

Male Prime-age Nonworkers: Evidence from the NLSY97

Donna S. Rothstein, *U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics**

The labor force participation rate of prime-age men has been mostly falling since the late 1960s, with steeper declines during recessionary periods. This paper uses longitudinal data to examine whether men's prior trajectories of schooling, work, family, income, health, incarceration, and living situations differ between nonworkers and their working peers. It also investigates whether non-work status is a transitory state, and whether parents, spouses, partners, or others are providing support. The data in this paper are from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1997 (NLSY97), which contains detailed histories about individuals' lives across multiple domains. This allows one to drill down past top-level information about employment and schooling to create a more nuanced picture involving support systems, criminal behaviors, family formation, health, disability, and youth expectations regarding educational attainment and future employment. At the 2015-16 NLSY97 survey date about 9 percent of men, who range in age from 30 to 36, had not worked in the prior year. Most of these men had never married, about a third lived in a household with a parent, and almost 20 percent were incarcerated at the time of the interview. The vast majority of men who did not work in the year prior to the 2015-16 interview also did not work much in earlier years.

JEL code: J20

*Contact Information: BLS, 2 Massachusetts Ave., NE, Suite 4945, Washington, DC 20212. Rothstein.donna@bls.gov, 202-691-7529. The views expressed are those of the author and do not reflect the policies of the BLS or the views of other BLS staff members.

The labor force participation rate of prime-age men has been mostly falling since the late 1960s, with steeper declines during recessionary periods. In 1969, the labor force participation rate of men ages 25 to 54 was 96 percent, and in 2015, the rate was under 89 percent.¹ Prime-age men who are out of the labor force in a given month increasingly reported they did not work in the previous year, 83 percent in 2015 compared with 73 percent in 1988 (Council of Economic Advisors, 2016). Not working during the prime years has implications for future job and earnings potential, as well as for the well-being of the nonworker and his family.

A number of recent papers document and try to explain the decline in labor force participation of prime-age men over time. Krueger (2017) finds that health conditions, disability, and the rise of opioid prescriptions may be important contributing factors. Coglianese (2017) suggests that much of the decline in prime-age men's labor force participation is due to the increase of "in-and-outs," that is, men who temporarily leave the labor force between jobs. He credits the rise in this phenomenon to the increase in men living with parents and to a wealth effect from married/cohabiting men's partner's growth in earnings. Aguiar, et al. (2018) posit that more recent declines in the labor supply of young men are due to the advancement of video game technology. Abraham and Kearney (2018) provide an extensive review of the literature on the decline in employment over time, and evaluate which factors they believe are most important for the decline from 1996-2016. They posit that factors associated with labor demand, primarily related to trade and automation, are the most responsible for the decline over this period. Labor supply factors related to disability caseloads and compensation (Social Security Disability Insurance (SSDI) and The Veteran Affairs Disability Compensation program), the real value of

¹ See Bureau of Labor Statistics, Current Population Survey (CPS) data series LNS1130061, Seasonally adjusted, Labor Force Participation Rate 25-54 years, Men, Civilian labor force participation rate.

the minimum wage, and the rise in incarceration and the growth in the number of people with prison records, also had an impact. Stewart (2006) provides descriptive statistics of male nonworkers and their sources of financial support. He uses the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1979 (NLSY79) to look at work behavior from 1987-1997 and finds that a small fraction of men account for the majority of person-years spent not working. Using data from the Current Population Survey, he finds that a substantial proportion of nonworkers live with family members and receive financial support from those members.

This paper describes male nonworkers' characteristics, whether they want to work, and their paths to nonworker status. More specifically, it uses longitudinal data to examine whether men's prior trajectories of schooling, work, family, income, health, incarceration, and living situations differ between nonworkers and their working peers. It also investigates whether non-work status is a transitory state, and whether parents, spouses, partners, or others provide support. Data in this paper are from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1997 (NLSY97), which contains detailed histories about individuals' lives across multiple domains. This paper takes a more micro-approach than much of the prior literature on nonworkers, using data that allows one to drill down past top-level information about employment to create a more nuanced picture involving support systems, incarceration, substance use, family background, health, disability, and youth expectations regarding future employment.

