1775.595	1199.782	1.48
expsch2	9.695677	74.27862	0.13
_Iregion_2_2	1503.12	2342.107	0.64
_Iregion_2_3	-758.3296	1842.162	-0.41
_Iregion_2_4	-4349.382	4354.678	-1.00
eu	2104.833	2469.24	0.85
eo	-5658.963	2042.933	-2.77
uo	-8041.488	3013.967	-2.67
ue	4171.686	2962.476	1.41
ou	-6760.159	3277.03	-2.59
year2	2464.752	1623.926	1.52
year2ue	-3438.269	3955.155	-0.87
_cons	-9925.203	19356.15	-0.51

Hispanics, 25-44
Sample Size: 381, R^2: 0.1839

incwag_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
exp2	3245.814	1155.192	2.81
exp22	-50.28867	20.17911	-2.49
sch2	3315.043	843.2249	3.93
expsch2	-138.013	41.83421	-3.30
_Iregion_2_2	3275.126	2340.4	1.40
_Iregion_2_3	-40.53885	1887.552	-0.02
_Iregion_2_4	-99.86572	1749.641	-0.06
eu	722.1459	2176.626	0.33
eo	-4940.447	1620.112	-3.05
uo	-11900.77	2651.122	-4.49
ue	2121.773	2417.369	0.88
ou	-11104.77	3057.076	-3.63
year2	3357.872	1411.82	2.38
year2ue	-3830.491	3147.244	-1.22
_cons	-39671.47	15209.25	-2.61

Appendix E – Labor Force Status Effects on Earnings, by Race/Ethnicity and Age Group, 2006 to 2008

I. Before Transition

Whites, 16-19
Sample Size: 153, R^2: 0.0993

incwag	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
exp	335.032	4608.137	0.07
expl1	-407.9797	1746.237	-0.23
_Iregion_2	591.4789	1744.727	0.34
_Iregion_3	-581.9356	1687.263	-0.34
_Iregion_4	-107.2947	1903.825	-0.06
eu	-576.7102	3645.234	-0.16
oe	-4330.908	1535.843	-2.82
uo	-1873.489	3323.228	-0.56
ue	929.9699	1943.331	0.48
ou	-4021.775	2707.52	-1.49
year1	771.0779	1370.557	0.56
year1eu	1693.358	4675.929	0.36
_cons	6999.819	3114.361	2.25

Blacks, 16-19
Sample Size: 29, R^2: 0.7355

incwag	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
exp	19435.25	7523.52	2.58
expl1	-6625.383	2574.172	-2.57
_Iregion_2	-1424.66	3245.494	-0.44
_Iregion_3	2024.577	1413.24	1.43
_Iregion_4	-360.6175	2996.485	-0.12
eu	-524.3871	2861.618	-0.18
oe	-5610.926	1877.528	-2.99
uo	-5234.724	2318.427	-2.26
ue	-5074.638	2141.386	-2.37
ou	-5435.156	3043.033	-1.79
year1	-1054.943	1624.884	-0.65
year1eu	9134.255	4051.93	2.25
_cons	-7194.307	5386.744	-1.34

Hispanics, 16-19
Sample Size: 26, R^2: 0.1649

incwag	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
exp	902.4612	2617.183	0.34
_Iregion_2	1879.629	7227.044	0.26
_Iregion_3	3133.103	5461.618	0.57
_Iregion_4	3935.463	5579.802	0.71
eo	2716.562	9332.31	0.29
oe	-195.8197	9145.937	-0.02
uo	-1860	10847.2	-0.17
ue	-4393.001	11302.76	-0.39
ou	-2834.478	10170.35	-0.28
_cons	55.07762	9285.982	0.01

Whites, 25-44
Sample Size: 2205, R^2: 0.1797

incwag	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
exp	4553.977	972.2781	4.68
expl1	-64.77292	17.6343	-3.67
nsch1	5249.89	703.7555	7.46
expnsch1	-153.8522	36.82675	-4.18
_Iregion_2	-1237.854	1707.889	-0.72
_Iregion_3	595.593	1607.481	0.37
_Iregion_4	2270.261	1644.228	1.38
eu	3337.683	2340.585	1.43
oe	-21777.33	1409.56	-15.45
uo	-16677.47	2682.899	-6.22
ue	-3743.806	1794.815	-2.09
ou	-21004.11	2892.563	-7.29
year1	-939.1258	1205.012	-0.78
year1eu	-5663.647	3295.056	-1.72
_cons	-62393.87	12591.74	-4.96

Blacks, 25-44
Sample Size: 323, R^2: 0.3287

incwag	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
exp	4128.406	1792.315	2.30
expl1	-60.55154	31.03258	-1.95
nsch1	5525.693	1267.001	4.36
expnsch1	-153.7147	73.90246	-1.67
_Iregion_2	-3230.761	3417.235	-0.95
_Iregion_3	-2246.253	2815.053	-0.80
_Iregion_4	-244.0509	3605.162	-0.07
eu	1364.097	3417.570	0.40
oe	-16676.55	2569.304	-6.49
uo	-15957.89	3271.55	-4.88
ue	-9351.842	2915.087	-3.21
ou	-20413.6	4222.602	-4.83
year1	-730.5597	2053.356	-0.36
year1eu	-3979.611	5303.642	-0.75
_cons	-66412.24	21740.61	-3.05

Hispanics, 25-44
Sample Size: 479, R^2: 0.2883

incwag	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
exp	2045.029	1154.707	1.77
expl1	-24.01975	20.63043	-1.16
nsch1	3020.459	895.9094	3.37
expnsch1	-88.49813	43.6107	-2.03
_Iregion_2	1238.926	2703.058	0.46
_Iregion_3	-3307.763	2060.38	-1.61
_Iregion_4	262.5343	1942.218	0.14
eu	6375.883	2612.737	2.44
oe	-16073.5	1706.982	-9.42
uo	-15395.68	3134.042	-4.91
ue	-2134.857	2285.717	-0.93
ou	-14892.55	3154.762	-4.72
year1	-835.6733	1464.38	-0.57
year1eu	-7051.152	3855.072	-1.83
_cons	-22962.6	15519.13	-1.48

II. After Transition

Whites, 16-19
Sample Size: 247, R^2: 0.0657

incwag_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
exp2	1763.752	848.2606	2.08
_Iregion_2_2	-659.5987	1502.222	-0.44
_Iregion_2_3	-1568.565	1412.158	-1.11
_Iregion_2_4	-1321.286	1434.012	-0.92
eu	-2173.066	2090.251	-1.04
eo	-2119.077	1338.643	-1.58
uo	-4466.294	2701.752	-1.65
ue	-755.0917	2834.466	-0.27
ou	-4533.019	1842.594	-2.46
year2	890.8728	1103.235	0.01
year2ue	-2394.506	3770.425	-0.64
_cons	5101.159	1683.022	3.03

Blacks, 16-19
Sample Size: 40, R^2: 0.6043

incwag_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
exp2	2590.207	2214.046	1.17
_Iregion_2_2	-24348.32	6592.477	-3.69
_Iregion_2_3	-5568.019	3401.223	-1.64
_Iregion_2_4	-2209.477	3876.38	-0.57
eu	4676.842	7275.981	0.64
eo	-1180.038	2954.019	-0.40
uo	4345.668	3989.692	1.09
ue	2021.945	5328.566	0.38
ou	-4582.163	3324.668	-1.38
year2	1096.603	2525.413	0.43
year2ue	27864.88	7983.63	3.49
_cons	3410.764	5122.643	0.57

Hispanics, 16-19
Sample Size: 52, R^2: 0.2928

incwag_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
exp2	3497.383	1523.164	2.30
_Iregion_2_2	2980.568	4266.516	0.70
_Iregion_2_3	849.1944	3178.857	0.27
_Iregion_2_4	2664.868	3098.93	0.86
eu	-316.8299	3638.591	-0.09
eo	-3480.031	2431.498	-1.43
uo	-1571.541	7127.563	-0.22
ue	-122.4906	3053.055	-0.03
ou	-6812.762	3055.638	-2.23
year2	-5366.646	2085.636	-2.57
year2ue	0	(omitted)	
_cons	4371.541	3517.628	1.24

Whites, 25-44
Sample Size: 2239, R^2: 0.1301

incwag_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
exp2	2875.073	1136.462	2.53
exp22	-34.44271	20.1938	-1.71
nsch2	4614.266	826.3742	5.56
expnsch2	-96.85897	44.25502	-2.19
_Iregion_2_2	2116.012	1953.625	1.08
_Iregion_2_3	1257.753	1857.862	0.68
_Iregion_2_4	2093.892	1905.08	1.10
eu	5037.3	2073.994	2.43
eo	-15707.12	1630.991	-9.63
uo	-22032.97	2973.719	-7.41
ue	603.9124	2712.323	0.22
ou	-17408.7	3329.366	-5.23
year2	218.1596	1387.397	0.16
year2ue	51.59832	3715.416	0.01
_cons	-52655.16	14763.38	-3.57

Blacks, 25-44
Sample Size: 332, R^2: 0.2622

incwag_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
exp2	1334.983	792.7941	1.68
exp22	-31.97737	23.39584	-1.37
nsch2	2499.174	498.3816	5.01
_Iregion_2_2	-1934.913	3273.851	-0.59
_Iregion_2_3	-1867.431	2681.565	-0.70
_Iregion_2_4	2553.711	3433.151	0.74
eu	469.2959	2863.436	0.16
eo	-14980.02	2374.523	-6.31
uo	-16955.18	3083.027	-5.51
ue	-8274.964	3789.046	-2.18
ou	-7830.068	4077.156	-1.92
year2	990.7413	1907.308	0.52
year2ue	7984.766	4812.836	1.66
_cons	-23405.38	9564.549	-2.45

Hispanics, 25-44
Sample Size: 493, R^2: 0.2010

incwag_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
exp2	2511.828	1124.938	2.23
exp22	-28.42736	20.10487	-1.41
nsch2	3182.259	882.682	3.60
expnsch2	-104.7491	42.98836	-2.44
_Iregion_2_2	17.9555	2546.187	0.01
_Iregion_2_3	-132.6999	1970.687	-0.07
_Iregion_2_4	1812.975	1861.014	0.97
eu	2174.016	2008.754	1.08
eo	-10288.77	1624.773	-6.33
uo	-13516.17	2903.217	-4.66
ue	1759.175	2784.814	0.63
ou	-9272.872	2931.765	-3.16
year2	-833.7075	1375.729	-0.61
year2ue	2545.289	3813.266	0.67
_cons	-34140.31	15157.18	-2.25

Appendix F – Labor Force Status Effects on Earnings, by Gender and Age Group, 1989 to 1991

I. Before Transition

Males, 16-19
Sample Size: 313, R^2: 0.1974

incl	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
expl	1081.126	251.948	4.29
_Iregion_2	-802.4931	489.1101	-1.64
_Iregion_3	-1657.845	504.3519	-3.29
_Iregion_4	-521.1452	555.3521	-0.94
year	-84.89423	391.7677	-0.22
yeareu	-399.2653	1067.935	-0.37
eu	776.8278	805.9873	0.96
uo	-24.45136	1058.537	-0.02
ou	-1704.399	709.7512	-2.40
ue	447.9019	654.807	0.68
oe	-1709.143	449.3306	-3.80
_cons	2911.768	534.8171	5.44

Females, 16-19
Sample Size: 279, R^2: 0.2331

incl	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
expl	554.5781	163.6306	3.39
_Iregion_2	-715.4255	305.5385	-2.34
_Iregion_3	-1034.936	298.2227	-3.47
_Iregion_4	-887.9787	372.9441	-2.38
year	-96.0765	232.3331	-0.41
yeareu	-1727.883	792.6814	-2.18
eu	1281.245	582.8752	2.20
uo	-325.2865	516.8422	-0.63
ou	-1231.714	554.7027	-2.22
ue	1266.858	515.6259	2.46
oe	-1162.363	257.4892	-4.51
_cons	2303.338	309.1676	7.45

