The Economic Trajectory of Juvenile Delinquency

by

Francesca DeFranco

A Senior Honors Project Presented to the

Honors College

East Carolina University

In Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for

Graduation with Honors

by

Francesca DeFranco

Greenville, NC

April 2022

Approved by:

Dr. Melinda Kane

Thomas Harriot College of Arts and Sciences

Department of Sociology

Table of Contents

Introduction

Economic status is one of the most important influences when it comes to an individual's power, privilege, and control. A factor that impacts an individual's ability to achieve adequate economic status is the individual's interaction with the law. However, there are conflicting views on the influence of juvenile delinquency on later economic outcomes, along with minimal research on whether juvenile delinquency has an impact on a women's economic status as an adult. Most of the research done has examined men and tends to neglect women (Taylor, 2013). This research aims to evaluate the relationship between juvenile delinquency and its impact on the delinquent's future economic status.

Research demonstrates that incarceration and offenses against the law as an adult impacts a person's economic status. But what about juvenile delinquency's impact on participants' economic outcomes? According to an article by Melanie Taylor, "contact with the criminal or juvenile justice systems result in subsequent challenges shape future employment outcomes" (Taylor, 2016:2). Employment outcomes have a direct impact on economic status. A negative juvenile interaction with the law can affect a variety of economic status characteristics (Carter, 2019).

The economic indicators that correlate to one's economic status can be explained by sociological theory. Drawing upon life course theory, existing research understands the impact of delinquency and crime by looking at data collected over the trajectory of one's life and attributing adult outcomes to factors like arrests (Western, 2002). Many studies highlight the life course theory to explore the impact of juvenile delinquency over the course of time. These studies argue that juvenile delinquency negatively impacts

economic status due to interruptions of education or work (Stienberg, et al., 2004). They also suggest that juvenile delinquency impacts the individual by altering their relationship with the social strata and the individuals in that stratification (Uggen, 2000). This altered relationship with society can be understood as a direct impact of symbolic interactionism.

This study will build upon these studies by examining how the event of juvenile delinquency impacts people's economic trajectory controlling for other factors that impact economic status. Specifically, the study examines how interactions with the law and human capital affect people's annual income. The study will look at the individuals who participated in the 1997 National Longitudinal Survey of Youth.

I will also explore how female juvenile offenders' economic trajectories are impacted. Very little research has been done on female juvenile delinquents, though there have been many studies done on the gender disparity between female and male economic status, few have looked at the role of delinquency.

Literature Review

There are two main theoretical frameworks used to explain the interaction between juvenile delinquency and future economic status. First, is the life-course perspective. Generally, "life-course perspective focuses on criminal onset, risk and protective factors and the impact of life events on individuals' future trajectory" (Mowen, Brent &Bare,2017:360). This perspective focuses mainly on specific events that spur transitions that alter the course of the individual's life called "Turning points." "Turning points" emphasize the behavioral change over the life-course (Uggen 2000). These behavioral changes can be anything from the job a person obtains to the number of times a individual has been arrested. These "Turning points" can be classified as positive events

that promote success in life, while others can be defined as negative events that prevent upward growth and positive success in life.

Research using the life-course perspective classifies interaction with the criminal justice system as a negative "turning point" (Sampson & Laub 2003). Specifically, juvenile delinquency and incarcerations have been found to negatively impact the individuals' economic mobility and prosocial bonds (Mowen et al. 2017). This negative impact can be explained by the life course concepts of "state dependence" and "cumulative disadvantage," which describes how engagement in criminal behaviors limits future opportunities by reducing access to normative trajectories of employment, educational attainment, and financial literacy (Carter, 2018).

Research using life course approach to examine employment and work attainment has shown that earnings upward trajectory is dependent upon stable employment in career jobs. (Western, 2002). Contact with the juvenile justice system creates challenges to the normative trajectories of employment and educational attainment. These challenges include the inability or disruption to the completion of a high school education, higher education, and prevention to the acquisition of knowledge and skill formation (Taylor, 2013).