Descriptive Statistics

Data are from the NLSY97, a cohort of individuals born in the years 1980 to 1984 who were living in the U.S. when first interviewed in 1997. At the latest interview in 2015-16, respondents were ages 30 to 36. The data set is well suited for the study of nonworkers because it contains a complete work history of individuals since their teens. It also contains a cognitive

test score², incarceration history, schooling history, income sources, and information about health and living situations, among other topics.

I limit my sample to men who participated in the 2015-16 interview and delete a small number who were missing key labor force status information, bringing the sample size to 3,500. I define nonworkers as those who did not work in the year prior to the 2015-16 interview, or about 9 percent of the (weighted) sample.³ The other 91 percent of the sample, who worked at least some weeks prior to the 2015-16 interview, I group in a worker category. About 90 percent of men in this category worked at least 75 percent of weeks in the year prior to the 2015-16 interview (Table 1). Table 1 also provides information about work behavior in the years leading up to the measure. The picture that emerges from this table is that the vast majority of men who did not work in the year prior to the 2015-16 interview, also did not work in earlier years. For example, 79 percent did not work in the second year before the interview, 64 percent did not work in the third year before the interview, and 61 percent did not work in the fourth year before the interview. Over half did not work in the four years prior to the 2015-16 interview. In contrast, those who did work at least some weeks in the year prior to the 2015-16 interview tended to work at least 75 percent of weeks in each of the prior years—89 percent in the second year before the interview, 86 percent in the third year before the interview, and 84 percent in the fourth year before the interview.

Table 2 shows status across multiple domains at the 2015-16 interview date. Workers and nonworkers have substantially different characteristics. About a third of the men who did

² The Armed Forces Qualification Test (AFQT) is the cognitive test used in the paper; it covers four sections of the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB) and measures math and verbal aptitude. This test was given to NLSY97 respondents in 1997-98.

³ Descriptive statistics in the tables that follow use round 17 (2015-16 interview) survey weights.

not work in the prior year reported at least some weeks of unemployment during that year, compared with 11 percent of men who did at least some work in the prior year. About 37 percent of those who did not work in the prior year stated that health limited their ability to work, compared with 4 percent of the sample who did at least some work in the prior year. Those who did not work were more likely to have been interviewed in prison than those who had worked at any point in the prior year (16 percent vs. 0 percent). Compared with men who worked in the prior year, men who did not work in the prior year were more likely to be black (33 percent vs. 14 percent), have less than a high school diploma (39 percent vs. 18 percent), and have an AFQT percentile score of less than 25 (53 percent vs. 24 percent). Men who did not work at any point in the prior year were much more likely to have never been married than their peers who had worked in the prior year (70 percent vs. 44 percent), and were more likely to live in a household with a parent (30 percent vs. 14 percent). With respect to time use in a typical week, men who did not work in the prior year were more likely to watch at least 21 hours of television and less likely to spend 10 or more hours on the computer than those who worked in the prior year. Table 3 displays men's housing situation at the 2015-16 interview. Of note is the lower percentage of nonworkers who own homes compared with their working peers (12 percent vs. 43 percent), the larger percentage who live in a parent's home (20 percent vs. 8 percent), and the larger percent that list prison as their current residence (15 percent vs. 0 percent).

