Parental Job Loss and Children's College Attendance
In Black and White Middle Class Families

Ariel Kalil and Patrick Wightman
Harris School of Public Policy Studies
University of Chicago

March 7, 2008

Abstract

Job loss remains a permanent feature of the American economy. Black and white children may experience parental job loss differently, even when they share the same class location. We address this question using data from the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID), following those children "born" into the survey (1968-1979) and followed through age 21. We focus on "middle-class" families (income greater than twice the appropriate poverty threshold at the child's birth; 810 whites and 149 blacks). We find that parental job loss reduces the likelihood of obtaining any post-secondary education for all children, but the impact on blacks is greater. Furthermore, job loss appears to have a greater destabilizing effect on black households and this appears to account for a significant portion of the differential impact that we observe.

Parental Job Loss and Children's College Attendance
In Black and White Middle Class Families

Economic instability and job displacement remain permanent features of the American economy. According to the leading government statistic, there were over sixteen and a half million new jobless claims filed in 2006. Many of those claims represent families. It is well-established that involuntary job loss and unemployment can lead to poorer future outcomes (e.g., lower earnings) in the labor market for the affected worker, significant material hardship, marital discord and divorce, poor physical and mental health for adults in the family, and family stress and strained parent-child relations (Charles & Stephens, 2004; Coelli, 2005; Conger & Elder, 1994; Farber, 1993; Jacobson, LaLonde, & Sullivan, 1993; Kessler, House, & Turner, 1987; Kessler, Turner, & House, 1987, 1988, 1989; Oreopolous et al., 2005; Price, 1992; Price & Fang, 2002; Price, Choi, & Vinokur; 2002; Ruhm, 1991; Stevens, 1997; Vinokur, Price, & Caplan, 1996; Yeung & Hofferth, 1998). Yet, surprisingly little is known about how important labor market phenomena such as parental involuntary job loss shape the life course of American children. In particular, we know little about the consequences of parental job loss among older youth who are preparing for the transition to adulthood and whose concurrent behavioral choices can have long-term economic consequences (see Coelli, 2005 and Oreopolous et al., 2005 for recent important exceptions).

Moreover, studies of this topic among black youth have focused almost exclusively on low-income families. A contribution of this study is to examine the impact of parental job loss among black middle-class families in a nationally representative sample. We argue that due to differences in wealth, neighborhood contexts, and discrimination in the labor market, black and white adolescents are likely to experience parental job loss differently, even when they share the same class location. These differences, if they indeed exist, are relevant because educational

achievement is a strong predictor of earnings and employment in today's economy. For example, in 1998 those with just a high school degree earned on average $23,594 while the average annual earnings of college graduates was $43,782 (Newburger & Curry, 2000). Educational attainment may have even more salience for the economic outcomes of black adolescents than their white counterparts. A crucial, yet unexamined, question is whether parental job loss affects youths similarly, or whether there are important differences by race. If differences exist, parental job loss will affect the resources that black and white youth bring with them as they make the transition to adulthood.

Background: Parental job loss & children's education

This paper examines the association between parental involuntary job loss and the likelihood that children will enter college by the age of 21. Job loss is associated with both immediate and long-term economic consequences. Farber (1997), using the Displaced Worker Survey (DWS)—a regular supplement to the January Current Population Survey (CPS) since 1984—estimates that displaced workers have a large (35 percentage point) probability of being unemployed following a displacement, are five percentage points more likely to work part-time than they were prior to the displacement, and earn 13% less upon reemployment. Ruhm (1991), using the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID), finds that job loss is associated with longer-term losses as well; displaced workers display increased unemployment and decreased wages up to four years following displacement. Jacobson, LaLonde, and Sullivan (1993) also find longer-term economic losses. Using administrative data they find that the earnings of even high-tenure workers are 25% lower than their pre-displacement levels five years after the initial job loss.

Involuntary job losses can occur among mothers and fathers and are hypothesized to adversely affect children's educational attainment. We anticipate negative impacts for a number

4

of reasons. First, insufficient work resulting from involuntary job loss can limit the income necessary to purchase such things as education, housing, food, and safe and cognitively enriched learning environments that are critical for children's successful development (Becker & Thomes, 1986; Duncan & Brooks-Gunn, 1997). In situations where parents purchase their children's education directly, either by sending them to private schools or financing their college educations, the loss of resources may be potentially devastating. For example, Dynarski (2003) finds evidence that the credit constraint, that is, the inability of families to finance their children's post-secondary education, is a significant obstacle when federal assistance is not available. Kane (2001) and others argue that the slow response of minorities and low-income whites to the rising educational premium of the late 70s and early 80s is also evidence that parental income is vital to children's access to the education market and that credit constraints restrict this access.

Carneiro and Heckman (2003) suggest that these trends rather point to the importance of providing a household environment that supports children's education preparedness. They argue that higher incomes buy higher quality environments which produce children who are differentially capable, motivated and empowered by their parents to take advantage of educational opportunities. Yeung, Linver and Brooks-Gunn (2002) find that the positive association between family income and children's cognitive development is mediated by investment in a stimulating learning environment. Yeung and Hofferth (1998) find that families who experience severe income losses are especially susceptible to cuts in expenditures and receipt of welfare. Stephens (2001) finds that consumption is significantly reduced as a result of permanent earnings shocks such as job loss.

Of course, there exists the potential for a strong endogeneity between parental earnings and children's development. If good workers are also good parents then the positive correlation typically observed between family income and educational outcomes may in the extreme be the exclusive result of this parental quality. However, because job loss approximates an exogenous earnings shock it can serve as a control for unobserved parental quality.