There has been extensive research done on interaction with the justice system and future employment for both juveniles and adults. Evidence suggests that former delinquents will earn less than their non-delinquent counterparts (Taylor, 2013). Using life-course theory, Western (2002), found that incarceration is a negative "turning point "that reduces the earning mobility of male juveniles and young offenders." Citing that "there is strong evidence to suggest that incarceration reduces wages of ex-inmates by 10

to 20 percent" (Western, 2002:542). A direct example of this disadvantage is that it has been found that young adults who have been incarcerated as juveniles had an income reduction of $4,000 to $5,000 per year (Apel & Sweeten, 2010). The turning points within life-course are not the only reason for this disadvantage in employment.

The life-course theory builds the propositions found within the theory of symbolic interactionism. Symbolic interactionism is the second theoretical framework used to explain juvenile delinquency's impact on future economic status. Symbolic interactionism is the processes of social interactions at the individual level and the attachment of meaning to behaviors (Apel & Sweeten, 2010). When the normative trajectory of employment and educational attainment are challenged or not met by an individual, that individual tends to face social stigma which not only impacts the individual's educational or work attainment but can also impact the individuals' self-concepts (Apel & Sweeten, 2010).

Job applicants with juvenile delinquency and criminal records experience negative labor market outcomes not just from the disruption of their education or skill formation, but also from the stigma associated to them. As employers may be hesitant to hire those with criminal or delinquent records because of negative stigmas (e.g., dangerousness or laziness) that employers have of former offenders (Taylor, 2013). Further evidence of this limitation by negative stigmas placed on offenders is the concept of "institutional exclusion". Our exclusion of offenders and delinquents from the institution of the labor market has led to an accumulation of social disadvantages (Uggen, 2000). A direct example of this is "the variety of state-imposed restrictions that prohibit employment in certain sectors (e.g., public employment), catering to certain vulnerable

clientele (e.g., children), and professional licensing and bonding in certain occupations" (Aple & Sweeten, 2010:451). Other studies have suggested that there is no relation between institutional exclusion and future economic outcomes.

The continual negative labeling and stigmatization of delinquents and offenders' prospects can lead to a process of identity transformation. The labeled individuals adopt a criminal self-concept and become inundated with the roles and behaviors the label has prescribed (Apel & Sweeten, 2010). Because of the low value placed on employment, labeled offenders tend to withdraw or disengage from the labor market or work, leaving them to the potential of obtaining illegal work, falling below the poverty line and an inability to gain proper education. This reinforces the perceived stereotypes and stigmas associated with juvenile delinquents and criminal offenders (Carter, 2018).

The stigma and damage to self-concept are the main determinants in people's perceived human capital. Human capital is determined by the investments made to an individual's perceived worth in the job market. This worth is measured through work experience, education, and job training, which is assumed to increase an individual's skill level and market value (Aple & Sweeten, 2010).

Research demonstrates that scale measures of delinquency have been negatively associated with job attainment even after accounting for human capital characteristics. (Carter, 2018). This is because juvenile delinquents tend to be disconnected from school and work due to a myriad of reasons including periods of confinement, interruptions to their education, etc. (Taylor, 2013). This disconnection limits adolescents' ability to acquire human capital, during a time when other adolescents are investing in their perceived worth, causing individuals that experience disconnection to fall behind and be

less competitive in the job market (Carter, 2018). Even after controlling for this disruption in human capital, there is a negative association between delinquency and job attainment, which I argue is probably tied to stigma and institutional barriers.

The research on the relationship between a history of juvenile delinquency, the development of human capital, and employment outcomes largely examines men. Little research has been done to explore how female juvenile delinquents are impacted economically in the future. One of the few studies to examine the disparities in employment outcomes between men and women with a history of juvenile delinquency suggested that women's occupational statuses were not impacted by delinquency (Taylor, 2013). Taylor (2013) argues that "females may have to balance work and family, so they are less inclined than men to maximize their occupational aspirations'' (Taylor, 5, 2013). Which assumes that women are willing to take a less prestigious or active role in employment, leading to a decrease in earning potential and economic success independent of juvenile deliquency. Although there is much disagreement about this causal link, none of the evidence provided directly speaks on this matter. The assumption is that because women are willing to take a less prestigious or active role in the work force, the implication of a family has more of an impact on a women's income and earning potential then delinquency would (Taylor,2013).