Table 4 focuses on nonworkers and job search. The top section of the table displays the years since the respondent last reported a job. About 20 percent of nonworkers last reported a job between 1 and 2 years prior to the 2015-16 interview date, and 56 percent last reported a job 4 or more years prior (or never). Moving to the next section, the descriptive statistics refer to information from the 2015-16 interview about job search during the prior 4 weeks. About 25

percent of nonworkers report that they were looking for work in the last 4 weeks, with 14 percent noting that they are retired, disabled, or unable to work. Of the 27 percent who reported they were looking for work, almost 90 percent wanted to work 40 or more hours per week. Of the other 73 percent (who did not look for work in the last 4 weeks or stated they were retired/disabled/unable to work), 45 percent responded that they may want a job either full time or part time, and 18 percent responded they were retired, disabled, or unable to work. About half of this group responded they could currently start a job if one was offered. The majority of respondents who did not look for work in the last 4 weeks provided the main reason as ill health or physical disability (35 percent) or “other” (45 percent).

Table 5 shows descriptive statistics related to earnings, finances, and program participation. At the 2015-16 interview date, 39 percent of men who did not work in the prior year assessed their financial situation positively compared to 67 percent of men who worked at some point in the prior year. About a third of nonworkers assessed their financial situation as tough or in over their head, compared with a little over a tenth of those who had worked in the prior year. Very small percentages of workers and nonworkers indicate that they had financial issues such as late rent/ mortgage payments or a cash advance on credit cards in the past 12 months, although about a tenth in both groups responded to feeling pressure to pay bills by stores, creditors, or bill collectors. The next section of the table displays the incidence of program participation since the date of the last interview for the respondent and his spouse or partner. Of note is the higher percentage of nonworkers who report food assistance (27 vs. 9 percent) and Supplemental Security Income (17 percent vs. 1 percent).

Much of the income section of the NLSY97 asks about income sources in the prior calendar year, 2014 for the round 17 interview. About 94 percent of men who worked in the

prior year stated they received income from a job in the 2014 calendar year, compared with only 20 percent of men who did not work in the prior year. Of those who received income from a job in 2014, only 5 percent of men who worked in the prior year reported an income of less than \$10,000 compared with 43 percent of men who did not work in the prior year. About two thirds of men who worked in the prior year had a spouse or partner in 2014 compared with one third of men who did not work in the prior year. Of those with a spouse or partner in 2014, about 73 percent of men who worked in the prior calendar year and 60 percent of men who did not work in the prior year had a spouse or partner who received income from a job. Of men with a spouse/partner who received income from a job in 2014 and worked in the year prior to the 2015-16 interview, about 40 percent had a spouse or partner who earned at least \$40,000 from their job compared with 34 percent of nonworkers. For both groups, the majority (at least 70 percent) of these spouses or partners worked 40 or more hours per week.

About 28 percent of men who did not work in the prior year had other relatives in the household in 2014 compared with 16 percent for those who worked in the prior year. The relatives' combined income was at least \$40,000 for 39 percent of nonworkers with relatives in their household, and 68 percent for workers with relatives in their households. The NLSY97 does not ask a separate question about income amount from Social Security Disability Insurance, rather it is grouped with other income sources: "During 2014 did [you/you or your spouse/you or your partner] receive income from any other sources, such as Social Security payments, pension or retirement income including survivor's benefits, alimony, veterans or GI benefits, payments from life insurance policies or any other regular or periodic source of income?" A substantial percent of nonworkers (26 percent) report receiving other income in 2014 compared with only 4 percent of workers. The vast majority of recipients in both groups receive under \$20,000 in other income.

The final measure in this table is total family income for 2014, which includes own earnings, spouse/partner earnings, relatives' earnings, rental income, income from dividends, other income, etc. Nonworkers have substantially lower family income in 2014 than workers; 43 percent of nonworkers have a family income of less than \$10,000 compared with only 5 percent of workers. About 31 percent of nonworkers have a family income of at least \$40,000 compared with 75 percent of workers.