Second, involuntary job losses are presumed to be psychologically stressful for parents (see Conger & Elder, 1994; McLoyd, Jayaratne, Ceballo, & Borquez, 1994; Kessler et al., 1988, 1989). Furthermore, Charles & Stephens (2001) find that job loss increases the probability of marital separation and divorce. These pressures can inhibit parents' emotional warmth and increase parents' erratic or disengaged behaviors. In turn, ineffective parenting can lead to poorer adjustment in children (Elder, Nguyen, & Caspi, 1985; McLoyd, 1998).

Third, children's achievement motivation and school engagement may be affected by their parents' job loss (Galambos & Silbereisen, 1987). Barling, Dupre, and Hepburn (1998) showed that youth's perceptions of parents' job insecurity were negatively correlated with their belief that work is inherently good and fulfilling and that hard work can overcome obstacles to success. In turn, the less youth believed in this notion, the more likely they were to display low motivation to work. In a related study, Barling, Zacharatos, and Hepburn (1999) showed that undergraduates who perceive their parents to be insecure about their jobs are distracted cognitively and have worse academic performance.

Job loss in black and white families

To date, multiple distinct racial groups have not been included in the same study. If multiple groups are included, there is often little overlap in their socio-economic status, which often results in comparisons of higher-income whites with lower-income blacks. Some evidence

suggests that even within the middle class, the consequences of job loss appear to be more severe for blacks. Wilson, Tienda, and Wu (1995) find that among college graduates, blacks are 2.24 times as likely to be dismissed or laid off as whites. Spalter-Roth and Deitch (1999) report that blacks who lose jobs are more likely than their white counterparts to fall from professional or managerial to lower level occupations and to move from a job with health insurance benefits to reemployment without health insurance.

Moreover, at least three additional factors suggest that parental job loss may affect black and white families differently, even when they share the same class location. These factors are family wealth, parental experiences of employment discrimination, and neighborhood role models of employment.

Family wealth. The difference between black and white wealth (i.e., home ownership, savings, assets) far exceeds race differences in income, occupational, and educational levels; this difference is especially pronounced among the middle class (Conley, 1999; Oliver & Shapiro, 1997). Home ownership, for example, which is the primary method of equity accumulation for most American families, varies significantly by race. In 1997, only 44 percent of blacks owned their own homes, in contrast to 71 percent of whites (Conley, 1999). Similarly, while the typical white family has assets totaling a median of $72,000, the median net worth of the typical black family is only $9,800. These wealth differences could dramatically affect families' ability to sustain itself through a financial crisis such as the loss of employment. Financial assets, which can be liquidated or against which families can borrow, or recourse to assistance to family and friends can mitigate the negative effects of a parental job loss by alleviating economic pressure and serving as a "psychological buffer" against worries about the future. Parents in families with few assets or little equity to draw upon may be particularly pessimistic about their children's

future in the event of a household economic downturn. The transmission of these beliefs and expectations may affect the youth's own expectations and behaviors. Similarly, adolescents' reactions to parental employment downturns may be moderated by the knowledge that vital financial resources are available from sources other than parents' current earnings. This may be especially important during adolescence, when families are making plans for children's college attendance and how to finance it. Conley (1999) showed that family wealth is a significant predictor of children's college completion and that it accounts for a substantial amount of the black-white difference in educational attainment.

Race discrimination. Parents' own experiences of race-based discrimination in the labor market predict the extent to which they socialize their adolescents to be prepared for future experiences of racial bias (Hughes & Chen, 1999). Expectations by parents and their children regarding future discrimination may be associated with adolescents' achievement-related expectations and behaviors. On one hand, higher rates of perceived discrimination on the part of parents may be associated with greater encouragement for their children to do well in school and advance to college. This could, in turn, be associated with better school performance and a greater attachment to the importance of education (Wong, Eccles, & Sameroff, 2000). On the other hand, youth who perceive that discrimination will negatively affect their future economic well-being could respond by disengaging from school (Ogbu, 1992; Taylor, Casten, Flickinger, Roberts, & Fulmore, 1994). Middle-class black adults in professional, white-collar occupations are likely to be in the (statistical) minority at their places of employment and might be especially aware of workplace race dynamics, especially given their elevated risk of discrimination in the labor market (Wilson et al., 1995).

Neighborhood context. Black middle class communities display highly-segregated residence patterns, with blacks significantly less likely than whites to reside in economically-advantaged census tracts (Massey & Denton, 1993). High socioeconomic status neighborhoods (i.e., those with greater numbers of college-educated and managerial/professional workers) are particularly important for promoting academic achievement among children and adolescents (Leventhal & Brooks-Gunn, 2000). Neighborhood role models of employment have also been linked to adolescents' visions of the future and perceptions of barriers to occupational and educational success (Cook, Church et al., 1996; MacLeod, 1995). These neighborhood conditions could also moderate the effects of parental job loss. Residence in more-advantaged neighborhoods may translate into richer networks of ties to information about employment prospects for parents who have lost a job; this may be particularly relevant for middle-class blacks seeking to re-enter the professional or managerial labor market. Neighborhood social networks that provide useful information and connections for adolescents' educational or future employment prospects may also buffer against the effects of parental job loss on adolescents' expectations for the future and concurrent behavior. Finally, neighborhood conditions may be associated with the psychological experience of parental job loss in black and white families. Because middle-class black families are more likely to live among disadvantaged neighbors, their job losses may raise psychological issues of "sliding down" to an immediately visible lower social class status. This may be associated with parents' and adolescents' expectations for the future and with adolescents' behavioral choices.

To our knowledge only three papers have examined the effect of parental job loss on children's educational attainment and human capital development using high-quality, large-scale longitudinal data. Using the Survey of Income and Program Participation, Kalil and Ziol-Guest

(2007) find that fathers' involuntary job losses increase the likelihood that children will repeat a grade or be suspended or expelled from school. Coelli (2005) uses the Canadian Survey of Labour and Income Dynamics to show that parental job loss leads to an increase in children's probability of dropping out of high school and a decrease in the probability of entering university. Also using Canadian data, Oreopoulos, Page and Stevens (2005) find that the sons of workers displaced in 1982 from a sample of mid-sized firms had lower earnings between the ages of 25 and 31 and were more likely to receive unemployment and social assistance. The present paper builds on these findings by examining these associations with a dataset that includes data gathered over sample members' entire childhoods, and by focusing on race differences within middle-class families.