Males, 25-44
Sample Size: 1124, R^2: 0.2502

incl	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
expl	1835.033	726.6667	2.53
expll	-25.49338	12.74736	-2.00
expschl	-41.05514	27.45224	-1.50
schl	2350.880	515.024	4.56
_Iregion_2	-4425.109	1130.904	-3.91
_Iregion_3	-6443.765	1081.244	-5.96
_Iregion_4	-4992.18	1216.662	-4.10
year	-1817.57	1007.31	-1.80
yeareu	2780.325	1774.397	1.57
eu	5174.971	1687.39	3.07
uo	-6318.472	1971.317	-3.21
cu	-9743.427	2070.915	-4.70
ue	980.8075	1318.184	0.74
oe	-7607.711	1605.735	-4.74
_cons	-23467.4	9377.769	-2.50

Females, 25-44
Sample Size: 2185, R^2: 0.2110

incl	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
expl	1214.786	346.6752	3.50
expll	-9.913728	6.228795	-1.59
expschl	-72.22264	13.51471	-5.34
schl	2087.597	245.3045	8.51
_Iregion_2	-1223.901	531.2746	-2.30
_Iregion_3	-766.1246	493.9901	-1.55
_Iregion_4	561.0859	551.9368	1.02
year	274.6525	392.6369	0.70
yeareu	4248.375	1167.344	3.64
eu	187.498	951.1098	0.20
uo	-4654.229	874.6627	-5.32
ou	-6500.361	841.2357	-7.73
ue	-1109.392	648.2004	-1.71
oo	-6660.819	459.8938	-14.48
_cons	-19192.16	4384.239	-4.38

II. After Transition

Males, 16-19
Sample Size: 279, R^2: 0.1481

inc2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
exp2	1188.604	769.1241	1.55
exp22	-140.3728	367.107	-0.38
_Iregion_2_2	134.9952	583.5978	0.23
_Iregion_2_3	-492.3742	623.5749	-0.79
_Iregion_2_4	-792.5247	617.5451	-1.28
year2	-683.0012	434.0827	-1.57
year2ue	224.7224	1544.362	0.15
eu	2154.84	738.0227	2.92
eo	-1063.152	526.6812	-2.02
uo	-2497.979	1008.443	-2.48
ou	-831.4225	794.7392	-1.05
ue	26.80208	1013.884	0.03
_cons	2839.322	601.6731	4.72

Females, 16-19
Sample Size: 317, R^2: 0.1079

inc2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
exp2	901.1156	528.701	1.70
exp22	-97.13518	274.6144	-0.35
_Iregion_2_2	-1328.904	421.1457	-3.16
_Iregion_2_3	-1321.782	418.3369	-3.16
_Iregion_2_4	-1337.805	441.8972	-3.03
year2	-115.6964	301.4106	-0.38
year2ue	-139.435	1161.327	-0.12
eu	196.2834	603.6688	0.33
eo	-805.2597	362.2888	-2.22
uo	-1895.001	708.7228	-2.67
ou	-449.1696	801.7294	-0.56
ue	-169.1157	935.219	-0.18
_cons	2911.897	367.9202	7.91

Males, 25-44
Sample Size: 1135, R^2: 0.2445

inc2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
exp2	1060.079	640.4581	1.66
exp22	-15.5959	11.18908	-1.39
expsch2	-16.46094	24.21224	-0.68
sch2	1313.676	451.3947	2.91
_Iregion_2_2	-2069.187	998.9844	-2.07
_Iregion_2_3	-4675.832	945.2325	-4.95
_Iregion_2_4	-1354.418	1046.47	-1.29
year2	-875.8942	845.085	-1.04
yearue	-1243.01	1638.272	-0.76
eu	8421.012	1314.374	6.41
eo	-3544.272	1439.612	-2.46
uo	-8335.702	1857.691	-4.49
ou	-5154.957	1962.564	-2.63
ue	2941.04	1592.455	1.85
_cons	-12267	8309.606	-1.48

Females, 25-44
Sample Size: 2192, R^2: 0.1432

inc2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
exp2	1183.827	325.1686	3.64
exp22	-11.945	5.80155	-2.06
expsch2	-66.8384	12.53164	-5.33
sch2	1692.197	228.4969	7.41
_Iregion_2_2	-768.2186	485.6567	-1.58
_Iregion_2_3	-877.3787	456.6776	-1.92
_Iregion_2_4	207.3624	514.1899	0.40
year2	510.3112	361.0893	1.41
yearue	-461.5959	1085.732	-0.43
eu	6634.911	578.5811	11.47
eo	-151.7215	416.2079	-0.36
uo	-3282.714	773.6556	-4.24
ou	-2855.337	776.6739	-3.68
ue	2910.305	794.5589	3.66
_cons	-18744.03	4135.372	-4.53

Appendix G – Labor Force Status Effects on Earnings, by Gender and Age Group, 1999 to 2001

I.   Before Transition

Males, 16-19
Sample Size: 83, R^2: 0.2383

incwag	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
exp1	7526.103	3265.373	2.30
exp11	-2819.525	1273.757	-2.21
_Iregion_2	2255.953	1749.72	1.29
_Iregion_3	-545.0441	1675.193	-0.33
_Iregion_4	1696.005	1769.919	0.96
eu	451.6091	1800.603	0.25
oe	-2686.016	1337.171	-2.01
uo	-2285.811	1612.873	-1.42
ue	-2507.011	1483.577	-1.69
ou	-3122.349	1741.821	-1.79
year1	786.5906	1025.227	0.77
year1eu	-993.4217	2738.053	-0.36
_cons	227.884	2469.694	0.09

Females, 16-19
Sample Size: 78, R^2: 0.3566

incwag	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
exp1	2831.024	2417.363	1.17
exp11	-970.2678	1026.58	-0.95
_Iregion_2	939.6179	1396.958	0.67
_Iregion_3	-1621.635	1207.326	-1.34
_Iregion_4	-945.2147	1320.148	0.72
eu	3362.733	3932.97	0.86
oe	-4135.408	1032.113	-4.01
uo	-4088.171	1541.314	-2.65
ue	-587.8243	2331.074	-0.25
ou	-4975.643	1685.572	-2.95
year1	1017.296	907.2484	1.12
year1eu	-4773.496	5591.792	-0.85
_cons	4477.925	1741.556	2.57

Males, 25-44
Sample Size: 892, R^2: 0.1991

incwag	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
exp1	2890.913	1342.454	2.15
exp11	-49.40591	23.27266	-2.12
schl	4194.953	982.4497	4.27
expschl	-47.79586	52.27627	-0.91
_Iregion_2	711.0986	2092.219	0.34
_Iregion_3	-1223.828	2037.488	-0.60
_Iregion_4	-1902.569	2043.561	-0.93
eu	-847.0717	2695.326	-0.31
oe	-11776.26	2121.499	-5.55
uo	-10310.62	3285.445	-3.14
ue	-935.1024	2101.608	-0.44
ou	-18179.63	3997.838	-4.55
year1	799.2233	1622.141	0.49
year1eu	7942.769	3442.922	2.31
_cons	-49834.18	17584.23	-2.83

Females, 25-44
Sample Size: 1700, R^2: 0.1538

incwag	Coef.	std. Err.	t
exp1	2293.766	801.06	2.86
exp11	-13.81394	14.30975	-0.97
schl	4478.137	553.3052	8.09
expschl	-143.9961	29.71675	-4.85
_Iregion_2	-2311.305	1308.227	-1.77
_Iregion_3	-1498.339	1213.155	-1.24
_Iregion_4	751.6736	1285.707	0.58
eu	525.0305	2377.076	0.22
oe	-10442.08	1050.691	-9.94
uo	-6841.436	2063.103	-3.32
ue	-354.3954	1478.37	-0.24
ou	-5958.192	2126.586	-2.80
year1	704.1559	913.2122	0.77
year1eu	428.2406	3204.414	0.13
_cons	-45678.6	10224.52	-4.47

II. After Transition

Males, 16-19
Sample Size: 122, R^2: 0.3126

incwag_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
exp2	6093.371	5247.376	1.16
exp22	-1452.81	1846.489	-0.79
_Iregion_2_2	841.7818	1400.646	0.60
_Iregion_2_3	905.9172	1296.593	0.70
_Iregion_2_4	-1517.605	1351.215	-1.12
eu	2456.34	1862.414	1.32
eo	-3007.946	1047.118	-2.87
uo	-4690.138	1595.649	-2.94
ue	3668.532	2048.132	1.79
ou	694.3473	1617.837	0.43
year2	166.9537	896.2889	0.19
year2ue	1784.066	2929.062	0.61
_cons	-125.4633	3401.636	-0.04

Females, 16-19
Sample Size: 117, R^2: 0.1130

incwag_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
exp2	5574.393	3351.324	1.66
exp22	-2185.47	1224.39	-1.78
_Iregion_2_2	40.11075	1090.151	0.04
_Iregion_2_3	414.9299	1101.239	0.38
_Iregion_2_4	416.6549	1110.04	0.38
eu	-791.1361	1941.712	-0.41
eo	-1472.992	855.1561	-1.72
uo	-3465.934	1740.955	-1.99
ue	-831.9426	4125.676	-0.20
ou	-2909.322	1413.99	-2.06
year2	295.5221	765.3471	0.39
year2ue	3094.32	4694.193	0.66
_cons	1083.381	2318.789	0.47

Males, 25-44
Sample Size: 873, R^2: 0.1404

incwag_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
exp2	3480.443	1512.057	2.30
exp22	-52.66114	26.14885	-2.01
sch2	4364.004	1118.385	3.90
expsch2	-93.15687	59.53933	-1.56
_Iregion_2_2	-1018.409	2438.513	-0.42
_Iregion_2_3	1039.394	2355.754	0.44
_Iregion_2_4	1157.004	2335.906	0.50
eu	5555.623	2522.31	2.20
eo	-8789.415	2452.401	-3.58
uo	-15649.13	3764.421	-4.16
ue	4286.025	3133.178	1.37
ou	-14254.16	4850.532	-2.94
year2	4805.226	1857.573	2.59
year2ue	-4580.988	3916.536	-1.17
_cons	-58152.76	20031.72	-2.90

Females, 25-44
Sample Size: 1666, R^2: 0.0930

incwag_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
exp2	1481.219	879.8208	1.68
exp22	-10.48189	15.34763	-0.68
sch2	3359.355	621.4405	5.41
expsch2	-82.4925	33.60248	-2.45
_Iregion_2_2	-2397.265	1408.355	-1.70
_Iregion_2_3	-1321.361	1310.097	-1.01
_Iregion_2_4	-1255.71	1382.15	-0.91
eu	5920.972	1838.247	3.22
eo	-2266.001	1124.698	-2.01
uo	-7518.025	2241.545	-3.35
ue	5881.396	2061.598	2.85
ou	-6803.046	2354.499	-2.89
year2	844.9874	1004.562	0.84
year2ue	-2129.717	2928.456	-0.73
_cons	-35542.44	11303.46	-3.14

Appendix H – Labor Force Status Effects on Earnings, by Gender and Age Group, 2006 to 2008

I. Before Transition

Males, 16-19
Sample Size: 104, R^2: 0.1463

incwag	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
exp	-2608.619	1456.848	-1.79
_Iregion_2	-1188.155	2482.526	-0.48
_Iregion_3	-1154.87	2168.711	-0.53
_Iregion_4	-14.34124	2337.936	-0.01
eu	-641.1922	4041.022	-0.16
uo	-7173.351	3341.065	-2.15
ue	-2492.397	2262.544	-1.10
ou	-8104.119	3265.998	-2.48
oe	-6499.297	2287.576	-2.84
year1	-1401.19	1872.383	-0.75
year1eu	2802.19	5797.493	0.48
_cons	13563.88	2965.022	4.57

Females, 16-19
Sample Size: 100, R^2: 0.2583

incwag	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
exp	1243.978	893.5898	1.39
_Iregion_2	3771.947	1486.655	2.54
_Iregion_3	1988.495	1391.887	1.43
_Iregion_4	626.8269	1550.299	0.40
eu	137.4663	2731.989	0.05
uo	1301.313	2495.67	0.52
ue	1929.197	1844.875	1.05
ou	-2469.338	2723.839	-0.91
oe	-3176.083	1231.002	-2.58
year1	816.8421	1103.682	0.74
year1eu	2388.429	3458.603	0.69
_cons	652.7611	1920.832	0.34