Table 6 shows early background characteristics, by work status in the year prior to the 2015-16 interview. On the whole, they suggest that nonworkers come from less advantaged backgrounds than workers. Nonworkers are more likely to have a mother with less than a high school diploma compared to their working peers (31 percent vs. 17 percent). They are less likely to live with both of their biological parents at the 1997 (round 1) interview, and more likely to have a mother who was 18 or younger at their birth. Nonworkers are more likely to have a parent report that they are in fair or poor health compared with their working peers (24 percent vs. 10 percent). Nonworkers are much more likely to report that they were shot at or had seen someone shot at with a gun between the ages of 12 and 18 compared with workers (27 percent vs. 11 percent). Nonworkers are also more likely to have been arrested while age 18 or younger (41 percent vs. 27 percent) and are three times as likely to have used marijuana by 19 (63 percent vs. 21 percent). They are less likely to have graduated from high school by age 20 compared with their working peers (50 percent vs. 78 percent).

Table 7 shows a snapshot of men in the NLSY97 sample at age 25, by whether they worked in the year prior to the 2015-16 interview. About 31 percent of nonworkers also did not work in the year they turned 25 compared with 5 percent of workers, although 42 percent did work at least 75 percent of weeks in the year they turned 25 compared with 80 percent of

workers. About 10 percent of nonworkers were incarcerated at some point in the year they turned 25 compared with 2 percent of workers. At the interview in the year they turned 25, nonworkers were much less likely to be married (9 percent vs. 24 percent), much more likely to live in a household with a parent (42 percent vs. 28 percent), and over twice as likely to rate their health as fair or poor (16 percent vs. 7 percent) than their working peers.

Probability of Being a Nonworker

This section examines the probability of not working in the year prior to the 2015-16 interview, as a function of early background and age 25 characteristics (as described in Tables 6 and 7). Table 8 displays coefficients and standard errors from simple linear probability models; the first specification includes early background characteristics and the second adds age-25 characteristics.⁴ Looking at column (1), the results suggest that early cognitive test scores and educational attainment are significant predictors of the likelihood of being a nonworker. For example, having an AFQT percentile score of less than 25 increases the likelihood by 6.6 percentage points, and obtaining a high school diploma by age 20 decreases the likelihood by 8.4 percentage points. Early arrests and drug use are not significant predictors, but a parent rating the youth's health in round 1 as poor or fair have large effects (although only 9% of the sample who have a parent interview had their health rated poor (1%) or fair (8%)). Having lower expectations about the likelihood of future work asked in the 2000 interview also increased the likelihood of being a nonworker.

The specification in column (2) adds age 25 characteristics. With the addition, the size of a number of the background characteristic coefficients diminish, although many, such as

⁴ Note that these results are descriptive and do not imply a causal relationship between the background characteristics and the likelihood of being a future nonworker.

obtaining a high school diploma by age 20 and AFQT percentile score, remain statistically significant. The strongest predictor of future nonwork is the percentage of weeks worked in the year turned 25, with not working or working less than 25% of weeks having the larger effects. Incarceration, marital status, and drug use at 25 are not statistically significant, but living with parents has a small positive effect on the likelihood of being a future nonworker (2.7 percentage points), and rating health at age 25 as poor has a large, statistically significant effect (27.4 percentage points).

Summary

In summary, about 9 percent of men in the NLSY97 did not work in the year prior to the 2015-16 interview. A majority had also not worked much in earlier years. Two possible reasons for the current nonwork status relates to health limitations that affect the ability to work (37 percent) and current or recent incarceration (20 percent). Men who did not work in the prior year were more likely to have less than a high school education and scored lower on the AFQT test given to respondents after the round 1 interview compared to men who had worked in the prior year. Nonworkers were also less likely to be married and more likely to live in a household with a parent. About a third of the men in the nonworker category had looked for work at some point during the prior year. Self-assessed questions about the respondent's financial situation at the interview date show that 39 percent of nonworkers considered their situation to be comfortable, with 43 percent assessing their situation as tough or in over their head. Program participation data indicate that nonworkers or their spouse or partner are more likely to have cash assistance from Supplemental Security Income. Nonworkers are more likely to have very low total family income than their working peers, although they are more likely to have other relatives

contributing in their household. Nonworkers come from less advantaged backgrounds than workers and were much more likely not to work at age 25.