Data & Sample Description

We use the Panel Study of Income Dynamics for our analysis. Our sample consists of the pooled cross section of those children who are "born" into the survey, that is, observed at age one and subsequently followed through age 21. Furthermore, because our dependent variable is post-secondary education, we restrict our sample to high school graduates for whom college is a viable option. To determine class status, we use total family income at the time of the individual's birth. Given that average income is highly correlated with job tenure and job loss, using this to determine sample composition could potentially bias our results. Therefore we use income at birth as a way capturing a kind of "starting gate" equality. Following Duncan et. al. (1992) we designate a sample family as "middle class" if their total income is between two and six times the appropriate poverty threshold (i.e. adjusted for family size and age of household head). In 2005, for family of four this range extends from $38,700 to $116,100.

Using these criteria, our sample is comprised of 959 individuals, 810 whites and 149 blacks. We draw an average of 74 whites and 14 blacks, 88 total, from each annual survey wave between 1968 and 1979. We use 1979 as our cut-off to ensure that the entire sample is at least 18 years old by 1997, after which the PSID changed to a biennial format. Because the PSID initially over-sampled low-income households and given that we use income to construct our sample, we use the survey-supplied sampling weights in all our analyses. Specifically, for each individual we use the weight from the most recent year he or she was observed in the survey.

Our dependent variable is report of any post-secondary education by the age of twenty-one. Because the reported education information varies by the relationship to the household head (in two-parent households the male spouse is the head by convention), we use all available sources to determine educational status. A non-head/non-spouse is categorized as a college entrant if he or she reports thirteen or more years of completed education or if he or she currently resides in an academic institution. For heads and spouses post-secondary education includes non-academic training, some college but no degree, or a college degree. Of those children born into middle-class incomes, 62 percent of whites and 55 percent of blacks report some post-secondary education by age twenty-one (the difference is not statistically significant). Conditional on high school graduation, these figures rise to 68 and 67 percent, respectively. Whites are more likely to be heads or spouses of their own households by age twenty-one, and as a result are more likely to report some college but no degree. Otherwise there is no significant difference in the source of information between blacks and whites.

We consider jobs lost by household heads. Following Ruhm (1991), Stevens (1997), Stephens (2001, 2002) and Charles & Stephens (2004) the job losers in our sample are those parents who report being separated from their employment as a result of either a plant

closing/employer death or lay off/dismissal. Using this definition, 39 percent of the whites and 42 percent of the blacks in our sample grew up in a household in which a parent lost a job. The difference is not statistically significant.

There is a question of whether or not dismissed or fired is really a shock. And if it is, then it is a different kind of shock than being laid off; the primary distinction being that when an individual is fired, he or she is being singled out for personal reasons as opposed to being swept up in a wave of layoffs. Furthermore, personal attributes that put an individual at risk of being fired are likely to be correlated with or even influence parenting behaviors. If this is the case, then any measure of the association between job loss and child development will be biased by these parental attributes. Unfortunately, in practice, we cannot separate out the lay-offs from the firings. However in an in-depth study of the original responses, Boisjoly, Duncan & Smeeding (1994) report that only 16 percent of the lay-offs/firings reported between 1968 and 1992 were firings. Thus whatever bias may result from the inclusion of these individuals, while non-trivial, is likely to be minimal. Moreover, inasmuch as being fired typically results in the loss of employment and earnings together with all the other consequences of displacement, it is not entirely clear that these parents should be excluded from our sample. This is especially true considering that our main interest is not in the impact of the shock of the loss of employment, but the *difference* between the effects of the shock on black and white families.

Methodology

We estimate our models using ordinary least squares; as a result the coefficient estimates measure the percentage-point change in the probability of obtaining some post-secondary education attributable to a one-unit change in the corresponding independent variable (results from probit estimations are both quantitatively and qualitatively similar). In order to present a

12

more descriptive picture of both the impact and the *differential* impact of job loss on black and white families, we suppress the common constant (main effect) and interact each of our controls and independent variables with separate black and white dummy variables. This specification generates coefficient estimates identical to those we would obtain were we to estimate the model on blacks and whites separately. In addition, we are able to test the statistical significance of the differences between the coefficients.

Controls include the individual's gender, birth order (dummy variable equal to 1 if firstborn), the number of siblings, an indicator for father's and mother's college education, a dummy variable indicating that the individual was born into a two-parent household, total family income at birth, year of birth, and an indicator if the individual recorded one or more survey non-response between ages 1 and 18 (we assume that such non-responses are random). Means and standard deviations are reported in Table 1. Roughly 10 percent of the black individuals in our sample were born to a single parent, compared to 2.5 percent of the white individuals. To put this difference in context, among individuals born into incomes less than 200 percent of the poverty line, 45 percent of blacks are born to single parents compared to 10 percent of whites. This is some confirmation that our measure of class status captures some distinctions beyond the difference in income. Conditioning on class status, the total family income of black and white children at birth is $61,500 and $56,500, respectively. However, averaged over childhood, family income appears to move in drastically different directions. The mean annual family income for black children is roughly $60,000 compared to roughly $78,000 for white children.

Main Results

Our main results are reported in Table 2. Looking first at the demographic controls, the correlates of post-secondary educational attainment are generally similar in direction but differ

somewhat by magnitude. Females are more likely to go to college, but compared to white females, black females are almost twice as likely to do so. Parental education has a strong positive correlation with the education of both black and white children, but this is especially true of black mothers with at least some college education.