Males, 25-44
Sample Size: 1103, R^2: 0.2120

incwag	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
exp	5788.863	1452.553	3.99
exp11	-97.39861	26.31754	-3.70
nsch1	5702.234	1083.442	5.26
expnsch1	-126.4863	56.08758	-2.26
_Iregion_2	-1130.552	2614.945	-0.43
_Iregion_3	-673.0634	2482.491	-0.27
_Iregion_4	2647.325	2471.558	1.07
eu	-3059.878	3108.278	-0.98
oe	-23273.02	2616.074	-8.90
uo	-24516.34	3865.268	-6.34
ue	-9296.534	2426.551	-3.83
ou	-26539.2	4166.878	-6.37
year1	-3078.171	1888.469	-1.63
year1eu	-4105.352	4225.193	-0.97
_cons	-74221.68	18954.79	-3.92

Females, 25-44
Sample Size: 1646, R^2: 0.1769

incwag	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
exp	3541.877	916.4881	3.86
exp11	-39.6132	16.54555	-2.39
nsch1	4885.744	642.3692	7.61
expnsch1	-164.2498	34.79079	-4.72
_Iregion_2	-1954.823	1664.831	-1.17
_Iregion_3	158.5461	1481.711	0.11
_Iregion_4	-529.7654	1564.570	-0.34
eu	4768.407	2479.293	1.92
oe	-16408.72	1245.653	-13.17
uo	-9903.057	2270.837	-4.36
ue	-5177.795	1904.03	-2.72
ou	-15883.83	2652.083	-5.99
year1	178.8019	1094.266	0.16
year1eu	-5567.922	3753.273	-1.48
_cons	-53301.18	11668.27	-4.57

II. After Transition

Males, 16-19
Sample Size: 170, R^2: 0.1086

incwag_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
exp2	2774.52	1336.593	2.08
_Iregion_2_2	-2160.53	2343.863	-0.92
_Iregion_2_3	-3558.457	2005.509	-1.77
_Iregion_2_4	-1408.846	2043.273	-0.69
eu	-3982.976	3093.959	-1.29
eo	165.4793	2154.346	0.08
uo	-5648.124	3156.864	-1.79
ue	1304.668	3530.914	0.37
ou	-5494.332	2355.619	-2.33
year2	971.4288	1650.489	0.59
year2ue	-2477.072	4720.397	-0.52
_cons	5473.895	2514.201	2.18

Females, 16-19
Sample Size: 136, R^2: 0.1313

incwag_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
exp2	377.4681	701.509	0.54
_Iregion_2_2	1803.738	1303.993	1.38
_Iregion_2_3	-704.0394	1137.072	-0.62
_Iregion_2_4	-769.881	1278.802	-0.60
eu	-54.8863	2084.85	-0.03
eo	-2902.75	1014.664	-2.86
uo	112.6592	2056.202	0.05
ue	716.4996	2657.771	0.27
ou	-4160.533	1719.562	-2.42
year2	653.588	900.6567	0.73
year2ue	-60.43934	3661.398	-0.02
_cons	3812.072	1472.018	2.59

Males, 25-44
Sample Size: 1160, R^2: 0.2027

incwag_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
exp2	4022.635	1681.72	2.39
exp22	-59.1482	29.66943	-1.99
nsch2	5697.243	1247.237	4.57
expnsch2	-81.47581	65.0779	-1.25
_Iregion_2_2	2502.151	3041.858	0.82
_Iregion_2_3	-1268.352	2862.473	-0.44
_Iregion_2_4	-1193.833	2881.573	-0.41
eu	-6184.715	2884.741	-2.14
eo	-25673.54	2807.359	-9.15
uo	-33609.81	4380.33	-7.67
ue	-12547.46	3749.569	-3.35
ou	-29615.83	5052.102	-5.86
year2	-1671.257	2166.15	-0.77
year2ue	1656.186	4852.76	0.34
_cons	-64428.81	22202.55	-2.90

Females, 25-44
Sample Size: 1653, R^2: 0.1000

incwag_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
exp2	1709.197	981.7277	1.74
exp22	-14.50121	17.37393	-0.83
nsch2	3109.214	701.1452	4.43
expnsch2	-87.39649	38.96479	-2.24
_Iregion_2_2	683.078	1725.199	0.40
_Iregion_2_3	455.2154	1552.658	0.29
_Iregion_2_4	92.59066	1647.287	0.06
eu	6709.402	2011.228	3.34
eo	-7842.974	1311.66	-5.98
uo	-13510.54	2285.359	-5.91
ue	5026.683	2623.352	1.92
ou	-8270.505	2726.118	-3.03
year2	1994.591	1154.061	1.73
year2ue	-1069.845	3653.512	-0.29
_cons	-31866.72	12530.89	-2.54

Appendix I – Labor Force Status Effects on Weeks Worked per Year, by Race/Ethnicity and Age Group, 1989 to 1991

I. Before Transition

Whites, 16-19
Sample Size: 372

wkslyr	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
hwag	.0475536	.008306	5.73
income1	.001546	.0003309	4.67
year	.3000278	1.777785	0.17
yeareu	4.64027	4.775309	0.97
_Iregion_2	-.2419611	2.180531	-0.11
_Iregion_3	-.8334995	2.381258	-0.35
_Iregion_4	-2.939773	2.44249	-1.20
eu	-6.941825	3.379734	-2.05
uo	-18.98906	4.119786	-3.00
ou	-16.36502	4.008716	-4.08
oe	-15.5528	2.070951	-7.51
ue	-12.11064	2.918641	-4.15
_cons	27.14163	2.475189	10.97

Blacks, 16-19
Sample Size: 46

wkslyr	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
hwag	.1222528	.0406615	3.01
income1	.0002233	.0016916	0.13
year	-.9744128	4.192942	-0.23
yeareu	9.192968	14.29682	0.64
_Iregion_2	8.935242	6.354024	1.41
_Iregion_3	4.896413	5.532236	0.89
_Iregion_4	0	(omitted)	
eu	-6.274934	12.92846	-0.49
uo	-3.947757	6.509528	-0.60
ou	-5.907183	7.931206	-0.74
oe	-8.319932	5.65234	-1.47
ue	2.228691	5.591399	0.40
_cons	7.539795	6.546073	1.15

Hispanics, 16-19
Sample Size: 23

wkslyr	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
hwag	.0776153	.0538684	1.44
income1	.0019937	.0012409	1.61
year	-16.32112	5.70347	-2.86
yeareu	-3.79006	9.147901	-0.41
_Iregion_2	0	(omitted)	
_Iregion_3	-16.89855	6.625899	-2.55
_Iregion_4	4.404111	7.760517	0.57
eu	2.076382	6.710926	0.31
uo	-77.26673	10.43673	7.40
ou	0	(omitted)	
oe	-17.47603	5.321114	-3.28
ue	-22.47713	6.395483	-3.51
_cons	34.058	6.473532	5.26

Whites, 25-44
Sample Size: 2056

wkslyr	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
hwag	.017455	.0022669	7.70
income1	.0014342	.0002146	6.68
year	-.3723937	1.026081	-0.36
yeareu	-.3739037	2.292985	-0.16
incsch1	-.0000665	.0000149	-4.47
sch1	.4175441	.2607403	1.60
_Iregion_2	-.7999827	1.273312	-0.63
_Iregion_3	-.156203	1.236352	-0.13
_Iregion_4	-2.632904	1.330553	-1.98
eu	4.061596	1.933996	2.10
uo	-12.86284	2.357873	-5.46
ou	-13.15624	2.534284	-5.19
oe	-13.33237	1.313043	-10.15
ue	-6.367426	1.330515	-4.79
_cons	28.91033	3.654248	7.91

Blacks, 25-44
Sample Size: 333

wkslyr	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
hwag	.0521537	.011884	4.39
income1	.0037572	.0005465	6.87
incsch1	-.0002893	.0000376	-7.70
year	-3.072238	2.617847	-1.17
yeareu	4.993719	5.420832	0.92
sch1	3.205071	.7139802	4.49
eu	-8.961134	4.527249	-1.98
oe	-16.43803	4.034536	-4.07
ou	-22.87147	5.093862	-4.49
uo	-10.28825	3.239698	-3.18
ue	-14.71425	4.222818	-3.48
_Iregion_2	-3.884251	3.969819	-0.98
_Iregion_3	-1.638557	3.294089	-0.50
_Iregion_4	3.780177	4.893048	0.77
_cons	-1.055288	10.05606	-0.10

Hispanics, 25-44
Sample Size: 191

wkslyr	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
hwag	.0550685	.0179479	3.07
income1	.0004179	.00072	0.58
year	-5.57571	3.499268	-1.59
yeareu	7.377984	8.355147	0.88
incsch1	.0000329	.0000528	0.62
sch1	-.058489	.6319178	-0.09
_Iregion_2	-19.49934	7.722772	-2.52
_Iregion_3	-4.514498	4.910878	-0.92
_Iregion_4	-7.150735	4.448288	-1.61
eu	-5.87436	6.664119	-0.88
uo	-13.68171	6.647053	-2.06
ou	1.5878	9.181441	0.17
oe	-18.89449	4.528027	-4.17
ue	-9.140233	4.390844	-2.08
_cons	36.29006	8.664307	4.19

II. After Transition

Whites, 16-19
Sample Size: 430

wkslyr_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
hwag2	.0030026	.0066639	9.67
income2	.0009804	.000307	3.19
year2	.6768472	1.378625	0.49
year2ue	1.084375	4.695416	0.23
_Iregion_2_2	-1.117234	1.643163	-0.60
_Iregion_2_3	-4.398172	2.012103	-2.19
_Iregion_2_4	-1.87266	1.96103	-0.95
eu	5.648749	2.34926	2.40
eo	-.0849899	1.710273	-0.05
ou	-4.955597	2.861134	-1.72
uo	-8.005159	4.815836	-1.66
ue	5.802258	3.420471	1.70
_cons	16.08207	1.941768	8.28

Blacks, 16-19
Sample Size: 48

wkslyr_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
hwag2	.1309978	.0217025	6.04
income2	.0003625	.0006808	0.53
year2	-4.684871	3.129199	-1.50
year2ue	24.02856	11.66836	2.06
_Iregion_2_2	5.755306	4.643313	1.24
_Iregion_2_3	8.43631	4.632227	1.82
_Iregion_2_4	6.726706	8.814538	0.76
eu	6.273639	5.063233	1.24
eo	-1.566491	4.95004	-0.32
ou	2.953078	4.672351	0.63
uo	-1.092154	6.324392	-0.17
ue	4.993769	7.671668	0.65
_cons	2.339039	5.239386	0.45

Hispanics, 16-19
Sample Size: 26

wkslyr_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
hwag2	.0657393	.0347075	1.89
income2	.0012354	.0011181	1.10
year2	-1.120728	4.891248	-0.23
_Iregion_2_2	0	(omitted)	
_Iregion_2_3	3.779833	7.942571	0.48
_Iregion_2_4	9.915449	7.570805	1.31
eu	3.202516	6.333391	0.51
eo	13.75946	6.074435	2.27
ou	-3.490344	10.18779	-0.34
uo	0	(omitted)	
ue	-.7224595	6.547344	-0.11
_cons	8.380499	7.810266	1.07

Whites, 25-44
Sample Size: 2267

wkslyr_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
hwag2	.0118272	.0012947	9.14
income2	.000349	.000391	8.92
year2	.3509981	.791507	0.44
year2ue	-.6696918	1.823772	-0.37
sch2	-.8941435	.1460411	-6.12
_Iregion_2_2	-.9232015	.9779254	-0.94
_Iregion_2_3	.6692977	.9657936	0.69
_Iregion_2_4	-.8823974	1.041774	-0.85
eu	8.266362	1.06883	7.73
eo	-.0247904	.9655218	-0.03
ou	-8.502642	2.073209	-4.10
uo	-6.674063	2.466682	-2.71
ue	4.694011	1.409647	3.33
_cons	35.69595	2.177746	16.39