Simple linear probability models suggest that early cognitive test scores and whether the respondent attained a high school diploma by age 20 are important predictors of the likelihood of not working in the year prior to the 2015-16 interview, whereas early drug use and arrest are not. Low or no employment while age 25 and poor health at 25 increase the likelihood of being a future nonworker.

Next steps: explore: impact of Great Recession on this cohort, neighborhood/geographical characteristics, more details about health, comparison to employment behaviors in the NLSY79 cohort at same age.

References

- Abraham, Katharine G. and Melissa S. Kearney. 2018. "Explaining the Decline in the U.S. Employment-to-Population Ratio: A Review of the Evidence." *NBER Working paper No. 24333*.
- Aguiar, Mark, Mark Bilts, Kerwin Kofi Charles, and Erik Hurst. 2018. "Leisure Luxuries and the Labor Supply of Young Men." *NBER working paper No. 23552*.
- Coglianesi, John. November 2017. "The Rise of In-and-Outs: Declining Labor Force Participation of Prime Age Men." *Harvard University, working paper*.
- Counsel of Economic Advisors. June 2016. "The Long-term Decline in Prime-age Male Labor Force Participation."
- Krueger, Alan B. 2017. "Where Have All the Workers Gone? An Inquiry into the Decline of the U.S. Labor Force Participation Rate." *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, pp. 1-59.
- Stewart, Jay. 2006. "Male Nonworkers: Who Are They and Who Supports Them?" *Demography* 43(3): 537-52.

Table 1. Men in the NLSY97 sample, employment history, by work status in past year, 2015-16 interview (weighted)

Characteristic	All	Work in prior year	Not work in prior year
<u>Percent of weeks employed</u>			
<u>Year before interview</u>			
0%	.09	.00	1.00
Greater than 0 to less than 25%	.02	.02	.00
25% to less than 75%	.07	.08	.00
75% or more	.82	.90	.00
<u>Second year before interview</u>			
0%	.10	.03	.79
Greater than 0 to less than 25%	.03	.02	.07
25% to less than 75%	.06	.06	.09
75% or more	.82	.89	.04
<u>Third year before interview</u>			
0%	.10	.05	.64
Greater than 0 to less than 25%	.03	.02	.07
25% to less than 75%	.08	.07	.11
75% or more	.80	.86	.17
<u>Fourth year before interview</u>			
0%	.11	.06	.61
Greater than 0 to less than 25%	.02	.02	.04
25% to less than 75%	.07	.07	.08
75% or more	.80	.84	.27
No work in second and third years	.07	.02	.64
No work in second, third, and fourth years	.06	.01	.56
Sample size	3,500	3,134	366

Table 2. Men in the NLSY97 sample, by work status in past year, 2015-16 interview date (weighted)

At 2015-16 Interview date	All	Work in prior year	Not work in prior year
Any weeks unemployed prior year	.13	.11	.33
Collect UI prior year	.04	.04	.03
Health limit work	.07	.04	.37
Disabled-proxy interview	.00	.00	.02
Interviewed in prison	.02	.00	.16
Incarcerated prior year	.03	.01	.20
Ever incarcerated	.14	.12	.36
Enrolled in school at interview date	.06	.06	.07
Veteran	.11	.11	.07
Race/Ethnicity			
White	.70	.72	.53
Black	.15	.14	.33
Hispanic	.13	.13	.13
Education level			
Less than high school	.19	.18	.39
High school diploma	.23	.23	.30
Some college	.25	.25	.22
Bachelor's degree or higher	.33	.35	.09
AFQT percentile score			
Less than 25%	.26	.24	.53
25% to less than 50%	.24	.24	.20
50% to less than 75%	.23	.24	.19
75% or higher	.27	.29	.07
AFQT score missing	.18	.18	.23
Marital status			
Never married	.46	.44	.70
Married	.45	.48	.18
Separated	.01	.01	.03
Divorced/widowed	.08	.08	.09
Cohabiting (sample not married)	.33	.36	.16
Live in household with parent	.15	.14	.30
Child under 18 in household	.51	.54	.23
Child under age 6 in household	.36	.38	.13
Age 30 to 32	.40	.40	.39
Age 33 to 36	.60	.60	.61
Time use in a typical week			
Watch television 21 or more hours per week	.11	.10	.24
Use computer 10 or more hours per week	.56	.59	.30
Have health insurance	.76	.78	.53
Self-rated health			
Excellent or very good	.60	.62	.43
Good	.29	.28	.33
Fair	.10	.09	.18
Poor	.01	.01	.06