Parental job loss decreases the probability of entering college for both black and white children. For white children, job loss reduces the likelihood by over 5 percentage points, but this effect is not statistically significant. For black children the impact is -18 percentage points, a statistically significant effect size of 27 percent. The 12 percentage point difference has a p-value of 0.17, above conventional measures of statistical significance but non-trivial nonetheless. These results contrast markedly with those we obtain by estimating the same model with the low-income sample, that is, individuals born into households whose total income was less than twice the appropriate poverty threshold. For these individuals, parental job loss has a much smaller impact, 9 percentage points for whites and 7 points for blacks.

Childhood Conditions

The specifications in Table 3 expand the set of controls to include conditions that prevailed over the individuals' childhood. These include the average and standard deviation of annual income (measured over ages 1-17), the number of years that the individual lived in an owned home and the number of years his or her parents were married. These variables are designed to serve as (admittedly crude) proxies of the economic and social resources available to these individuals as they grew up. These controls were excluded from the initial model because of their potential endogeneity with parental job loss; we include them now to see if in fact any such relationship exists. Because they are measured over the entire childhood they do not take into account the timing of the job loss and therefore do not constitute a formal test of mediation.

14

Nevertheless, if the effect of job loss is diminished by the addition of one or more of these controls, we may assume that the relationship between parental job loss and children's education operates through one or more of these intermediary channels, at least in part. Moreover, if the resources available to black households are fewer or less stable than those in white households, then we would expect the differential impact of job loss to be mediated as well.

The first specification adds the mean and standard deviation of annual income. As seen in the summary statistics, white families average almost $20,000 dollars more in total income then black families over the first 17 years. However, as can be seen in the first three columns of Table 3, the inclusion of these variables has virtually no influence on the impacts of parental job loss. Similarly, the family structure and residential stability controls have virtually no impact on the influence of job loss. Together these results suggest that conditions, even those potentially sensitive to parental displacement, do not explain the relationship we observe between job loss and children's education.

The Job Loss Experience

We next turn to the job loss itself. If there is something about the experience of being separated from employment that differs between black and white middle-class families this may account for differential impact that job loss has on children's education.

Stevens (1997) finds that repeated job loss contributes to the persistently depressed earnings typically observed after an initial job loss. Looking at our descriptive statistics we see that black parents are over 5 percentage points more likely to report two or more job losses over the individuals' childhood. While this difference is not statistically significant, we distinguish between single and multiple job losers to see if the impact may account for some of the difference we see. Looking at columns (1)-(3) of Table 4, we see that the impact of losing a job

just once is both trivial and quantitatively insignificant for both black and white children.

However, for both blacks and whites the effect of multiple job losses is large, and in the case of

blacks, tremendously so. Black children whose parents report two or more job losses are almost

40 percent less likely to obtain any post-secondary education compared to children who report no

or one job loss. For whites the impact is 17 percent; the difference is significant at the 17 percent

level.

Columns (4)-(6) examine the role that macroeconomic conditions may have played when

households reported their first job loss. We do this by controlling separately for displacements

that occurred during the recessionary periods of the early 70s, the early and late 80s and the early

90s. Jobs lost during these periods had significant but similar effects on the education of both

blacks and whites. However, while jobs lost outside these periods had a trivial impact on whites,

for blacks the effect size was nearly 30 percent, suggesting that whereas white households may

be more in synch with broader labor market trends, the job-loss impact on black households is

more robust.

Blacks are more likely to experience unemployment after losing a job and this has a

slightly larger impact on black children. Job loss with no subsequent unemployment has slight,

similar impacts on both blacks and whites. Conversely, the effects of displacement and at least 6

months of unemployment are 14 and 21 percentage points, for whites and blacks respectively.

While the difference is not significant, this result suggests that small difference between the

unemployment experiences by households has large consequences for black children. (We also

considered any and 3 months unemployment as well, with smaller but similar results.)

We used an approach similar to the one above to investigate whether job losses that

resulted in income losses of 25 percent or greater (over the previous year) could explain our

16

initial results. Families experiencing such a loss fared worse than families whose incomes

proved more stable, but this did not explain the gap between black and white households, which

supports our earlier finding that, even if middle class blacks are poorer than their white

counterparts, income itself explains very little of the differential response to job loss we observe.

Our final specification examines the role of labor market attachment, or put differently,

the magnitude of the shock. We impose "tenure" criteria and create mutually exclusive

categories indicating whether or not the first separation was from a tenured or non-tenured job.

In order to be considered tenured a parent must be between the ages of 25 and 59, have been at

his or her employer for at least a year and worked for at least 1000 hours in the year prior to

reporting a loss (20 hours a week over 50 weeks). The greater the attachment, the greater the

shock of losing such a job; these employees may be less prepared for the requirements of a job

search and if their general skills have been replaced by more firm specific ones they may be less

attractive to potential new employers. Alternatively, they are more likely to have recourse to

resources such severance packages and unemployment benefits. In one sense, the distinction is

designed to separate the more genuine shocks from more predictable instances of labor market

churning.

Among black households, the first displacement is more likely to be from an untenured

position, roughly 60 percent of households reporting a job loss. The number for white

households is 48 percent. Looking at columns (10)-(11), either type of separation is more

traumatic for black households than white, but the loss of a tenured job is especially so. The loss

of a tenured job negatively affects a black child's likelihood of obtaining some post-secondary

education by almost 28 percentage points, an effect size of over 40 percent. For whites the

impact is 9 percentage points for an effect size of 13 percent, large, but not nearly as large as it is

for blacks. So it appears that the greater the shock, especially for black households, the more difficult the recovery.

Discussion

Taken together, suggest that the destabilizing effect of a job loss is much greater for blacks than whites. The small differences between blacks and whites in both unemployment and subsequent employment have large consequences for black children. This suggests that in spite of some recent gains, the economic foundation of the black middle-class is still quite fragile. Indeed, as we've shown here, the inheritance of class status, at least in terms of educational success, appears to be highly susceptible to common economic shocks.