In general, the literature review supports the existence of a relationship between juvenile delinquency and economic trajectory, through the analysis of how educational, employment and skill attainment associated with economic success are impacted by interactions with the criminal justice system. There is a link between juvenile delinquency and economic trajectory but, unfortunately most studies draw this conclusion

from samples based on boys or men. Less is known about the relationship between juvenile delinquency and the economic trajectory of women. This project intends to look at the link between juvenile delinquency and economic trajectory. While, also looking at how juvenile delinquency impact a womens' economic trajectory.

Sample

For my thesis, I used data from the 1997 edition of the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (NLSY). The NLSY is collected by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics to measure the relationship between juvenile delinquency (i.e., arrest, incarcerations, and delinquency score) and adult income. The NLSY is the appropriate dataset for this project, as it includes multiple indicators of interaction between juvenile delinquency and income. The NLSY consists of a representative sample of 8,984 men and women. These participants were surveyed over a period of 19 rounds, providing this research project with ample data (Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor).

Participants were between the ages of 12 to 16 in the first round of interviews, and were interviewed between 1997 to 2011 annually and biennially since then. At each round, respondents were surveyed about a wide array of topics, including familial background, educational status, occupational status, interactions with the law, economic status and much more. In my analyses, I used interactions with the law, economic status, and familial background to predict the economic trajectory of juvenile delinquents. After dropping the cases with missing data, I had 2,425 male cases and 2,317 female cases.

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable is the total income from wages and salary in 2017 (USD). This is an individual's income received from wages, salary, commission of tips

from all jobs, before deductions for taxes. The income of the of the top 2 percent of respondents in the NLSY97 was truncated at $149,999. Values for all cases at or over this level are averaged, and the average is used. The values for this measure are categorical and range from $0 through the truncated value of $149,999. When looking at the total income and salaries before applying delinquency measure, men made more income than women, on average, with men making on average $50,555.15 and women making $37,101.26 on average (approximately $13,453.89 less than men).

Independent Variables

Three independent variables were used to indicate juvenile delinquency. The juvenile delinquency variables for this project will count activity up through age 23. To combat the changing legal definition of what a juvenile age is, I was required to include participants through the age of 23 years old to capture the full juvenile population. The legal definition of a juvenile according to the United Nations (UN) is defined in two categories: first is "child" which is individuals from 0 to 14 years of age, the second is "youths" which 15 to 23 years of age (Young & Church 2017). This definition has since been applied to the United States federal, state and county laws(Young & Church 2017).

The first, *juvenile arrest,* is a series of dichotomous variables indicating whether the respondent was ever arrested as a juvenile, and if so, at what age. This was broken down into two variables: First arrest age 5-18 (yes or no) and First arrest age 19-23 (yes or no). Individuals who have been arrested over the age of 24 without an earlier history of juvenile arrests are classified in the same category as people who have never been arrested. This is because in this investigation I am only interested on juvenile delinquency, not adult activity.

The second, *juvenile incarceration,* was a binary measure indicating whether the respondent was incarcerated as a juvenile, and if so, at what age. This was broken down into two variables: First incarceration 12-18 (yes or no) and First incarceration 19-23 (yes or no). Individuals who have been incarcerated over the age of 24 they are considered in the same category as those who have never been incarcerated because in this investigation I am only interested on juvenile delinquency not adult activity.

The final independent variable is *delinquency score*. Delinquency score is a scale ranging from 0 to 5; higher outcomes indicate more incidents of delinquency (0= no delinquency, 1= delinquency score of 1 or 2, 2= delinquency score of 3 or 4, 3= delinquency score of 5 or 6, 4= delinquency score of 7 or 8 and 5= 9 or 10). The delinquency score measures negative or illegal incidences taking place during adolsecence such as running away from home, underage drinking or participated in gang activity. Unfortunately, due to the range of scores I was not able to determine exactly who had a specific result but could determine the range they fell into.