Region			
Northeast	.17	.17	.16
North Central	.24	.25	.20
South	.36	.35	.44
West	.22	.23	.20
Sample size	3,500	3,134	366

Table 3. Men in the NLSY97 sample, reported housing situation at 2015-16 interview date (weighted)

At 2015-16 Interview date	All	Work in prior year	Not work in prior year
Own home	.41	.43	.12
Spouse/partner own home	.01	.01	.01
Rent home	.44	.44	.42
Live in parent's home	.09	.08	.20
Live in spouse/partner parent's home	.01	.01	.01
Live with grandparents	.00	.00	.00
Live in housing as part of job compensation	.01	.01	.01
Housing is a gift	.01	.01	.03
Housing paid by government/welfare/charity	.00	.00	.01
Temporary quarters, house under construction	.00	.00	.00
Live without formal arrangement	.00	.00	.02
Incarcerated	.02	.00	.15
Homeless	.00	.00	.01
Live in house that will inherit/estate in progress	.00	.00	.00
Other	.01	.01	.02
Missing	.00	.00	.02

Table 4. Men in the NLSY97 sample who did not work in the past year, current gap between jobs, 2015-16 interview (weighted)

Characteristic	Not work in prior year
Years since last job	
Greater than 1 and less than 2	.20
2 or more and less than 3	.16
3 or more and less than 4 calendar year	.07
4 or more (or no job)	.56
Have current gap between jobs	.98
Current job gap:	
Doing anything to find work in last 4 weeks?	
Yes	.27
No	.59
Retired, disabled, or unable to work	.14
<u>Conditional on looking for work in last 4 weeks</u>	
How many hours want to work?	
40 or more	.88
Less than 40	.12
<u>Conditional on NOT looking for work in last 4 weeks</u>	
Currently want a job either full time or part time?	
Yes or maybe, it depends	.45
No	.37
Retired, disabled, or unable to work	.18
Could currently start a job if one offered?	
Yes	.50
Reason not look for work last 4 weeks	
Couldn't find work	.02
Lack necessary skills	.01
Can't arrange child care	.02
Family responsibilities	.05
In school or other training	.06
Ill health, physical disability	.35
Transportation problems	.03
Other	.45

Table 5. Men in the NLSY97 sample, earnings, finances, and program participation by work status in past year, 2015-16 interview (weighted)