This study's findings are particularly relevant for understanding the impact of job loss in black families. Black families, even in the middle class, are economically fragile (Pattillo-McCoy, 1999) and for some of these families, a job loss represents an economic catastrophe that ultimately affects the children's educational futures. Greater scientific energy needs to be devoted to understanding this phenomenon. Results from this research shed some light on why blacks are only half as likely as whites to complete college (Conley, 1999). Policies that help increase black families' economic security may be especially critical in helping pave the way for future generations of black youth to achieve socioeconomic success.

Partial Bibliography

Boisjoly, J., G. Duncan and T. Smeeding (1998) "The Shifting Incidence of Involuntary Job Losses from 1968 to 1992." *Industrial Relations* **37**(2), April, 207-231.

Boggess, S. "Family Structure, Economic Status and Educational Attainment" *Journal of Population Economics* 11:205-222

Chevalier, A. and L. Gautheir "The Relative Effect of Family Characteristics and Financial Situation of Educational Achievement." *Education Economics*, 2002, 10, 165-182

Coelli, M.(2005) *Leading Determinants of Education Attainment*, Doctoral Dissertation (preliminary), University of British Columbia, Vancouver, June.

Conley, D. (1999), *Being Black, Living in the Red: Race, Wealth, and Social Policy in America*. University of California Press.

Dynarski, S. and J. Gruber (1997), "Can Families Smooth Variable Earnings", *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, **1**, 229-284.

Dynarski, S. (2003), "DoesAid Matter? Measuring the Effect of Student Aid on College Attendance and Completion", *The American Economic Review*, **93**(1), 279-288.

Duncan, Greg, T. Smeeding & W. Rodgers (1992) "The Incredible Shrinking Middle Class," *American Demographics*, Vol. 14, No. 5, pp. 34-38.

Haveman, R., B. Wolfe and J. Spaulding (1991) "Childhood Events and Circumstances Influencing High School Completion." *Demography* **28**(1), 133 - 157.

Haveman, R. and B. Wolfe, "The Determinants of Children's Attainments: A Review of Methods and Findings," *Journal of Economic Literature* 32 (1995), 1829-79

Heckman, J. and A. Krueger (2003), *Inequality in America*. The MIT Press.

Hill M. and G. Duncan (1987) "Parental family income and the socioeconomic attainment of children," *Social Science Research* 16:9-73

Jacobson, L., R. LaLonde and D. Sullivan (1993), "Earnings Losses of Displaced Workers", *The American Economic Review*, **83**(4), 685-709.

Jappelli, T. (1990), "Who is Credit Constrained in the US Economy?" *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, **105**(1), February, 219-34.

Kalil, A. and K. Ziol-Guest (2004), "Parental Job Loss and Children's Academic Progess" Harris Graduate School of Public Policy Working Paper.

Levy, D and G. Duncan (2000), "Using Sibling Samples to Assess the Effect of Childhood Family Income on Completed Schooling" JCPR Working Paper 168.

Morris, P., G. Duncan., and C. Rodrigues (2004). *Does money really mater? Estimating impacts of family income on children's achievement with data from random-assignment experiments*. Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the Population Association of America.

Oreopoulos, P., M. Page and A. Stevens (2005) "The Intergenerational Effect of Worker Displacement," NBER Working Papers 11587, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.

Kane, T. (2001), "College-Going and Inequality: A Literature Review", paper prepared for the Thomas Sage Foundation.

Kane, T. (1999), *The Price of Admission: Rethinking How Americans Pay for College*. Brookings Institution Press.

Ruhm, C. (1991), "Are Workers Permanently Scarred by Job Displacements?", *The American Economic Review*, March, 319-324.

Ruhm, C. (2004), "Parental Employment and Child Cognitive Development", *The Journal of Human Resources*, **39**(1), 155-186.

Shea, J. (2000), "Does Parents' Money Matter?", *Journal of Public Economics*, **77**: 155–184.

Stephens Jr., M., K. Charles (2004) "Job Displacement, Disability, and Divorce", *Journal of Labor Economics*, **22**(2), 489-522.

Stephens Jr., M. (2001), "The Long-Run Consumption Effects of Earnings Shocks", *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, **83**(1), 28-36.

Stephens Jr., M. (2002), "Worker Displacement and the Added Worker Effect", *Journal of Labor Economics*, **20**(3), 504-537.

Stevens, A. (1997), "Persistent Effects of Job Displacement: The Importance of Multiple Job Losses", Journal of Labor Economics, **15**(1), 165-188.

Yeung, W. and S. Hofferth (1998), "Family Adaptations to Income and Job Loss in the U.S.", *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, **19**(3), 255-283.

Yeung, W., M. Linver, and J. Brooks-Gunn (2002), "How Money Matters for Young Children's Development: Parental Investment and Family Processes", *Child Development*, **73**(6), 1861-1879.