Control Variables

The control variables included to isolate the influence of juvenile delinquency as the reason for income differences are broken down into four categories: education, familial background, sex and race/ethnicity. These control measures were selected because they have been shown to have direct impacts on economic trajectory. These need to be controlled for in order identify the impact of juvenile delinquency on economic trajectory. Education was controlled for by the variables ASVAB score, and Highest Degree obtained by participant. ASVAB was used because all the participants were subjected to this exam when enrolled as a participant in the study. The ASVAB is a

educational achivenment test taken by all the participant as teenagers. The ASVAB is scored on a scale ranging from minimum of 0 to maximum of 100000. The measure of Highest Degree obtained by participant as of 2017 included the categories of 0 = No degree, 1= High school or Equivalent, 2= Associates degree, 3= Bachelor's Degree and 4= Professional/ Graduate degree. Familial background was controlled for through the variables Household size under the age of 18 and the Presence of Both Biological Parents present in their homes. The variable household size under the age of 18 is measured in 2017, while the participant is an adult, and included the categories of 0= None, 1= one under 18, 2= two under 18, 3= three under 18, 4= four under 18, 5= five under 18 and 6= six or more under 18. Presence of Both Biological Parents is measured when the participant was a child and was categorized as (0= No and 1=Yes). The category of sex was defined by the variable sex (1=male, and 2= female). The category of Race/Ethnicity was controlled for by two variables: is participant Hispanic (yes or no) and is participant Black (yes or no). Whites & other racial groups is the omitted category.

Analytical Approach

To assess the economic trajectory of juvenile delinquents, I used bivariate correlations and ordinary least squares regression. In each model, I included the measure of total income of wages and salary of 201, race and sex.

Results

Descriptive Analysis

Table 1 displays the descriptive statistics of my sample including juvenile delinquency, human capital, race, and sex measures for the 8,984 participants of the NLSY97. There are few characteristics of my sample that are noteworthy. First, that

when looking at the juvenile delinquency measures, 19.4% of NLSY participants experienced a first arrest between the ages of 5 through 18,while only 10 percent of the NLSY97 participants experienced a first arrests between the ages of 19 through 23. Secondly, there is only a small percent of the population that have experienced juvenile incarceration, 2% between the ages of 12 through 18 and and 4.1% between the ages of 19 and 23. Lasty, the delinquency scores mean is .33; this is because the score of 0 meaning no delinquency is the most popular score by 6,504 participants bringing down the mean significantly. The values measuring human capital and sex of the participants are typical, while racial minorities are over sampled by the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1997. This overrepresentation in the data is set relative to their size in the population surveyed.

[Table 1]

Bivariate Correlations

In Table 2, I present bivariate correlations to analyze the strength of the relationship between the dependent measure of total income in 2017 and the juvenile delinquency measures. The bivariate correlations show that all the juvenile delinquency measures are significant. As expected, juvenile arrest, incarceration, and delinquency score all negatively impacted income.

[Table 2]

Multivariate Analysis

Table 3 presents results from the OLS regression models examining all respondents, both women and men. The first model explores the influence of delinquency on income, while the second model includes human capital measures as well. In model 1,

I find that having a First arrest between the ages of 5 through 18 (b= -4900.374, p<.001) significantly decreases a person's total income of wage and salary as an adult. The variable of First arrest between the ages of 19 through 23 is not statistically significant in model 1. First incarceration between the ages of 12 through 18 (b=-8064.106, p<.05) is statistically significantly significant, as is First incarceration between the ages of 19 through 23 (b=-6355.985, p<.05). The Delinquency score is not statistically significant in Model 1. This suggests that delinquency may not matter, but instead interaction with the criminal justice system holds more significance when looking at the impact on adult income and economic status.

Model 2 combines delinquency variables with human capital measures. Here, the deliquency variables lose statistical significance, but all of the human capital measures are statistically significant (see Model 2). In Model 2, the Presence of both biological parents is statistically significant (b=2322.053,p<.05), finding that the salary of participants that had both biological parents living at home was higher than other participants. Highest degree obtained was also statistically significant (b=7182.835,p<.001), meaning the higher the degree earned by the participant, the higher their total income on average would be in 2017. ASVAB score is also statistically significant (b=.195,p<.001), showing that the higher the ASVAB score achieved the higher the potential earnings can be on average. Finally the Household size of members under 18 is statistically significant (b=927.717,p<.01) in Model 2, suggesting the more household members under the age of 18, raises an indidvidual's total income. These findings align with pervious research on the significant effects of a biological parents presence, the amount of children present in the home, race, and education.