Characteristic	All	Work in prior year	Not work in prior year
Self-assessed financial situation at interview date			
Comfortable	.65	.67	.39
Occasional difficulties	.21	.21	.18
Tough	.11	.09	.30
In over head	.03	.02	.13
In past 12 months, you or spouse/partner:			
Cash advance on credit cards	.02	.02	.02
Obtained a payday loan	.01	.01	.01
Rent/mortgage late > 60 days	.02	.02	.02
Pressure from bill collectors	.10	.09	.11
Program participation since date of last interview			
Respondent and/or spouse/partner			
Lived in public housing	.01	.01	.04
Rental voucher	.01	.01	.02
Transportation assistance	.01	.00	.04
Child care service/assistance	.00	.00	.00
Help paying energy bills	.02	.01	.03
Food assistance, WIC or SNAP	.10	.09	.27
Cash assistance from SSI	.02	.01	.17
Cash assistance from AFDC/TANF	.01	.01	.02
Other non-cash assistance	.00	.00	.02
<u>Calendar year 2014</u>			
Collect Unemployment Insurance 2014	.04	.04	.05
Collect Worker's Compensation 2014	.01	.01	.01
Wage and salary income 2014			
Receive income from job?	.87	.94	.20
Income less than \$10,000	.06	.05	.43
Income \$10,000 to less than \$20,000	.10	.10	.21
Income \$20,000 to less than \$40,000	.28	.28	.24
Income \$40,000 to less than \$70,000	.32	.32	.10
Income \$70,000 or more	.24	.24	.03
Receive 2014 income from bus., farm, practice	.04	.04	.01
Have spouse/partner in 2014	.62	.65	.34
Spouse/partner wage and salary income 2014			
Spouse/partner receive income from job?	.72	.73	.60
Income less than \$10,000	.08	.08	.12
Income \$10,000 to less than \$20,000	.16	.16	.16
Income \$20,000 to less than \$40,000	.36	.36	.37
Income \$40,000 to less than \$70,000	.26	.27	.13
Income \$70,000 or more	.13	.13	.21
Spouse partner hours worked per week 2014			
1 to 20 hours	.09	.09	.05
21 to 39 hours	.21	.21	.21

40 or more hours	.70	.70	.74
Income from other sources?	.06	.04	.26
Other income less than \$10,000	.49	.50	.47
Other income \$10,000 to less than \$20,000	.31	.28	.38
Other income \$20,000 to less than \$40,000	.11	.14	.05
Other income \$40,000 to less than \$70,000	.05	.03	.08
Other income \$70,000 or more	.04	.05	.02
Other relatives in household 2014	.17	.16	.28
Relative income less than \$10,000	.06	.05	.10
Relative income \$10,000 to less than \$20,000	.09	.07	.20
Relative income \$20,000 to less than \$40,000	.21	.20	.31
Relative income \$40,000 to less than \$70,000	.19	.20	.15
Relative income \$70,000 or more	.45	.48	.24
Total family income 2014			
Family income less than \$10,000	.08	.05	.43
Family income \$10,000 to less than \$20,000	.06	.05	.14
Family income \$20,000 to less than \$40,000	.15	.15	.12
Family income \$40,000 to less than \$70,000	.24	.25	.15
Family income \$70,000 or more	.48	.50	.16
Family income missing	.10	.09	.16
Sample size	3,500	3,134	366

Table 6. Men in the NLSY97 sample, early background characteristics, by work status in past year, 2015-16 interview (weighted)

Characteristics	All	Work in prior year	Not work in prior year
Biological mother's education level			
Less than high school	.18	.17	.31
High school diploma	.37	.37	.33
Some college	.24	.24	.20
Bachelor's degree or higher	.21	.22	.16
Mother's education level missing	.07	.07	.10
Family structure at round 1 interview (1997)			
Two biological or adoptive parents	.56	.57	.41
Two parents, one biological	.14	.13	.23
Biological/adoptive mother only	.23	.23	.27
Biological/adoptive father only	.04	.04	.03
Other	.04	.03	.07
Mother age 18 or younger at birth	.06	.06	.14
Mother's age at birth missing	.07	.06	.10
Parent rating of youth health round 1			
Excellent or very good	.61	.62	.44
Good	.28	.28	.32
Fair	.10	.09	.18
Poor	.01	.01	.06
Parent rating of youth health missing or no parent interview			
Youth year of birth			
1980	.20	.21	.15
1981	.20	.20	.24
1982	.20	.20	.21
1983	.19	.19	.19
1984	.20	.20	.20
Youth experiences 12 to 18			
Victim of repeated bullying	.12	.12	.13
Home broken into	.10	.10	.10
Shot at, or see someone shot at with gun	.14	.12	.27
Youth received high school diploma by age 20	.76	.78	.50
Youth arrested while age 18 or younger	.28	.27	.41
Youth used marijuana by 19	.55	.21	.63
Youth used hard drugs by 19	.18	.18	.21
Youth expectations about school and work for 5 years from 2000 interview date			
Percent chance in school			
Less than 75 percent	.71	.70	.76
75 percent or more	.29	.30	.24
If in school, percent chance work 20+ hr/wk			
Less than 75 percent	.32	.31	.39
75 percent or more	.68	.69	.61