Table 1: Summary Statistics				
	Entire Sample			
	All	Whites	Blacks	Difference
Some post-secondary education	0.6757	0.6763	0.6662	-0.0101
.	(0.4684)	(0.4682)	(0.4732)	.
Head ever reported job loss	0.3935	0.3916	0.4249	0.0333
.	(0.4888)	(0.4884)	(0.4960)	.
Head ever lost tenured job	0.2062	0.2084	0.1679	-0.0405
.	(0.4048)	(0.4064)	(0.3750)	.
Head ever lost non-tenured job	0.1874	0.1832	0.2570	0.0738
.	(0.3904)	(0.3871)	(0.4385)	.
One reported job loss	0.1948	0.1962	0.1705	-0.0257
.	(0.3962)	(0.3974)	(0.3773)	.
Two or more reported job losses	0.1987	0.1954	0.2544	0.0590
.	(0.3993)	(0.3968)	(0.4370)	.
Lost job during recession	0.1943	0.1923	0.2271	0.0348
.	(0.3959)	(0.3944)	(0.4204)	.
Lost job during non-ression period	0.1992	0.1993	0.1978	-0.0015
.	(0.3996)	(0.3997)	(0.3997)	.
Gender (female)	0.4856	0.4880	0.4460	-0.0420
.	(0.5001)	(0.5002)	(0.4987)	.
Firstborn	0.4374	0.4352	0.4738	0.0385
.	(0.4963)	(0.4961)	(0.5010)	.
Number of siblings	1.2030	1.1923	1.3829	0.1906*
.	(0.7354)	(0.7228)	(0.9065)	.
Father less than high school graduate	0.0922	0.0865	0.1890	0.1026**
.	(0.2895)	(0.2812)	(0.3929)	.
Father high school graduate	0.2414	0.2398	0.2693	0.0295
.	(0.4282)	(0.4272)	(0.4451)	.
Father some college	0.4209	0.4199	0.4384	0.0185
.	(0.4940)	(0.4938)	(0.4979)	.
Father college graduate	0.2434	0.2521	0.0983	-0.1537**
.	(0.4294)	(0.4345)	(0.2988)	.
Mother less than high school graduate	0.0601	0.0527	0.1852	0.1325***
.	(0.2379)	(0.2236)	(0.3898)	.
Mother high school graduate	0.2561	0.2611	0.1719	-0.0893
.	(0.4367)	(0.4395)	(0.3785)	.
Mother some college	0.2964	0.2982	0.2673	-0.0308
.	(0.4569)	(0.4577)	(0.4441)	.
Mother college graduate	0.1340	0.1317	0.1728	0.0411
.	(0.3409)	(0.3384)	(0.3793)	.
Child born into two-parent household	0.9705	0.9753	0.8897	-0.0856***
.	(0.1693)	(0.1553)	(0.3144)	.
Total family income in first year	61.2396	61.5166	56.5765	-4.9401*
.	(19.3480)	(19.3908)	(18.0694)	.
Nonresponse between ages 1-17	0.0531	0.0518	0.0740	0.0222
.	(0.2243)	(0.2218)	(0.2627)	.
Average family income	76.6975	77.7037	59.7571	-17.9466***
.	(36.0497)	(36.4723)	(22.0530)	.
Standard deviation of family income	25.4024	25.8592	17.6861	-8.1731**
.	(23.7310)	(24.2934)	(6.7737)	.
# of years with two parents	16.6129	16.7221	14.7733	-1.9489***
.	(4.4305)	(4.3129)	(5.7974)	.
# of years in own home	15.4120	15.6444	11.4990	-4.1454***
.	(5.1458)	(4.9149)	(7.0513)	.
Lost job & unemployed ≥ 6 months	0.0918	0.0885	0.1484	0.0600
.	(0.2889)	(0.2841)	(0.3567)	.
Sample size	959	810	149	.

	Income at Birth < 200% of Poverty Threshold			Income at Birth between 200 - 600% of Poverty Threshold		
	White	Black	Difference	White	Black	Difference
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Gender (female)	0.0638	0.0584	0.0054	0.0648*	0.1220	-0.0573
.	(0.0503)	(0.0581)	(0.9437)	(0.0344)	(0.0981)	(0.5821)
Firstborn	0.0384	0.2189**	-0.1806	0.0159	-0.0481	0.0640
.	(0.0664)	(0.0903)	(0.1076)	(0.0368)	(0.1197)	(0.6097)
Number of siblings	-0.0126	0.0375	-0.0501	-0.0257	0.0564	-0.0822
.	(0.0335)	(0.0341)	(0.2954)	(0.0300)	(0.0535)	(0.1810)
Father some college	0.2629***	0.1299	0.1330	0.1831***	0.0328	0.1503
.	(0.0651)	(0.0816)	(0.2030)	(0.0449)	(0.1220)	(0.2479)
Mother some college	-0.0009	0.0603	-0.0612	0.1665***	0.2671**	-0.1006
.	(0.0738)	(0.1258)	(0.6749)	(0.0383)	(0.1108)	(0.3911)
Child born into two-parent household	-0.0838	-0.0993	0.0155	-0.1488	0.0299	-0.1787
.	(0.1061)	(0.0717)	(0.9036)	(0.1180)	(0.1362)	(0.3217)
Family income in first year	0.0034	0.0092***	-0.0058	0.0013	0.0022	-0.0008
.	(0.0028)	(0.0029)	(0.1475)	(0.0009)	(0.0025)	(0.7612)
Birth year	0.0203***	-0.0043	0.0246**	-0.0010	-0.0364**	0.0354**
.	(0.0076)	(0.0086)	(0.0326)	(0.0051)	(0.0156)	(0.0317)
Nonresponse between ages 1-17	-0.0585	0.0377	-0.0963	-0.1569**	-0.0227	-0.1342
.	(0.0963)	(0.0977)	(0.4832)	(0.0767)	(0.1102)	(0.3179)
Head ever reported job loss	-0.0876	-0.0684	-0.0192	-0.0559	-0.1815**	0.1255
.	(0.0567)	(0.0645)	(0.8228)	(0.0376)	(0.0832)	(0.1694)
Constant	-39.6608	8.5437	.	2.5356	72.1115	.
.	(15.0778)	(16.8834)	.	(10.1111)	(30.8553)	.
Sample size	427	440	.	810	149	.
Mean of dependent variable	0.51	0.45	.	0.68	0.67	.
% Reporting job loss	0.58	0.60	.	0.39	0.42	.
R-squared	0.52	.	.	0.68	.	.