Blacks, 25-44
Sample Size: 304

wkslyr_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
hwag2	.0440459	.0111325	3.96
income2	.0000369	.0002561	0.14
year2	-.4218937	2.499139	-0.17
year2ue	-.3973072	5.061502	-0.08
sch2	-.0709735	.4862006	-0.15
_Iregion_2_2	-1.022035	4.081235	-0.25
_Iregion_2_3	-.9723643	3.384937	-0.29
_Iregion_2_4	-7.256179	5.009773	-1.45
eu	3.910349	3.420804	1.14
eo	-4.660920	3.533712	-1.32
ou	-12.74431	5.059663	-2.52
uo	-17.1678	5.13429	-3.34
ue	.788418	4.201893	0.19
_cons	29.29498	7.601477	3.85

Hispanics, 25-44
Sample Size: 188

wkslyr_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
hwag2	.0664713	.0120498	5.52
income2	.0004664	.0002026	1.72
year2	2.247972	2.469484	0.91
year2ue	-4.720705	5.20464	-0.91
sch2	-.9691398	.3130266	-3.10
_Iregion_2_2	-3.107085	4.529807	-0.69
_Iregion_2_3	-.4172284	3.119632	-0.13
_Iregion_2_4	-3.426389	3.016355	-1.14
eu	-2.921061	3.139099	-0.93
eo	.5131609	2.894504	0.18
ou	-6.389564	5.488483	-1.16
uo	-2.290793	7.906467	-0.29
ue	1.176686	3.827427	0.31
_cons	28.54965	5.129864	5.57

Appendix J – Labor Force Status Effects on Weeks Worked per Year, by Race/Ethnicity and Age Group, 1999 to 2001

I. Before Transition

Whites, 16-19
Sample Size: 89

wkslyr	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
hwag	.0078599	.0057753	1.36
income1	.0019079	.0004016	4.75
year1	-2.351069	3.560087	-0.66
_Iregion_2	-5.095141	5.114036	-1.00
_Iregion_3	-3.537026	4.954728	-0.71
_Iregion_4	-4.710153	5.436236	-0.87
year1eu	18.89646	11.75453	1.61
eu	3.683856	7.276605	0.51
oe	-18.37269	4.273479	-4.30
ou	-16.11981	6.997575	-2.30
ue	-5.222781	5.944834	-0.88
uo	-28.62355	8.252606	-3.47
_cons	32.20907	5.909474	5.45

Blacks, 16-19
Sample Size: 11

wkslyr	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
hwag	.4133657	.0332557	12.43
income1	-.0036354	.0003889	-9.35
year1	-37.86609	3.376888	-11.21
eu	7.257016	4.11795	1.76
uo	-57.71561	4.817163	-11.98
ou	0	(omitted)	
ue	4.84211	2.978247	1.63
oe	-71.06066	5.28073	-13.46
_cons	24.29016	4.088517	5.94

Hispanics, 16-19
Cannot be estimated because sample size is too small

Whites, 25-44
Sample Size: 1575

wkslyr	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
hwag	.0062787	.0017235	3.64
income1	.0004349	.0000499	8.71
sch1	-.4840502	.2658367	-1.82
year1	2.505705	1.388449	1.80
_Iregion_2	.6382252	1.833299	0.35
_Iregion_3	1.746817	1.843649	0.95
_Iregion_4	-3.128574	1.802879	-1.74
year1eu	-5.070203	3.564698	-1.42
eu	1.13171	2.69058	0.42
oe	-15.43265	1.726349	-8.94
ou	-25.395	4.257522	-5.96
ue	-11.57833	1.848932	-6.26
uo	-21.05881	2.939444	-7.16
_cons	49.64463	3.855372	12.88

Blacks, 25-44
Sample Size: 233

wkslyr	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
hwag	.0220225	.0068433	3.22
income1	.0004446	.00018	2.47
sch1	-.8401281	1.011841	-0.83
year1	3.465648	3.891017	0.89
_Iregion_2	5.394182	5.576886	0.97
_Iregion_3	1.933749	4.651593	0.42
_Iregion_4	-10.1361	9.643467	-1.05
year1eu	-9.681137	9.424849	-1.03
eu	4.877326	6.977669	0.70
oe	-17.52758	5.440359	-3.22
ou	-20.84939	8.340551	-2.50
ue	-15.71118	5.276012	-2.98
uo	-25.87561	6.506947	-3.98
_cons	49.17497	12.69275	3.87

Hispanics, 25-44
Sample Size: 266

wkslyr	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
hwag	.0210866	.0046933	4.49
sch1	-.6830715	.5374428	-1.27
year1	2.672631	3.793777	0.70
_Iregion_2	-5.812462	6.370173	-0.91
_Iregion_3	-2.334102	5.537828	-0.42
_Iregion_4	-11.0995	4.994942	-2.22
year1eu	-2.601429	10.20559	-0.25
eu	-.3125033	7.574798	-0.04
oe	-9.253732	4.820048	-1.92
ou	-33.72367	12.91926	-2.61
ue	-13.44109	4.654655	-2.89
uo	-14.54011	7.500698	-1.94
_cons	60.02455	8.22526	7.30

II. After Transition

Whites, 16-19
Sample Size: 154

wkslyr_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
hwag2	.0468532	.0100753	4.65
income2	.0004694	.000274	1.71
_Iregion_2_2	9.608048	3.498034	2.77
_Iregion_2_3	11.41523	3.478671	3.28
_Iregion_2_4	8.970671	4.016349	2.23
year2	1.381136	2.55255	0.54
year2ue	-26.74381	9.396391	-2.85
eu	2.870714	5.081932	0.56
eo	-2.352619	2.863065	-0.82
uo	-10.1119	5.885064	-1.72
ou	-3.888475	5.595306	-0.69
ue	6.48167	7.204368	0.90
_cons	8.554406	3.620228	2.36

Blacks, 16-19
Sample Size: 20

wkslyr_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
hwag2	.061916	.0854867	0.72
income2	.0005055	.0020405	0.25
_Iregion_2_2	17.19273	16.21573	1.06
_Iregion_2_3	-8.020607	12.7585	-0.63
_Iregion_2_4	-3.31757	19.49083	-0.17
year2	-2.458197	8.070338	-0.30
year2ue	-27.80875	18.31565	-1.52
eu	0	(omitted)	
eo	12.61356	10.32022	1.22
uo	-16.0153	23.65151	-0.68
ou	11.93004	9.481484	1.23
ue	-.4024218	10.02472	-0.04
_cons	18.10869	12.51577	1.45

Hispanics, 16-19
Sample Size: 17

wkslyr_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
hwag2	.145216	.050135	2.90
income2	.0068179	.001279	5.33
hwag2inc	-.0000189	4.03e-06	-4.69
year2	-15.24149	8.779812	-1.74
eu	33.08851	13.65858	2.42
eo	2.587022	12.28632	0.21
uo	0	(omitted)	
ou	3.874553	12.56307	0.31
ue	-12.17308	8.499223	-1.43
_cons	-2.86697	7.533534	-0.38

Whites, 25-44
Sample Size: 1596

wkslyr_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
hwag2	.0083424	.0018504	4.51
income2	.0002472	.0000486	5.09
sch2	-.9490005	.2228161	-4.26
_Iregion_2_2	-.148057	1.549388	-0.10
_Iregion_2_3	2.182102	1.541398	1.42
_Iregion_2_4	-.5423371	1.519288	-0.36
year2	.4086629	1.182089	0.35
year2ue	-.1775874	2.755505	-0.06
eu	4.462408	1.679315	2.66
eo	-2.986629	1.363254	-2.19
uo	-11.87421	3.380172	-3.51
ou	-13.73833	3.462804	-3.97
ue	1.3335	2.02262	0.66
_cons	43.22782	3.248724	13.31

Blacks, 25-44
Sample Size: 235

wkslyr_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
hwag2	.0372014	.0102662	3.62
income2	.0003498	.0002463	1.42
sch2	-1.375226	.742655	-1.85
_Iregion_2_2	5.999612	4.23445	1.42
_Iregion_2_3	6.968606	3.286093	2.12
_Iregion_2_4	12.82946	8.660768	1.48
year2	-1.719948	3.124082	-0.55
year2ue	-3.126057	6.565077	-0.48
eu	-4.410101	4.240034	-1.04
eo	-11.06372	3.879556	-2.85
uo	-18.98132	6.375497	-2.98
ou	-20.61889	6.897779	-2.99
ue	-8.102744	5.21584	-1.55
_cons	43.72637	9.9118	4.41

Hispanics, 25-44
Sample Size: 289

wkslyr_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
hwag2	.0447807	.0089933	4.98
income2	-.0001232	.0002031	-0.61
sch2	-1.491771	.4125193	-3.62
_Iregion_2_2	1.350381	4.984252	0.27
_Iregion_2_3	-.4342889	4.015405	-0.11
_Iregion_2_4	-3.022149	3.695683	-0.82
year2	-1.640779	3.03676	-0.54
year2ue	-.9976335	5.901333	-0.17
eu	.9336683	4.108144	0.23
eo	1.88512	3.454431	0.55
uo	-5.233778	8.708095	-0.60
ou	-17.99087	8.132047	-2.21
ue	-.7524887	4.65827	-0.16
_cons	46.84201	6.213378	7.54

Appendix K – Labor Force Status Effects on Weeks Worked per Year, by Race/Ethnicity and Age Group, 2006 to 2008

I. Before Transition

Whites, 16-19
Sample Size: 96

wkslyr	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
hwag06	.000343	.0013544	0.25
income1	.0002939	.0001091	2.69
_Iregion_2	-1.35723	4.634084	-0.29
_Iregion_3	4.5573	5.13769	0.89
_Iregion_4	.2003521	5.671408	0.04
year1	8.252431	3.890888	2.12
yearleu	-1.963009	11.59128	-0.17
eu	2.689229	9.151624	0.29
uo	-21.91363	10.01339	-2.19
ou	-7.965431	9.208866	-0.86
ue	-2.343838	5.166249	-0.45
oe	-13.96605	4.497315	-3.11
_cons	28.39063	4.452425	6.38

Blacks, 16-19
Sample Size: 12

wkslyr	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
hwag06	.0280276	.0975368	0.29
income1	-.0015704	.0050394	-0.31
year1	-26.99476	16.6388	-1.62
eu	-7.46449	22.68712	-0.33
uo	-81.31011	26.0086	-3.13
ue	-60.32447	24.19754	-2.49
oe	-52.21891	22.90113	-2.28
_cons	86.22356	27.67087	3.12

Hispanics, 16-19
Cannot be estimated because sample size is too small

Whites, 25-44
Sample Size: 1615

wkslyr	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
hwag06	.014407	.0021903	6.58
income1	.000245	.000051	4.80
nsch1	-1.53938	.2646084	-5.82
_Iregion_2	-.6633437	1.922893	-0.34
_Iregion_3	.4560983	1.866174	0.24
_Iregion_4	-.814862	1.903304	-0.43
year1	.8074056	1.418616	0.57
yearleu	-1.784931	3.53438	-0.51
eu	-1.333711	2.564141	-0.52
uo	-23.66052	3.022257	-7.83
ou	-27.07487	3.712661	-7.29
ue	-17.84881	1.859163	-9.60
oe	-20.17069	1.875512	-10.75
_cons	65.33285	3.956809	16.51

Blacks, 25-44
Sample Size: 233

wkslyr	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
hwag06	.0314098	.0071678	4.38
income1	.0002540	.000148	1.72
nsch1	-.783464	.9150975	-0.86
_Iregion_2	-4.328359	5.777903	-0.75
_Iregion_3	.9773369	5.026031	0.19
_Iregion_4	2.834863	6.357053	0.45
year1	-.6593805	3.610941	-0.18
yearleu	3.06544	7.534779	0.41
eu	-16.19011	5.369179	-3.02
uo	-17.9354	6.160644	-2.91
ou	-22.94374	7.874468	-2.91
ue	-21.72716	4.938873	-4.40
oe	-27.83296	4.983457	-5.59
_cons	52.76578	12.05925	4.38