If not in school, percent chance work 20+ hr/wk			
Less than 75 percent	.06	.05	.16
75 percent or more	.94	.95	.84
Age 5 years from 2000 interview	23.01	23.01	23.01
Missing 2000 interview	.07	.07	.07

Table 7. Men in the NLSY97 sample, status at age 25, by work status in past year, 2015-16 interview (weighted)

Characteristics	All	Work in prior year	Not work in prior year
Percent of weeks employed year turn 25			
0%	.07	.05	.31
Greater than 0 to less than 25%	.03	.03	.08
25% to less than 75%	.13	.13	.20
75% or more	.77	.80	.42
Incarcerated in year turn 25	.03	.02	.10
At interview, year turn 25			
Married	.23	.24	.09
Cohabiting	.18	.18	.16
Living with parent	.29	.28	.42
Self-rated health			
Excellent or very good	.66	.67	.48
Good	.26	.25	.37
Fair	.08	.07	.13
Poor	.01	.00	.03
Use marijuana since date of last interview	.23	.23	.25
Use hard drugs since date of last interview	.06	.05	.10
Missing interview year turn 25	.08	.08	.12

Table 8. Probability of not working in the year prior to the 2015-16 interview, OLS linear probability model, select variables (unweighted)

Characteristics	(1)	(2)
Black	.078 (.014)	.044 (.014)
Hispanic	-.014 (.014)	-.017 (.013)
AFQT percentile score		
Less than 25%	.066 (.018)	.063 (.017)
25% to less than 50%	.014 (.017)	.023 (.017)
50% to less than 75%	.027 (.017)	.032 (.017)
Mother age 18 or younger at birth	.046 (.021)	.042 (.020)
Parent rating of youth health round 1		
Good	.013 (.015)	.007 (.014)
Fair	.073 (.034)	.044 (.033)
Poor	.200 (.082)	.139 (.079)
Youth experiences 12 to 18		
Victim of repeated bullying	.004 (.017)	.006 (.017)
Home broken into	-.021 (.017)	-.021 (.017)
Shot at, or see someone shot at with gun	.045 (.015)	.035 (.015)
Youth received high school diploma by age 20	-.084 (.013)	-.056 (.013)
Youth arrested while age 18 or younger	.016 (.012)	-.003 (.012)
Youth used marijuana by 19	.017 (.011)	.013 (.011)
Youth used hard drugs by 19	-.002 (.015)	-.012 (.014)
Youth expectations 5 years from 2000 interview		
If not in school, percent chance work 20+ hr/wk		
Less than 75 percent	.061 (.021)	.032 (.022)
At Age 25		
Percent of weeks employed year turn 25		
0%	---	.279 (.020)

Greater than 0 to less than 25%	---	.103 (.026)
25% to less than 75%	---	.053 (.015)
Incarcerated in year turn 25	---	.013 (.027)
Married at 25	---	-.023 (.014)
Cohabiting at 25	---	-.009 (.014)
Living with parent at 25	---	.027 (.012)
Self-rated health at 25		
Good	---	.016 (.012)
Fair	---	.021 (.019)
Poor	---	.274 (.067)
Use marijuana since date of last interview (25)	---	.001 (.014)
Use hard drugs since date of last interview (25)	---	.034 (.025)
Sample size	3499	3499

Note: standard errors in parentheses. Also includes indicators for year of birth, other race, family structure at round 1, mother's educational attainment, and missing observations.