[Table 3]

Table 4 presents results from the regression models exploring differences between men and women participants. Does the importance of deliquency for economic outcomes vary by gender? In Table 4 there are four separate models split into two categories. The first category is delinquency measures only, in this category Model 1 represents men and Model 2 represents women. The second catgory is delinquency measures in combination with human capital measure, in this category Model 3 is men and Model 4 is women.

When looking at delinquency only for men (Model 1), I found that first arrest 5-18 ($b=-8187.634, p<.001$), first arrest 19-23 ($b=5367.293, p<0.01$), first incarceration 12-18($b=-10489.221, p<0.05$) and first incarceration 19-23($b=8143.530, p<0.05$) are all statistically significant. Arrests and incarceration at any age before 24 had a negative impact on men's total income and wages as adults. The variable of delinquency score is not statistically significant for Model 1. This changes for men when delinquency is combined with human capital measures.

Once in combination with human capital measures the delinquency varibles for men are rendered insignificant, while the human capital measures for men remain highly statistically significant (see Model 3). The measure of Highest degree obtained is statistically significant ($b=7685.084, p<.001$), suggesting men with higher degrees have higher income on average in 2017. ASVAB score is also statistically significant ($b=.146, p<.001$) suggesting higher ASVAB score for men also positively effects mens' income. The variable of Household members under the age of 18 is also significant ($b=4510.058, p<.001$), meaning that more members in a household under 18, positively affects mens income. Presence of both biological parent in participants youth, becomes

not significant. In other words, the presence of a biological parent in the particpants youth no longer impacts income when in conjunction with delinquency for men.

When looking at the influence of delinquency among women (see Model 2), I found that only first arrest 5-18 (b=-6565.674,p<.001) and first arrest 19-23(b=-6845.455,p<0.01) are statistically significant. Unlike men, the measures of first incarceration 12-18 &first incarceration 19-23 are not significant. Like men,delinquency has no statistical significance. The age at first arrest is the only form of deliquency that that impacts income for women in Model 2.

However, like men, when delinquency is combined with human capital, the delinquency measure are rendered insignificant (see Model 4). The human capital measures for women also remained highly statistically significant. The variable of Highest degree obtained is significant (b=8219.926,p<.001), suggesting the higher degree obtained by women, increase 2017 income, on average. The variable of ASVAB score is also significant (b=.216,p<.001) suggesting the higher the ASVAB score for women the more income they can make on average. The variable of Household size of members under the age of 18 is were differentiation between men and women can be seen. In Model 3 for men we see that Household size of members under 18 is positively significant showing that the more members under 18, the more income men can make. For women, Household size for members under the age of 18 is negatively significant (b=-1688.388, p<.001), meaning the more members of a household under 18 the less income a women has. Unlike men as well, the variable for black participants is not significant, meaning that being black does not impact a womens income, relative to whites & other racial groups. Like, men the variable of Presence of both biological parent

in participants youth becomes statistically not significant. Meaning that the presence of a biological parent in the particpants youth no longer impacts income when in conjunction with delinquency.

Discussion

Juvenile delinquency results in subsequent challenges for the individual, it is important to understand the implications these events could have on the economic trajectory of its participants. Using the 1997 National Longitudinal Survey of Youth data, my thesis has explored the difference in economic outcomes between those who engaged with the criminal justice system as juveniles, and those who did not, as well as differences between men and women with a history of juvenile delinquency. Ultimately, several outcomes differed among these groups.

Overall, there is no statistical difference in income between those who with a history of juvenile delinquency and those without. However, before controlling for human capital measures, delinqueny measures were significant and were associated with lower income then those who were not delinquents. The fact that my measures of juvenile delinquency lose significance after human capital measures are included suggest that juvenile delinquency has no unique effect on income or economic status. Instead, human capital measures are more powerful in effecting income or economic status.