Hispanics, 25-44
Sample Size: 329

wkslyr	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
hwag06	.0107607	.0085185	1.26
income1	.0005387	.0001944	2.77
nsch1	-1.171463	.4555575	-2.57
_Iregion_2	2.049639	5.511617	0.37
_Iregion_3	.2908174	4.344164	0.07
_Iregion_4	1.973035	4.126042	0.48
year1	.8965189	3.202909	0.28
yearleu	-8.378187	7.47386	-1.12
eu	-.4748465	5.321814	-0.09
uo	-26.42157	6.752105	-3.91
ou	-25.50981	7.141572	-3.57
ue	-17.60471	4.255035	-4.14
oe	-22.1384	4.330905	-5.11
_cons	56.58623	6.864461	8.24

II. After Transition

Whites, 16-19
Sample Size: 181

wkslyr_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
hwag062	.0043361	.0066146	0.66
income2	.000846	.000258	3.28
_Iregion_2_2	2.72294	3.843743	0.71
_Iregion_2_3	4.394544	3.860081	1.14
_Iregion_2_4	-.9536802	3.850634	-0.25
year2	.9764125	2.941316	0.33
year2ue	-4.13984	9.097463	-0.42
eu	-2.092043	5.085521	-0.41
ee	-8.441409	3.690803	-2.29
uo	-19.34925	7.671784	-2.52
ou	-13.69568	5.415129	-2.53
ue	1.879314	6.951643	0.27
_cons	25.95503	3.619324	7.17

Blacks, 16-19
Sample Size: 25

wkslyr_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
hwag062	.0286629	.0170556	1.68
income2	.0032529	.0010359	3.14
_Iregion_2_2	2.032934	12.61802	0.16
_Iregion_2_3	14.73136	6.724221	2.19
_Iregion_2_4	8.47599	7.356116	1.15
year2	-14.5685	5.796095	-2.51
year2ue	-86.6257		
eu	-2.341263	11.21467	-0.21
eo	-1.143078	5.366746	-0.21
uo	10.2813	8.285687	1.24
ou	21.83715	12.22246	1.79
ue	-.3137382	7.911601	-0.04
_cons	1.045143	7.268726	0.14

Hispanics, 16-19
Sample Size: 37

wkslyr_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
hwag062	.1286404	.0418336	3.08
income2	-.0022174	.0010875	-2.04
_Iregion_2_2	12.44666	18.39462	0.68
_Iregion_2_3	-4.784905	15.17789	-0.32
_Iregion_2_4	-9.630527	14.02707	-0.69
year2	-8.463504	6.840772	-1.24
eu	-11.32386	13.20658	-0.85
eo	-.2918906	8.06177	-0.04
uo	-48.38944	21.36748	-2.26
ou	-28.02048	12.41	-2.26
ue	16.54202	11.71752	1.41
_cons	38.61656	15.87967	2.43

Whites, 25-44
Sample Size: 1667

wkslyr_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
hwag062	.0056897	.001643	3.46
income2	.0003243	.000042	7.72
nsch2	-1.43501	.2279039	-6.30
_Iregion_2_2	.3071369	1.65175	0.19
_Iregion_2_3	2.315661	1.622582	1.43
_Iregion_2_4	-1.718353	1.630579	-1.05
year2	-.2238293	1.233863	-0.18
year2ue	-.5567409	2.874519	-0.19
eu	-5.264904	1.65087	-3.19
eo	-10.61952	1.505193	-7.06
uo	-23.59172	3.591848	-6.57
ou	-18.55681	3.254792	-5.70
ue	-7.014092	2.138803	-3.28
_cons	57.24466	3.446389	16.61

Blacks, 25-44
Sample Size: 219

wkslyr_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
hwag062	.041952	.0095759	4.38
income2	.000238	.0002247	1.06
nsch2	-2.367661	.9481764	-2.50
_Iregion_2_2	-5.471818	6.27914	-0.87
_Iregion_2_3	.8903806	5.324171	0.17
_Iregion_2_4	12.64207	7.216355	1.75
year2	3.376096	3.736474	0.90
year2ue	-7.6708	8.046098	-0.95
eu	-5.22702	4.843274	-1.08
eo	-10.73754	4.886645	-2.20
uo	-7.98549	7.66844	-1.04
ou	-.154778	8.74632	-0.02
ue	1.291298	6.180947	0.21
_cons	54.20147	13.25261	4.09

Hispanics, 25-44
Sample Size: 340

wkslyr_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
hwag062	.0376693	.008931	4.27
income2	.0001183	.0001955	0.61
nsch2	-1.496996	.4047504	-3.70
_Iregion_2_2	-1.665485	4.915465	-0.34
_Iregion_2_3	.5418414	3.877208	0.14
_Iregion_2_4	-3.292381	3.674185	-0.90
year2	-.0519609	2.700745	-0.02
year2ue	-1.606124	6.765337	-0.25
eu	-6.617402	3.387897	-1.95
eo	-5.450509	3.338264	-1.63
uo	-6.898343	9.622905	-0.72
ou	-12.07654	5.652235	-2.14
ue	-3.213619	4.882123	-0.66
_cons	50.33216	6.332226	7.95

Appendix L – Labor Force Status Effects on Hours Worked per Week, by Race/Ethnicity and Age Group, 1989 to 1991

I. Before Transition

Whites, 16-19
Sample Size: 367, R^2: 0.2241

hrslyr	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
_wklywg	.0126316	.0034478	3.66
incomel	.0007332	.0001837	3.99
year	.0070194	1.210749	0.01
yeareu	.5232415	3.193796	0.16
_Iregion_2	.5450532	1.479722	0.37
_Iregion_3	-.5756619	1.608216	-0.36
_Iregion_4	-.5893764	1.673084	-0.35
eu	7.590494	2.28214	3.33
uo	6.102215	2.904084	2.10
ou	6.064336	2.775437	2.19
ue	8.740348	1.979196	4.42
oe	6.374279	1.41046	4.52
_cons	15.53078	1.588402	9.78

Blacks, 16-19
Sample Size: 46, R^2: 0.4877

hrslyr	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
_wklywg	.0485089	.0221087	2.19
incomel	-.0002637	.0007371	-0.36
year	-2.137884	2.621544	-0.82
yeareu	-13.04991	9.426079	-1.38
_Iregion_2	1.521242	4.065733	0.37
_Iregion_3	1.009137	3.572971	0.28
_Iregion_4	0	(omitted)	
eu	18.60442	8.630831	2.16
uo	8.964352	3.898524	2.30
ou	14.49097	5.082277	2.85
ue	9.937081	3.517627	2.82
oe	10.87499	3.684915	2.95
_cons	12.08202	4.156065	2.91

Hispanics, 16-19
Sample Size: 23, R^2: 0.6459

hrslyr	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
_wklywg	.011653	.0304885	0.38
incomel	.0023505	.0009238	2.54
year	-5.553218	7.443077	-0.75
yeareu	12.04069	10.90995	1.10
_Iregion_2	0	(omitted)	
_Iregion_3	9.329319	7.960386	1.17
_Iregion_4	-1.914431	8.211108	-0.23
eu	-4.709344	8.64127	-0.54
uo	-46.77559	87.11277	-0.54
ou	0	(omitted)	
ue	-.1481355	8.931631	-0.02
oe	-9.752138	6.615841	-1.47
_cons	23.61077	7.453095	3.17

Whites, 25-44
Sample Size: 2008, R^2: 0.2586

hrslyr	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
_wklywg	.0116496	.0017477	6.67
incomel	.0005215	.0001043	5.00
incsch1	-.0000238	6.90e-06	-3.45
year	.7174107	.5960195	1.20
yeareu	-1.338222	1.217629	-1.10
sch1	-.1773825	.1461033	-1.21
_Iregion_2	1.081254	.7084987	1.53
_Iregion_3	2.692837	.6897895	3.90
_Iregion_4	2.037016	.7503447	2.71
eu	4.262493	1.029295	4.14
uo	2.495037	1.378971	1.81
ou	3.489352	1.537632	2.27
ue	5.634641	.7516989	7.50
oe	-1.557	.7709436	-2.02
_cons	27.91638	2.053612	13.59

Blacks, 25-44
Sample Size: 331, R^2: 0.2174

hrslyr	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
_wklywg	.0054209	.0038365	1.41
incomel	.0009428	.0001954	4.82
incsch1	-.0000591	.0000152	-3.90
year	-1.599877	1.145363	-1.40
yeareu	.5121261	2.322086	0.22
sch1	.6816477	.3283054	2.08
_Iregion_2	-1.33396	1.67161	-0.80
_Iregion_3	.4326858	1.397508	0.31
_Iregion_4	1.680624	2.021482	0.83
eu	2.864204	1.930231	1.48
uo	-.579268	1.91351	-0.30
ou	-4.09342	2.365518	-1.73
ue	4.078322	1.41784	2.88
oe	-.7106172	1.8043	-0.39
_cons	23.54457	4.588361	5.13

Hispanics, 25-44
Sample Size: 187, R^2: 0.2435

hrslyr	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
_wklywg	.0024373	.0088648	0.27
incomel	.0066642	.0002859	2.32
incsch1	-.0000295	.0000201	-1.46
year	.9615952	1.513505	0.64
yeareu	-2.384181	3.309936	-0.72
sch1	.5008689	.2833752	1.77
_Iregion_2	-2.816083	3.387277	-0.83
_Iregion_3	.2219527	1.943629	0.11
_Iregion_4	-.1630294	1.778737	-0.09
eu	1.826117	2.79015	0.65
uo	1.105297	3.045356	0.36
ou	-10.71534	4.614556	-2.32
ue	1.92906	1.90604	1.01
oe	-4.295229	2.030714	-2.12
_cons	26.68366	3.800811	7.02

II. After Transition

Whites, 16-19
Sample Size: 427, R^2: 0.3820

hrslyr_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
_wklywg_2	.0723391	.0070609	10.25
income2	.0001806	.0001718	1.05
year2	-.9547235	.9300396	-1.03
year2ue	-2.104231	3.135963	-0.67
_Iregion_2_2	.7092747	1.243737	0.57
_Iregion_2_3	.8387939	1.349776	0.62
_Iregion_2_4	2.613755	1.311726	1.99
eu	5.362434	1.542433	3.48
eo	1.149155	1.16939	0.98
uo	4.706129	3.314888	1.42
ou	5.778966	1.946984	2.97
ue	4.025161	2.264198	1.78
_cons	13.83622	1.311409	10.55

Blacks, 16-19
Sample Size: 48, R^2: 0.7304

hrslyr_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
_wklywg_2	.0578615	.0157339	3.68
income2	.0006248	.0003885	1.61
year2	-6.33768	1.838568	-3.45
year2ue	13.96185	6.573153	2.12
_Iregion_2_2	5.10212	2.752782	1.85
_Iregion_2_3	6.72244	2.726582	2.47
_Iregion_2_4	20.93646	5.246979	3.99
eu	-1.324666	2.935078	-0.45
eo	-4.981597	2.992156	-1.66
uo	-2.203215	3.831365	-0.58
ou	8.067967	2.795173	2.89
ue	-1.760539	4.649376	-0.38
_cons	12.37886	3.080599	4.02

Hispanics, 16-19
Sample Size: 26, R^2: 0.6669

hrslyr_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
_wklywg_2	.100781	.0529587	1.90
income2	-.0003373	.0010232	-0.33
year2	-5.42753	3.917305	-1.39
_Iregion_2_2	0	(omitted)	
_Iregion_2_3	-3.786396	7.441015	-0.51
_Iregion_2_4	4.953022	6.71854	0.74
eu	14.47355	5.714114	2.53
eo	2.221898	5.117491	0.43
uo	0	(omitted)	
ou	13.07256	9.434744	1.39
ue	-3.998589	6.095247	-0.66
_cons	13.51459	7.521607	1.80