Table 2: Parental Job Loss & Children's Post-Secondary Education

	Table 3: Parental Job Loss, Childhood Conditions & Children's Post-Secondary Education											
	Income Measures			Marital Stability			Residential Stability			Combined		
	Whites	Blacks	Difference	Whites	Blacks	Difference	Whites	Blacks	Difference	Whites	Blacks	Difference
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(11)
Gender (female)	0.0761**	0.1291	-0.0530	0.0673*	0.1216	-0.0543	0.0653*	0.1219	-0.0566	0.0737**	0.1174	-0.0437
.	(0.0342)	(0.1013)	(0.6202)	(0.0346)	(0.0992)	(0.6051)	(0.0344)	(0.0976)	(0.5846)	(0.0344)	(0.0959)	(0.6681)
Firstborn	0.0317	-0.0537	0.0854	0.0159	-0.0481	0.0641	0.0198	-0.0517	0.0716	0.0275	-0.0143	0.0418
.	(0.0364)	(0.1174)	(0.4874)	(0.0368)	(0.1204)	(0.6112)	(0.0370)	(0.1090)	(0.5344)	(0.0369)	(0.1056)	(0.7090)
Number of siblings	-0.0340	0.0555	-0.0895	-0.0323	0.0553	-0.0876	-0.0270	0.0564	-0.0834	-0.0392	0.0859	-0.1251*
.	(0.0304)	(0.0533)	(0.1450)	(0.0300)	(0.0647)	(0.2200)	(0.0300)	(0.0533)	(0.1728)	(0.0312)	(0.0637)	(0.0784)
Father some college	0.1525***	0.0225	0.1299	0.1828***	0.0327	0.1501	0.1839***	0.0305	0.1534	0.1510***	-0.0276	0.1786
.	(0.0449)	(0.1276)	(0.3371)	(0.0449)	(0.1222)	(0.2493)	(0.0448)	(0.1280)	(0.2585)	(0.0450)	(0.1339)	(0.2066)
Mother some college	0.1534***	0.2641**	-0.1107	0.1650***	0.2663**	-0.1012	0.1658***	0.2692**	-0.1034	0.1568***	0.2519**	-0.0952
.	(0.0379)	(0.1174)	(0.3698)	(0.0382)	(0.1148)	(0.4031)	(0.0383)	(0.1163)	(0.3986)	(0.0379)	(0.1192)	(0.4472)
Child born into two-parent household	-0.1341	0.0048	-0.1389	-0.1895	0.0218	-0.2113	-0.1632	0.0314	-0.1945	-0.1415	0.0190	-0.1605
.	(0.1136)	(0.1424)	(0.4460)	(0.1211)	(0.1724)	(0.3160)	(0.1192)	(0.1385)	(0.2874)	(0.1170)	(0.1742)	(0.4444)
Family income in first year	-0.0006	0.0020	-0.0026	0.0014	0.0022	-0.0007	0.0012	0.0021	-0.0008	-0.0005	0.0033	-0.0039
.	(0.0011)	(0.0024)	(0.3135)	(0.0009)	(0.0025)	(0.7803)	(0.0009)	(0.0025)	(0.7531)	(0.0011)	(0.0026)	(0.1654)
Birth year	0.0012	-0.0358**	0.0370**	-0.0013	-0.0364**	0.0351**	-0.0014	-0.0365**	0.0351**	0.0005	-0.0288*	0.0293*
.	(0.0051)	(0.0163)	(0.0305)	(0.0051)	(0.0158)	(0.0354)	(0.0052)	(0.0152)	(0.0292)	(0.0051)	(0.0155)	(0.0733)
Nonresponse between ages 1-17	-0.1235*	0.0049	-0.1283	-0.1062	-0.0198	-0.0864	-0.1304	-0.0265	-0.1039	-0.1133	-0.0631	-0.0503
.	(0.0744)	(0.1103)	(0.3349)	(0.0842)	(0.1097)	(0.5323)	(0.0822)	(0.1073)	(0.4422)	(0.0854)	(0.1288)	(0.7452)
Head ever reported job loss	-0.0327	-0.1937**	0.1610*	-0.0545	-0.1809**	0.1264	-0.0528	-0.1890**	0.1362	-0.0326	-0.1998**	0.1672
.	(0.0375)	(0.0896)	(0.0978)	(0.0375)	(0.0822)	(0.1620)	(0.0377)	(0.0888)	(0.1586)	(0.0378)	(0.0978)	(0.1110)
Average annual income	0.0039***	0.0002	0.0037	.	.	.	.	.	.	0.0035***	-0.0032	0.0067*
.	(0.0010)	(0.0022)	(0.1266)	.	.	.	.	.	.	(0.0011)	(0.0038)	(0.0888)
Standard deviation of annual income	-0.0035***	0.0002	-0.0037	.	.	.	.	.	.	-0.0043***	0.0043	-0.0086
.	(0.0013)	(0.0070)	(0.6017)	.	.	.	.	.	.	(0.0015)	(0.0069)	(0.2223)
# of years with two parents	.	.	.	0.0073	0.0008	0.0065	.	.	.	0.0004	0.0007	-0.0003
.	.	.	.	(0.0055)	(0.0116)	(0.6137)	.	.	.	(0.0059)	(0.0128)	(0.9837)
# of years in own home	.	.	.	.	.	.	0.0035	-0.0014	0.0049	0.0006	-0.0007	0.0013
.	.	.	.	.	.	.	(0.0044)	(0.0075)	(0.5748)	(0.0046)	(0.0075)	(0.8837)
Constant	-1.8530	71.0557	.	3.1023	72.1724	.	3.2785	72.4703	.	-0.5826	57.1619	.
.	(10.0492)	(32.1822)	.	(10.0192)	(31.3035)	.	(10.1656)	(30.0893)	.	(10.1080)	(30.6342)	.
Sample size	810	148	.	810	149	.	810	149	.	808	148	.
R-squared	0.68	.	.	0.68	.	.	0.68	.	.	0.69	.	.