In terms of gender, there were several significant differences between the gender of participants that have a expeience with juvenile arrest and incarceration. When I did the delinquency only regression for men I found that men who experienced there First arrest at the ages of 5-18, First arrest at the ages of 19-23, First incarceration 12-18 or first incarceration 19-23 all negatively impact there income and economic status. For

women only First arrest 5-18 and First arrest 19-23 negatively impact women income and economic status. First incarceration 12-18 and First incarceration 19-23 had no significance or impact on women income. The variable of Household size of members under the age of 18 though significant for both men and women, impacted women negatively. Unlike men, it has been suggested in research that women are willing to take less prestigious or active roles in the workforce impacting there earning potential and income. This is shown in results of the variable of Household size of member under the age of 18. The more members under the age of 18, the less money the women makes. This expectation for women to take a less active or prestigious role in the workforce has a greater impact then delinquency in my models.

As with any study, there was limitations to my investigation. One limitation to this study was the lack of occupational data. While the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1997 had many survey questions and variables. There was no variables that clearly stated occupational type or value to society. The other limitation in this investigation would be that I was not able to include the number of times the participant was involved with the justice system for there was no clear variable to specifiy this interaction.

The finding about the impact of juvenile delinquency on economic status did not have direct effects, once controls were added, but they did have some indirect results. The effect of juvenile delinquency goes away once the human capital measures are added. This might be because of juvenline delinquency affects income indirect by effecting human capital measures like ASVAB score and. existing research suggests juvenile delinquency has a direct impact on the prescribed worth or human capital of an individual. The effect of juvenile delinquency negatively impacts a individuals life course

and instigates stigma. My research supports the need for decreasing the impact of juvenile delinquency on an individual's human capital and the need to decrease the negative stigma associated with juvenile delinquency.

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics of Sample		
Variable	**N**	**Percent (%)** / Average
Total Income	5091	Mean= 44027.73
Juvenile Delinquency		
First Arrest Age 5-18	8946	19.4%
First Arrest Age 19-23	8946	10%
First Incarceration age 12-18	8971	2.0%
First Incarceration Age 19-23	8971	4.1%
Delinquency Score	8022	Mean=.33
Human Capital Measures		
Presence of Both Biological Parents	7754	26.6%
Highest Degree Obtained	8953	Mean=1.6417
ASVAB Score	7093	Mean= 45317
Household size of Members under 18	6925	Mean= 1.4042
Race/Ethnicity		
Hispanic	8984	21.2%
Black	8984	26%
Sex		
Men	4599	51.2%
Women	4385	48.8%

Table 2- Bivarate Correlations	
Total Income of Wages and Salary for 2017	
First Arrest Age 5-18	-.077*
First Arrest Age 19-23	-.036*
First Incarceration Age 12-18	-.047*
First Incarceration Age 19-23	-.066*
Delinquency Score	-.036*
Hispanic Participants	-.050*
Black Participants	-.170*
Sex	-.219*

**p-value significant at the 0.01
*p-value significant at the .05

Table 3- OLS Regression: Total Income of Wages and Salary, 2017, All Respondents				
	All Respondents- Delinquency Only		**All Respondents- Delinquency and Human Capital**	
Variables	**B**	**Sig.**	**B**	**Sig.**
First Arrest Age 5-18	-4900.374	<.001***	1257.690	.368
First Arrest Age 19-23	-2680.476	.084	1431.245	.404
First Incarceration age 12-18	-8064.106	.036*	-292.581	.948
First Incarceration Age 19-23	-6355.985	.018*	-559.007	.856
Delinquency Score	-513.527	.469	603.908	.443
Presence of Both Biological Parents	N/A	N/A	2322.053	.028*
Highest Degree Obtained	N/A	N/A	7182.835	<.001***
ASVAB Score	N/A	N/A	.195	<.001***
Household size of Members under 18	N/A	N/A	927.717	.010**
Hispanic	-8176.081	<.001***	-332.786	.798
Black	-14527.617	<.001***	-5830.362	<.001***
Constant	51048.687	<.000***	19770.047	<.001***
N	4742		4742	
Adjusted R-Square	.049		.186	