Whites, 25-44
Sample Size: 2178, R^2: 0.2870

hrslyr_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
_wklywg_2	.0180147	.0013628	13.22
income2	.0003926	.0001072	3.66
incsch2	-.0000222	7.20e-06	-3.23
year2	-.045047	.5292981	-0.09
year2ue	1.029091	1.204834	0.85
sch2	-.3926178	.1320343	-2.97
_Iregion_2_2	1.521821	.6464736	2.35
_Iregion_2_3	3.496285	.639646	5.47
_Iregion_2_4	1.975111	.690204	2.86
eu	6.328042	.6998845	9.04
eo	2.562838	.6578027	3.90
uo	5.451626	1.711157	3.19
ou	1.489921	1.393464	1.07
ue	4.930183	.9286373	5.31
_cons	27.518	1.896872	14.51

Blacks, 25-44
Sample Size: 302, R^2: 0.1101

hrslyr_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
_wklywg_2	9.12e-06	.0004865	0.02
income2	.0001585	.0002723	0.58
incsch2	2.68e-06	.0000198	0.14
year2	-1.118208	1.196937	-0.93
year2ue	2.679039	2.402043	1.12
sch2	-.3596399	.3316383	-1.08
_Iregion_2_2	.1877229	1.993495	0.10
_Iregion_2_3	-.8854872	1.626277	-0.54
_Iregion_2_4	.3486528	2.404814	0.14
eu	4.48201	1.630827	2.75
eo	1.133507	1.705626	0.66
uo	-1.78973	2.518955	-0.71
ou	1.373391	2.438843	0.56
ue	1.601022	2.007459	0.80
_cons	37.96703	4.645036	8.17

Hispanics, 25-44
Sample Size: 183, R^2: 0.2735

hrslyr_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
_wklywg_2	.0237988	.0075189	3.17
income2	-.0000849	.0002674	-0.32
incsch2	9.31e-06	.0000196	0.48
year2	.7208762	1.54947	0.47
year2ue	4.606947	3.232511	1.43
sch2	-.5525553	.2859445	-1.93
_Iregion_2_2	1.319246	2.941101	0.45
_Iregion_2_3	.3745352	1.91721	0.20
_Iregion_2_4	-.0714616	1.813129	-0.04
eu	-1.147915	1.868191	-0.61
eo	.2682038	1.825762	0.15
uo	-13.24937	6.247473	-2.12
ou	-7.402805	3.318647	-2.23
ue	-3.891778	2.367358	-1.64
_cons	35.73814	3.831299	9.33

Appendix M – Labor Force Status Effects on Hours Worked per Week, by Race/Ethnicity and Age Group, 1999 to 2001

I. Before Transition

Whites, 16-19
Sample Size: 88, R^2: 0.3941

hrslyr	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
_wklywg	.0472741	.009442	5.01
income1	-.0000494	.0002741	-0.18
year1	.5185102	2.346343	0.22
yearleu	-2.50991	6.8939	-0.36
_Iregion_2	-1.262423	3.265832	-0.39
_Iregion_3	-.7359682	3.262794	-0.23
_Iregion_4	2.457429	3.527791	0.70
eu	5.493684	4.509733	1.22
uo	-5.641648	5.677919	-0.99
ou	9.404701	4.678955	2.01
ue	10.32305	3.830663	2.69
oe	.8725735	2.834209	0.31
_cons	16.71861	3.875929	4.31

Blacks, 16-19
Sample Size: 11, R^2: 0.7345

hrslyr	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
_wklywg	.0851368	.0691978	1.23
income1	-.0015549	.0011597	-1.34
year1	-12.8451	10.65058	-1.21
eu	-2.526433	14.43712	-0.17
uo	-17.81527	22.03231	-0.81
ou	0	(omitted)	
ue	-3.751609	10.54	-0.36
oe	-39.21184	19.63701	-2.00
_cons	36.34295	17.67037	2.06

Hispanics, 16-19
Sample Size: 10, R^2: 0.8550

hrslyr	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
_wklywg	.0632499	.044958	1.41
income1	.0004836	.001954	0.25
year1	-1.013644	9.081319	-0.11
eu	11.10504	14.0382	0.79
uo	2.01811	16.3283	0.12
ou	0	(omitted)	
ue	26.91363	17.41298	1.55
oe	13.55385	17.84277	0.76
_cons	5.830784	19.71112	0.30

Whites, 25-44
Sample Size: 1540, R^2: 0.1578

hrslyr	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
_wklywg	.0006116	.0004869	1.26
income1	.0001489	.0000148	10.07
year1	-.1704947	.634139	-0.27
yearleu	.4303003	1.529479	0.28
eu	4.419084	1.14046	3.87
oe	-.1515341	.7930067	-0.19
ou	-2.710507	2.147853	-1.26
ue	4.556793	.8220359	5.54
uo	5.398577	1.405036	3.84
_Iregion_2	.4717321	.8240813	0.57
_Iregion_3	2.231561	.8194525	2.72
_Iregion_4	.9564205	.815461	1.17
_ccns	30.7107	.8043687	38.18

Blacks, 25-44
Sample Size: 232, $F_{(12, 219)}$: 2.16

hrslyr	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
_wklywg	.0536905	.0657208	0.82
income1	-.0007658	.0011179	-0.69
year1	1.177474	2.009247	0.59
yearleu	-1.16864	5.811184	-0.20
eu	2.666338	3.498349	0.76
oe	-.0173388	3.550299	-0.00
ou	.1695354	4.808553	0.04
ue	-1.451156	5.745492	-0.25
uo	-11.53388	9.570275	-1.21
_Iregion_2	1.712317	3.56535	0.48
_Iregion_3	1.537459	2.45538	0.63
_Iregion_4	.7764982	5.030425	0.15
_cons	30.17478	5.049265	5.98

Hispanics, 25-44
Sample Size: 262, $F_{(12, 249)}$: 0.05

hrslyr	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
_wklywg	.0552183	.1956055	0.28
income1	-.0012242	.0046798	-0.26
year1	9.809241	39.84609	0.25
yearleu	-13.325	50.66391	-0.26
eu	11.7274	31.70634	0.37
oe	-2.252116	12.36021	-0.18
ou	-12.90970	65.21203	-0.20
ue	-18.21363	76.21314	-0.24
uo	-5.560364	33.53546	-0.17
_Iregion_2	.9354719	17.86625	0.05
_Iregion_3	-19.40821	62.5307	-0.31
_iregion_4	-3.241711	12.23699	-0.26
_cons	38.71813	13.42732	2.88

II. After Transition

Whites, 16-19
Sample Size: 154, R^2: 0.2272

hrslyr_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
_wklywg_2	.0183551	.0058351	3.15
income2	.0004444	.0002021	2.05
year2	-.006545	2.067063	-0.00
year2ue	-7.309781	7.780537	-0.94
_Iregion_2_2	3.89604	2.91025	1.34
_Iregion_2_3	4.670669	2.893845	1.61
_Iregion_2_4	7.419253	3.271513	2.27
eu	-9.028019	4.010613	-2.25
eo	-4.767536	2.346016	-2.03
uo	4.330437	4.822219	0.90
ou	2.37582	4.518264	0.53
ue	-2.894861	5.845614	-0.50
_cons	19.79587	3.009055	6.58

Blacks, 16-19
Sample Size: 20, R^2: 0.9537

hrslyr_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
_wklywg_2	.0222361	.0085417	2.60
income2	-.0000115	.0002634	-0.04
year2	-3.282085	2.202977	-1.49
year2ue	-5.120285	5.36037	-0.96
_Iregion_2_2	-11.08035	4.368144	-2.54
_Iregion_2_3	-13.42278	3.077812	-3.46
_Iregion_2_4	-5.043676	5.357619	-0.94
eu	0	(omitted)	
eo	-9.391447	2.80416	-0.33
uo	-26.08331	5.899986	-4.42
ou	16.25769	2.685135	6.05
ue	11.90535	2.989514	3.98
_cons	34.57642	3.816949	9.06

Hispanics, 16-19
Sample Size: 10, R^2: 0.7540

hrslyr_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
_wklywg	.0030551	.1578546	0.02
income2	.0023951	.0018788	1.27
year2	14.08481	14.02557	1.00
eu	-9.884263	16.12897	-0.61
eo	-2.786837	17.2366	-0.16
uo	-21.75717	20.14252	-1.08
ou	0	(omitted)	
ue	2.040922	19.63132	0.10
_cons	-1.464552	35.47398	-0.04

Whites, 25-44
Sample Size: 1568, R^2: 0.1692

hrslyr_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
_wklywg_2	.0033857	.0010745	3.15
income2	.0002697	.0000707	3.81
incsch2	-.0000124	4.36e-06	-2.84
year2	-.583745	.6692097	-0.87
year2ue	.3614894	1.540054	0.23
sch2	-.4318918	.1506438	-2.87
_Iregion_2_2	.0810014	.8720307	0.09
_iregion_2_3	2.291131	.8609768	2.67
_Iregion_2_4	.806014	.8563528	0.94
eu	6.032196	.9182406	6.57
eo	1.275809	.7766299	1.64
uo	2.569732	2.027028	1.27
ou	-1.457437	2.008645	-0.73
ue	5.252667	1.12374	4.67
_cons	34.03797	2.163867	15.73

Blacks, 25-44
Sample Size: 231, R^2: 0.2025

hrslyr_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
_wklywg_2	.004055	.0019107	2.12
income2	.000402	.0002663	1.51
incsch2	-.0000261	.00001	-0.89
year2	-2.558869	1.490952	-1.72
year2ue	1.948395	3.188429	0.61
sch2	.6410568	.5483527	1.17
_Iregion_2_2	.6724758	1.998235	0.34
_Iregion_2_3	.9489717	1.538605	0.62
_Iregion_2_4	1.819869	4.203225	0.43
eu	-1.620655	1.926364	-0.84
eo	-1.125579	1.838085	-0.62
uo	-5.535054	3.308897	-1.67
ou	-8.374661	3.464549	-2.42
ue	-2.447959	2.37264	-1.03
_cons	25.89073	7.09558	3.65

Hispanics, 25-44
Sample Size: 285, R^2: 0.2509

hrslyr_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
_wklywg_2	.011264	.0033877	3.33
income2	.0004745	.0001488	3.19
incsch2	-.0000261	.00001	-2.61
year2	.9151671	1.301703	0.70
year2ue	-3.067967	2.531956	-1.21
sch2	-.2777614	.2335757	-1.19
_Iregion_2_2	1.452406	2.073949	0.70
_Iregion_2_3	.6561793	1.689936	0.39
_Iregion_2_4	-.4530758	1.544699	-0.29
eu	1.526944	1.741586	0.88
eo	.1636037	1.469421	0.11
uo	-6.777338	4.243696	-1.60
ou	3.126072	3.672275	0.85
ue	3.951206	1.965287	2.01
_cons	31.72145	3.316791	9.56

Appendix N – Labor Force Status Effects on Hours Worked per Week, by Race/Ethnicity and Age Group, 2006 to 2008

I. Before Transition

Whites, 16-19
Sample Size: 96, R^2: 0.1794

hrslyr	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
wklywg	.0105678	.0051535	2.05
income1	-.0000151	.0000786	-0.19
year1	-3.076263	2.743359	-1.12
year1eu	-3.638956	8.192369	-0.44
_Iregion_2	.8880894	3.337201	0.27
_Iregion_3	5.18233	3.621622	1.43
_Iregion_4	-1.902855	4.019644	-0.47
eu	-1.876359	6.566635	-0.29
uo	-7.540015	7.401109	-1.02
ou	8.081789	6.698026	1.21
ue	-2.849156	3.742669	-0.76
oe	-6.039641	3.179095	-1.90
_cons	27.24616	3.390042	8.04

Blacks, 16-19
Sample Size: 12, R^2: 0.7990

hrslyr	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
wklywg	.025265	.0977042	0.26
income1	-.0014129	.005415	-0.26
year1	-7.288804	24.09394	-0.30
_Iregion_2	-.4236111	42.72259	-0.01
_Iregion_3	-12.06561	10.80755	-1.12
_Iregion_4	0	(omitted)	
eu	2.636108	16.20451	0.16
uo	-33.47365	105.7178	-0.32
ou	0	(omitted)	
ue	-26.5376	35.73765	-0.74
oe	-3.5636	36.1541	-0.10
_cons	58.05435	47.53341	1.22