23

	Multiple Job Losses			Macroeconomic Conditions			Subsequent Unemployment			Job Attachment Prior to Separation		
	Whites	Blacks	Difference	Whites	Blacks	Difference	Whites	Blacks	Difference	Whites	Blacks	Difference
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(11)
Gender (female)	0.0645*	0.1452	-0.0807	0.0629*	0.1235	-0.0606	0.0651*	0.1072	-0.0421	0.0657*	0.1351	-0.0693
.	(0.0343)	(0.0997)	(0.4441)	(0.0342)	(0.0956)	(0.5506)	(0.0344)	(0.0964)	(0.6808)	(0.0344)	(0.0990)	(0.5087)
Firstborn	0.0205	-0.0423	0.0628	0.0193	-0.0511	0.0704	0.0177	-0.0332	0.0509	0.0143	-0.0605	0.0748
.	(0.0367)	(0.1198)	(0.6161)	(0.0365)	(0.1231)	(0.5839)	(0.0367)	(0.1194)	(0.6837)	(0.0368)	(0.1200)	(0.5513)
Number of siblings	-0.0287	0.0600	-0.0887	-0.0263	0.0582	-0.0845	-0.0262	0.0526	-0.0788	-0.0238	0.0429	-0.0667
.	(0.0303)	(0.0534)	(0.1490)	(0.0287)	(0.0563)	(0.1820)	(0.0299)	(0.0531)	(0.1963)	(0.0299)	(0.0552)	(0.2882)
Father some college	0.1773***	0.0176	0.1597	0.1818***	0.0327	0.1491	0.1832***	0.0486	0.1346	0.1847***	0.0517	0.1330
.	(0.0455)	(0.1234)	(0.2248)	(0.0447)	(0.1220)	(0.2516)	(0.0449)	(0.1290)	(0.3247)	(0.0449)	(0.1243)	(0.3145)
Mother some college	0.1637***	0.2807***	-0.1171	0.1633***	0.2665**	-0.1032	0.1665***	0.2631**	-0.0967	0.1658***	0.2576**	-0.0918
.	(0.0386)	(0.1072)	(0.3047)	(0.0385)	(0.1111)	(0.3804)	(0.0384)	(0.1169)	(0.4322)	(0.0383)	(0.1140)	(0.4455)
Child born into two-parent household	-0.1514	0.2114	-0.3628*	-0.1553	0.0315	-0.1868	-0.1502	0.1264	-0.2766	-0.1440	0.0277	-0.1718
.	(0.1188)	(0.1472)	(0.0554)	(0.1166)	(0.1383)	(0.3020)	(0.1170)	(0.1411)	(0.1317)	(0.1182)	(0.1178)	(0.3036)
Family income in first year	0.0012	0.0017	-0.0005	0.0014	0.0022	-0.0008	0.0013	0.0024	-0.0011	0.0014	0.0019	-0.0006
.	(0.0009)	(0.0025)	(0.8651)	(0.0009)	(0.0025)	(0.7591)	(0.0009)	(0.0025)	(0.6899)	(0.0009)	(0.0024)	(0.8236)
Birth year	-0.0010	-0.0365**	0.0355**	0.0007	-0.0366**	0.0373**	-0.0009	-0.0421***	0.0412**	-0.0009	-0.0363**	0.0354**
.	(0.0051)	(0.0154)	(0.0284)	(0.0051)	(0.0156)	(0.0228)	(0.0051)	(0.0154)	(0.0114)	(0.0051)	(0.0152)	(0.0275)
Nonresponse between ages 1-17	-0.1506*	-0.0155	-0.1352	-0.1472**	-0.0242	-0.1230	-0.1560**	-0.0198	-0.1362	-0.1649**	-0.0248	-0.1401
.	(0.0785)	(0.1102)	(0.3178)	(0.0743)	(0.1133)	(0.3643)	(0.0760)	(0.1021)	(0.2851)	(0.0775)	(0.1090)	(0.2949)
One reported job loss	0.0026	-0.0003	0.0030	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
.	(0.0476)	(0.1259)	(0.9825)	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Two or more reported job losses	-0.1183**	-0.2649***	0.1466	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
.	(0.0476)	(0.0942)	(0.1650)	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Lost job during recession	.	.	.	-0.1397***	-0.1698	0.0300	.	.	.	.	.	.
.	.	.	.	(0.0450)	(0.1103)	(0.8009)	.	.	.	.	.	.
Lost job during non-recession	.	.	.	0.0228	-0.1939*	0.2168*	.	.	.	.	.	.
.	.	.	.	(0.0474)	(0.1102)	(0.0711)	.	.	.	.	.	.
Lost job & unemployed ≥ 6 months	.	.	.	.	.	.	-0.1365**	-0.2127	0.0762	.	.	.
.	.	.	.	.	.	.	(0.0615)	(0.1489)	(0.6363)	.	.	.
Lost job & unemployed < 6 months	.	.	.	.	.	.	-0.0302	-0.0236	-0.0066	.	.	.
.	.	.	.	.	.	.	(0.0393)	(0.1034)	(0.9528)	.	.	.
Head lost tenured job	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	-0.0862*	-0.2767**	0.1905
.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	(0.0478)	(0.1131)	(0.1212)
Head ever lost non-tenured job	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	-0.0209	-0.1220	0.1011
.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	(0.0470)	(0.0943)	(0.3374)
Constant	2.4892	72.2076	.	-0.8265	72.5894	.	2.3002	83.3429	.	2.2754	72.0099	.
.	(10.0222)	(30.3799)	.	(9.9789)	(30.7602)	.	(10.1152)	(30.4819)	.	(10.1250)	(30.0610)	.
Sample size	810	149	.	810	149	.	810	149	.	810	149	.
R-squared	0.68	.	.	0.68	.	.	0.68	.	.	0.68	.	.

Table 4: Parental Job Loss Experiences & Children's Post-Secondary Education