*p<.05,**p<0.1,***p<.001 (two tailed)

Table 4- OLS Regression of Total Wages and Salary 2017- Men vs. Women								
	Men - Delinquency Only		**Women – Delinquency Only**		**Men- Delinquency and Human Capital**		**Women- Delinquency and Human Capital**	
Variables	**B**	**Sig.**	**B**	**Sig.**	**B**	**Sig.**	**B**	**Sig.**
First Arrest Age 5-18	-8187.634	<.001***	-6565.674	<.001***	-3004.135	.105	1157.823	.545
First Arrest Age 19-23	-5367.293	.007**	-6845.455	.006**	-1020.204	.639	-2808.117	.278
First Incarceration age 12-18	-10489.221	.016*	-9624.793	.285	-2971.741	.553	-3754.984	.726
First Incarceration Age 19-23	-8143.530	.008*	-9279.772	.119	-2277.078	.552	-3747.649	.546
Delinquency Score	-1437.565	.106	-1848.748	.108	-474.124	.636	-1161.033	.316
Presence of Both Biological Parents	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	685.841	.646	99.634	.940
Highest Degree Obtained	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	7685.084	<.001***	8219.926	<.001***
ASVAB Score	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	.146	<.001***	.216	<.001***
Household size of Members under 18	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	4510.058	<.001***	-1688.388	<.001***
Hispanic	-7573.682	<.001***	-7627.915	<.001***	-2112.561	.260	3982.289	<.001***
Black	-17357.998	<.001***	-9767.509	<.001***	-8543.561	<.001***	141.892	.12
Constant	60120.312	.000	43185.294	.000	27807.506	<.001***	11430.048	<.001***
N	2425		2317		1828		1778	
Adjusted R-Square	.077		.038		.214		.271	

*p<.05,**p<0.1,***p<.001

Reference

Apel, R., & Sweeten, G. (2010). The Impact of Incarceration on Employment during the Transition to Adulthood. *Social Problems, 57*(3), 448-479. doi:10.1525/sp.2010.57.3.448

Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor. National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1997 cohort, 1997-2017 (rounds 1-18). Produced and distributed by the Center for Human Resource Research (CHRR), The Ohio State University. Columbus, OH: 2019.

Carter, A. (2019). "The Consequences of Adolescent Delinquent Behavior for Adult Employment Outcomes." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 48 (1): 17-29. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10964-018-0934-2.

Freiburger, T. L., & Burke, A. S. (2011). Status Offenders in the Juvenile Court: The Effects of Gender, Race, and Ethnicity on the Adjudication Decision. Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice, 9(4), 352– 365. https://doi.org/10.1177/1541204011399933

Mowen, T. J., J. J. Brent, and KJ. Bares. "How Arrest Impacts Delinquency Over Time Between and Within Individuals." *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice* 16, no. 4 (October 2018): 358–77. https://doi.org/10.1177/1541204017712560.

Taylor, M. "Adult Earnings of Juvenile Delinquents: The Interaction of Race / Ethnicity, Gender , and Juvenile Justice Status on Future Earnings." (2016).

Sampson, R. J. and J. H. Laub. "LIFE-COURSE DESISTERS? TRAJECTORIES OF CRIME AMONG DELINQUENT BOYS FOLLOWED TO AGE 70*." *Criminology* 41, no. 3 (08, 2003): 555-592. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.2003.tb00997.

Uggen, C. (2000). Work as a Turning Point in the Life Course of Criminals: A Duration Model of Age, Employment, and Recidivism. American Sociological Review, 65(4), 529-546. doi:10.2307/2657381

Western, B. (2002). The Impact of Incarceration on Wage Mobility and Inequality. American Sociological Review, 67(4), 526-546. doi:10.2307/3088944

Young, S., Greer, B., & Church, R. (2017). Juvenile delinquency, welfare, justice and therapeutic interventions: a global perspective. BJPsych bulletin, 41(1), 21–29. https://doi.org/10.1192/pb.bp.115.052274