Hispanics, 16-19
Cannot be estimated because sample size is too small

Whites, 25-44
Sample Size: 1589, R^2: 0.1372

hrslyr	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
wklywg	.0038352	.0009204	4.17
income1	.0000509	.0000194	2.62
year1	.0418736	.6629881	0.06
year1eu	.1573963	1.567772	0.10
_Iregion_2	1.441583	.9009569	1.60
_Iregion_3	1.985647	.8571155	2.32
_Iregion_4	3.27935	.8731398	3.76
eu	2.969458	1.08869	2.73
uo	2.045591	1.532262	1.34
ou	5.34466	1.996373	2.68
ue	2.410559	.8659288	2.78
oe	-3.304089	.9084186	-3.64
_cons	31.34952	.8832062	35.50

Blacks, 25-44
Sample Size: 232, R^2: 0.1948

hrslyr	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
wklywg	.0022671	.0017564	1.29
income1	.0001257	.0000407	3.09
year1	.2427616	1.500394	0.16
year1eu	3.024098	3.318986	0.91
_Iregion_2	-3.650893	2.461157	-1.48
_Iregion_3	.2177384	2.037261	0.11
_Iregion_4	3.775315	2.516483	1.50
eu	-.4133750	2.131389	-0.19
uo	2.632959	2.776622	0.95
ou	-6.185516	3.708586	-1.67
ue	.9091237	2.012285	0.45
oe	-.8080241	2.072389	-0.39
_cons	33.12085	2.385495	13.88

Hispanics, 25-44
Sample Size: 324, R^2: 0.2191

hrslyr	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
wklywg	.0000725	.0023159	0.03
income1	.0002638	.0000524	5.04
year1	.7032672	1.186121	0.59
year1eu	-1.293828	2.673495	-0.48
_Iregion_2	1.054859	2.066327	0.51
_Iregion_3	2.600225	1.606665	1.62
_Iregion_4	.0475216	1.507786	0.03
eu	1.742897	1.757807	0.99
uo	1.911411	2.77258	0.69
ou	2.458937	2.883614	0.85
ue	2.333993	1.55994	1.50
oe	-2.064441	1.642006	-1.26
_cons	30.39376	1.758428	17.28

II. After Transition

Whites, 16-19
Sample Size: 180, R^2: 0.2513

hrslyr_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
wklywg_2	.0230781	.0057466	4.02
income2	-.0000341	.0001516	-0.23
year2	5.810972	1.734076	3.35
year2ue	-2.034484	5.764712	-0.35
_Iregion_2_2	-.3139973	2.274606	-0.14
_Iregion_2_3	-.0796436	2.264692	-0.04
_Iregion_2_4	.7223948	2.270004	0.32
eu	-1.263799	3.027643	-0.42
eo	-1.621132	2.208983	-0.73
uo	-.3114354	4.748731	-0.07
ou	-.4638552	3.377921	-0.14
ue	4.601057	3.989035	1.15
_cons	19.92826	2.163468	9.21

Blacks, 16-19
Sample Size: 25, R^2: 0.7234

hrslyr_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
wklywg_2	.0289404	.0267205	1.08
income2	-.0001387	.0005198	-0.30
year2	-5.8816	4.134233	-1.42
year2ue	-5.775825	18.29647	-0.32
_Iregion_2_2	10.59377	10.36869	1.02
_Iregion_2_3	-6.511407	7.228097	-0.90
_Iregion_2_4	-5.170734	6.47686	-0.80
eu	15.16235	8.634907	1.76
eo	-2.980144	4.084562	-0.73
uo	-.1354246	6.129522	-0.02
ou	-11.71084	11.12971	-1.05
ue	8.582155	6.519859	1.32
_cons	27.35226	7.706696	3.55

Hispanics, 16-19
Sample Size: 36, R^2: 0.5249

hrslyr_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
wklywg_2	.0422249	.0175445	2.41
income2	-.0001758	.0005415	-0.34
_Iregion_2_2	-3.054114	9.67824	-0.32
_Iregion_2_3	-.4966585	8.651481	-0.06
_Iregion_2_4	-2.476116	7.934364	-0.31
year2	6.248969	4.276757	1.46
eu	2.342697	8.688797	0.27
eo	-3.691755	5.583384	-0.66
uo	-16.26473	12.77274	-1.27
ou	-3.503494	9.400295	-0.37
ue	7.725233	7.667695	1.01
_cons	20.84845	8.412394	2.48

Whites, 25-44
Sample Size: 1641, R^2: 0.1341

hrslyr_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
wklywg_2	.0015043	.0007722	1.95
income2	.000089	.0000171	5.19
year2	.4952103	.6899358	0.72
year2ue	-2.246745	1.630039	-1.38
_Iregion_2_2	-.3560548	.9334003	-0.38
_Iregion_2_3	1.228892	.9027777	1.36
_Iregion_2_4	1.395414	.922941	1.51
eu	5.149073	.8888386	5.79
eo	-.1337105	.8603195	-0.16
uo	2.580096	2.202694	1.17
ou	3.275925	1.919065	1.71
ue	4.997587	1.189503	4.20
_cons	30.55779	.9235462	33.09

Blacks, 25-44
Sample Size: 215, R^2: 0.2591

hrslyr_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
wklywg_2	-.0022773	.0010959	-2.08
income2	.0002668	.0000404	6.61
year2	.6446272	1.413337	0.46
year2ue	-3.070815	3.036599	-1.01
_Iregion_2_2	-3.396218	2.412333	-1.41
_Iregion_2_3	-1.635391	2.018823	-0.81
_Iregion_2_4	-.1800363	2.564151	-0.07
eu	2.382604	1.728084	1.38
eo	-4.110571	1.896154	-2.17
uo	3.826731	3.043113	1.26
ou	1.766618	3.140547	0.56
ue	3.190096	2.336358	1.37
_cons	32.65581	2.243564	14.56

Hispanics, 25-44
Sample Size: 335, R^2: 0.1745

hrslyr_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
wklywg_2	.0086755	.0031768	2.73
income2	.0000948	.0000646	1.47
year2	-.0957641	1.205442	-0.08
year2ue	-.0261156	2.930231	-0.01
_Iregion_2_2	-1.982589	2.173385	-0.91
_Iregion_2_3	.243835	1.727551	0.14
_Iregion_2_4	.4316927	1.640909	0.26
eu	3.245048	1.484349	2.19
eo	2.212804	1.535243	1.44
uo	2.489301	4.491100	0.55
ou	1.386437	2.64324	0.52
ue	.611764	2.101246	0.29
_cons	30.32893	1.873054	16.19

Appendix O – Labor Force Status Effects on Hours Worked per Week, by Gender and Age Group, 1989 to 1991

1. **Before Transition**

Males, 16-19
Sample Size: 235, R^2: 0.1730

hrslyr	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
_wklywg	.0104037	.0042649	2.44
income1	.0006213	.0002445	2.54
_Iregion_2	1.805089	2.244269	0.80
_Iregion_3	2.581889	2.37707	1.09
_Iregion_4	1.763826	2.413349	0.73
year	-.9459988	1.804936	-0.52
yeareu	2.231638	4.410324	0.51
eu	5.786741	3.306013	1.75
uo	10.52506	4.368253	2.41
ou	7.805932	3.583793	2.18
ue	7.287275	2.670676	2.73
oe	6.331527	2.155711	2.94
_cons	17.05701	2.398572	7.11

Females, 16-19
Sample Size: 195, R^2: 0.3665

hrslyr	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
_wklywg	.0512786	.0095425	5.37
income1	.0006454	.0002743	2.35
_Iregion_2	.3155598	1.73247	0.18
_Iregion_3	-2.786213	1.764556	-1.58
_Iregion_4	-3.377696	2.061584	-1.64
year	-.15056	1.339972	-0.11
yeareu	-2.956627	4.061795	-0.73
eu	8.042612	2.806364	2.87
uo	8.345351	2.638663	3.16
ou	3.243258	3.485079	0.93
ue	6.839159	2.498673	2.74
oe	5.628762	1.560441	3.61
_cons	11.89373	1.869507	6.36

Males, 25-44
Sample Size: 988, R^2: 0.1329

hrslyr	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
_wklywg	.0101386	.0019953	5.08
income1	.0000193	.0000417	0.46
_Iregion_2	1.227744	.9010595	1.36
_Iregion_3	.1384639	.8675558	0.16
_Iregion_4	1.361836	.9721277	1.40
year	-.1588479	.8294529	-0.19
yeareu	.1138492	1.378515	0.08
eu	1.079426	1.295302	0.83
uo	-1.354043	1.721347	-0.79
ou	.819955	1.913234	0.43
ue	3.122821	1.017255	3.07
oe	2.723291	1.415931	1.92
_cons	34.76678	1.180371	29.45

Females, 25-44
Sample Size: 1458, R^2: 0.1947

hrslyr	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
_wklywg	.006718	.0021751	3.09
income1	.0002933	.000049	5.98
_Iregion_2	.4166072	.872995	0.48
_Iregion_3	3.358406	.7989187	4.20
_Iregion_4	2.143849	.8955679	2.39
year	.6505529	.6616805	0.98
yeareu	-2.48345	1.663027	-1.49
eu	4.935174	1.334617	3.70
uo	2.531218	1.459119	1.73
ou	1.001156	1.751755	0.57
ue	3.630506	.9600194	3.78
oe	-2.733314	.7986438	-3.42
_cons	25.26425	.8473665	29.82

II. After Transition

Males, 16-19
Sample Size: 237, R^2: 0.3726

hrslyr_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
_wklywg_2	.0652906	.0099267	6.58
income2	.0002132	.0002398	0.89
year2	-.8272697	1.364106	-0.61
year2ue	3.75018	4.561713	0.82
_Iregion_2_2	1.178541	1.815071	0.65
_Iregion_2_3	.7031022	1.987184	0.35
_Iregion_2_4	3.393722	1.911173	1.78
eu	4.955954	2.102516	2.36
uo	3.567014	3.662531	0.97
ou	7.15463	2.308146	3.10
ue	2.320536	2.867196	0.81
eo	2.057871	1.721937	1.20
_cons	15.17688	1.942636	7.81

Females, 16-19
Sample Size: 257, R^2: 0.3240

hrslyr_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
_wklywg_2	.0686143	.0092083	7.45
income2	.0002167	.0002254	0.96
year2	-.8678886	1.092501	-0.79
year2ue	-2.045058	3.930819	-0.52
_Iregion_2_2	.2160319	1.555365	0.14
_Iregion_2_3	1.454043	1.539105	0.94
_Iregion_2_4	1.40363	1.636049	0.86
eu	4.587156	2.0004	2.29
uo	-.9572142	4.898868	-0.20
ou	2.301518	2.692124	0.85
ue	2.698992	3.123787	0.86
eo	-1.058297	1.396978	-0.76
_cons	13.99099	1.591176	8.79

Males, 25-44
Sample Size: 960, R^2: 0.0775

hrslyr_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
_wklywg_2	.0005737	.000522	1.10
income2	.0001595	.0000274	5.81
year2	-.852922	.8121544	-1.05
year2ue	1.219316	1.476188	0.83
_Iregion_2_2	1.339166	.9285497	1.44
_Iregion_2_3	.4622361	.8985345	0.51
_Iregion_2_4	1.580054	.973239	1.62
eu	4.223994	1.173544	3.60
uo	5.442971	2.286167	2.38
ou	2.160256	1.986416	1.09
ue	2.495022	1.399264	1.78
eo	2.984302	1.390335	2.15
_cons	33.43583	1.275254	26.22

Females, 25-44
Sample Size: 1626, R^2: 0.2074

hrslyr_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
_wklywg_2	.0162079	.0016159	10.03
income2	.0001093	.0000364	3.01
year2	-.1324714	.6000984	-0.22
year2ue	1.089887	1.614628	0.68
_Iregion_2_2	1.175548	.7888867	1.49
_Iregion_2_3	4.141786	.7424377	5.58
_Iregion_2_4	2.112765	.8448432	2.50
eu	6.473381	.8678628	7.46
uo	1.152687	1.824503	0.63
ou	2.525328	1.562426	1.62
ue	3.045022	1.171716	2.60
eo	2.419153	.6883599	3.51
_cons	21.95368	.775054	28.33

Appendix P – Labor Force Status Effects on Hours Worked per Week, by Gender and Age Group, 1999 to 2001

I. Before Transition

Males, 16-19
Sample Size: 59, R^2: 0.3791

hrslyr	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
_wklywg	.0451317	.0106953	4.22
incomel	-.0003776	.0003582	-1.05
_Iregion_2	.2840704	5.884941	0.05
_Iregion_3	-2.357725	5.916593	-0.40
_Iregion_4	1.510851	6.402298	0.24
year1	1.021565	3.371222	0.30
year1eu	.6786544	7.895383	0.09
eu	2.139285	5.424725	0.39
uo	-2.847987	6.090123	-0.47
ou	12.71551	6.033719	2.11
ue	4.028837	4.701033	0.86
oe	-3.140945	5.013792	-0.63
_cons	22.77908	5.862261	3.89

Females, 16-19
Sample Size: 50, R^2: 0.2603

hrslyr	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
_wklywg	.0060604	.0111358	0.54
incomel	.0002511	.0005868	0.43
_Iregion_2	-3.415602	5.430537	-0.63
_Iregion_3	-.2058536	5.458951	-0.04
_Iregion_4	11.1513	6.167386	1.81
year1	2.468294	4.300151	0.57
year1eu	-29.43673	20.04477	-1.47
eu	21.24806	13.96304	1.52
uo	2.117533	8.153525	0.26
ou	6.018623	10.0559	0.60
ue	18.88964	14.40712	1.31
oe	7.131844	4.594235	1.55
_cons	15.70564	6.740374	2.33

Males, 25-44
Sample Size: 747, R^2: 0.1099

hrslyr	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
_wklywg	.0021695	.0013788	1.57
incomel	.000085	.0000284	2.99
_Iregion_2	.4293686	1.017034	0.42
_Iregion_3	.9419144	1.012328	0.93
_Iregion_4	-.0585878	1.017049	-0.06
year1	-.0055862	.8228724	-0.01
year1eu	-.2659801	1.621298	-0.16
eu	1.429628	1.252419	1.14
uo	2.567077	1.657135	1.55
ou	-2.913778	2.446264	-1.19
ue	1.247952	.990041	1.26
oe	-.7624434	1.127357	-0.68
_cons	37.32503	1.133206	32.94

Females, 25-44
Sample Size: 1139, R^2: 0.1228

hrslyr	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
_wklywg	.0003726	.000509	0.73
incomel	.0001506	.0000175	8.60
_Iregion_2	.6304667	1.014043	0.62
_Iregion_3	3.108311	.9524723	3.26
_Iregion_4	1.767613	1.001759	1.76
year1	-.4857441	.7262851	-0.67
year1eu	2.092372	2.18479	0.96
eu	2.560329	1.632347	1.57
uo	3.388269	1.624113	2.09
ou	-1.728076	2.319412	-0.75
ue	3.713143	1.031469	3.60
oe	-.54503	.8922713	-0.61
_cons	29.09891	.9384083	31.01

Males, 16-19
Sample Size: 97, R^2: 0.1857

hrslyr_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
_wklywg_2	.0130283	.0069439	1.88
income2	.0004378	.0002769	1.58
_Iregion_2_2	4.839236	4.849378	1.00
_Iregion_2_3	5.906169	4.607316	1.28
_Iregion_2_4	8.577868	4.870764	1.76
year2	1.045315	2.904128	0.36
year2ue	-10.23871	8.486674	-1.21
eu	-4.540686	5.559746	-0.82
eo	-1.788909	3.581368	-0.50
uo	.8057637	5.769864	0.14
ou	4.245662	4.790394	0.89
ue	2.226597	5.777921	0.39
_cons	18.99482	5.059743	3.75

Females, 16-19
Sample Size: 91, R^2: 0.2951

hrslyr_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
_wklywg_2	.0357995	.0095384	3.75
income2	.0001761	.0002518	0.70
_Iregion_2_2	3.953439	3.1527	1.25
_Iregion_2_3	1.718017	3.147375	0.55
_Iregion_2_4	1.316649	3.428048	0.38
year2	-.9812627	2.259438	-0.43
year2ue	3.79812	12.10962	0.31
eu	-8.761453	4.979241	-1.76
eo	-6.436822	2.488226	-2.59
uo	-.9230229	6.155723	-0.15
ou	-5.431199	4.606673	-1.18
ue	-8.995067	10.57376	-0.85
_cons	20.25674	3.259538	6.21

Males, 25-44
Sample Size: 694, R^2: 0.0983

hrslyr_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
_wklywg_2	.0029577	.001296	2.28
income2	.0000461	.0000274	1.68
_Iregion_2_2	-.650463	1.17418	-0.55
_Iregion_2_3	.4852216	1.154578	0.42
_Iregion_2_4	-.625478	1.128175	-0.55
year2	-1.943369	.9452846	-2.06
year2ue	1.339082	1.783162	0.75
eu	3.079686	1.141271	2.70
eo	3.659422	1.280998	2.86
uo	-.3943396	2.372756	-0.17
ou	2.60697	2.76678	0.94
ue	1.105675	1.410547	0.78
_cons	37.33292	1.269121	29.42

Females, 25-44
Sample Size: 1224, R^2: 0.1199

hrslyr_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
_wklywg_2	.003415	.0011824	2.89
income2	.0000726	.0000261	2.78
_Iregion_2_2	.4639165	.9917238	0.47
_Iregion_2_3	3.364096	.931708	3.61
_Iregion_2_4	1.687875	.9753487	1.73
year2	.0306685	.7273109	0.04
year2ue	.7836441	1.901323	0.41
eu	3.898725	1.184765	3.29
eo	.7176027	.8002441	0.90
uo	1.293285	2.282149	0.57
ou	-3.76682	2.027024	-1.86
ue	4.248914	1.342013	3.17
_cons	26.99733	.915828	29.48

Appendix Q – Labor Force Status Effects on Hours Worked per Week, by Gender and Age Group, 2006 to 2008

I. Before Transition

Males, 16-19
Sample Size: 62, R^2: 0.1951

hrslyr	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
_wklywg	.0043171	.0061819	0.70
income1	-.0000765	.0000816	-0.94
year1	.3968824	3.776025	0.11
year1eu	-8.054215	9.480519	-0.85
_Iregion_2	1.478219	4.461527	0.33
_Iregion_3	4.483258	4.125608	1.09
_Iregion_4	1.744582	5.102112	0.34
eu	3.373476	6.771837	0.50
uo	-16.65019	6.527542	-2.55
ou	1.918813	8.183049	0.23
ue	-3.154489	4.654952	-0.68
oe	-3.229104	4.527803	-0.71
_cons	32.01908	4.795883	6.68

Females, 16-19
Sample Size: 54, R^2: 0.3144

hrslyr	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
_wklywg	.0318332	.0152918	2.08
income1	-.0002651	.0002798	-0.95
year1	-1.910205	3.603338	-0.53
year1eu	-4.421436	9.020607	-0.49
_Iregion_2	-2.556349	4.721197	-0.54
_Iregion_3	3.720943	5.098094	0.73
_Iregion_4	-7.864332	5.19269	-1.51
eu	2.726685	7.266366	0.38
uo	-14.27166	14.24252	-1.00
ou	10.10895	11.96857	0.84
ue	-1.591825	4.854526	-0.33
oe	-5.143004	4.202908	-1.22
_cons	22.65382	4.322498	5.24

Males, 25-44
Sample Size: 903, R^2: 0.0791

hrslyr	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
_wklywg	.0031642	.0012862	2.46
income1	.00002	.0000266	0.75
year1	.2707766	.8798389	0.31
year1eu	-.1626306	1.794993	-0.09
_Iregion_2	.5856047	1.190406	0.49
_Iregion_3	.8826562	1.143245	0.77
_Iregion_4	2.40047	1.134098	2.12
eu	-.7781352	1.306849	-0.60
uo	-.3576131	1.954736	-0.18
ou	5.241369	2.721743	1.93
ue	-1.460969	1.068431	-1.37
oe	-4.419363	1.423668	-3.10
_cons	38.32086	1.269075	30.20

Females, 25-44
Sample Size: 1067, R^2: 0.1378

hrslyr	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
_wklywg	.0036119	.0009764	3.70
income1	.000074	.0000216	3.42
year1	-.0351319	.7538092	-0.05
year1eu	-.09722	2.13941	-0.05
_Iregion_2	.7228497	1.101261	0.66
_Iregion_3	2.583403	.9834005	2.63
_Iregion_4	3.565623	1.039286	3.43
eu	3.187543	1.391115	2.29
uo	1.010902	1.636966	0.62
ou	1.016554	2.064601	0.49
ue	3.001258	1.139986	2.63
oe	-1.570485	.9410287	-1.67
_cons	28.28632	1.015618	27.85

II. After Transition

Males, 16-19
Sample Size: 130, R^2: 0.2053

hrslyr_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
_wklywg_2	.0157357	.0056153	2.80
income2	-.0000844	.0001473	-0.57
year2	6.136616	2.029856	3.02
year2ue	-3.836428	6.02519	-0.64
_Iregion_2_2	-.5345169	2.812413	-0.19
_Iregion_2_3	-2.222853	2.550703	-0.87
_Iregion_2_4	-.4359318	2.518866	-0.17
eu	-.7159237	3.5329	-0.20
uo	-1.258966	4.363088	-0.29
ou	-1.818432	3.63482	-0.50
ue	3.499407	4.037401	0.87
eo	-3.393436	2.598393	-1.31
_cons	26.08498	2.449786	10.65

Females, 16-19
Sample Size: 87, R^2: 0.4226

hrslyr_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
_wklywg_2	.0505571	.0118207	4.28
income2	.0001742	.0002357	0.74
year2	2.272706	2.054591	1.11
year2ue	1.823241	7.041672	0.26
_Iregion_2_2	1.03441	2.789592	0.37
_Iregion_2_3	2.380357	2.641782	0.90
_Iregion_2_4	1.007146	2.891522	0.35
eu	-1.643991	4.05557	-0.41
uo	.8404791	4.729347	0.18
ou	-3.112533	4.868235	-0.64
ue	6.009419	4.829223	1.24
eo	.055331	2.409663	0.02
_cons	11.07078	2.781683	3.98

Males, 25-44
Sample Size: 899, R^2: 0.0848

hrslyr_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
_wklywg_2	.0044254	.0014118	3.13
income2	-.000018	.0000285	-0.63
year2	1.2175	.900567	1.35
year2ue	-4.426998	1.837908	-2.41
_Iregion_2_2	.3834415	1.218398	0.31
_Iregion_2_3	1.314628	1.16933	1.12
_Iregion_2_4	1.571493	1.16822	1.35
eu	-1.277467	1.074498	-1.19
uo	-3.683954	2.505858	-1.47
ou	.2393445	2.416644	0.10
ue	-.5862599	1.410212	-0.42
eo	-4.220392	1.324645	-3.19
_cons	38.90446	1.302372	29.87

Females, 25-44
Sample Size: 1104, R^2: 0.1456

hrslyr_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t
_wklywg_2	.000475	.0007026	0.68
income2	.0001435	.0000193	7.43
year2	-.6458902	.7750498	-0.83
year2ue	.3639881	2.073766	0.18
_Iregion_2_2	-1.221849	1.11285	-1.10
_Iregion_2_3	.8097397	1.013179	0.80
_Iregion_2_4	.367217	1.08502	0.34
eu	5.703664	1.116466	5.11
uo	3.903512	2.583345	1.51
ou	2.50733	2.103619	1.19
ue	5.030353	1.493588	3.37
eo	1.398652	.8940661	1.56
_cons	28.01224	1.00616	27.84