



in focus

YOUTH IN FOCUS PROJECT DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES
No. 9, February 2010

**The relationship between income-support history
and the characteristics and outcomes of Australian youth:
outcomes of wave 2 of the Youth in Focus survey**

A report prepared for the Australian Government Department of Families,
Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs under the
2009 Social Policy Research Services (SPRS) Program

**Deborah Cobb-Clark
Anastasia Sartbayeva**

youthinfocus.anu.edu.au



Jointly funded by the Australian Government Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations, the Australian Government Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs and the Australian Research Council, and carried out by The Australian National University

Youth in Focus Project Discussion Paper Series
ISSN 1835-4025

Youth in Focus
Research School of Social Sciences
ANU College of Arts and Social Sciences
Coombs Building 9
The Australian National University
Canberra ACT 0200

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive summary	5
Introduction	7
Related research	8
Data: the Youth in Focus survey	8
Methodology	9
Structure of the report.....	10
Background to the Youth in Focus Project	11
Project motivation	11
Main research questions.....	12
Section 1: The demographic characteristics of youth	13
Section 2: Youth's living arrangements and household composition	16
Section 3: Youth's perspectives on their relationships with their parents	23
Section 4: Youth's educational outcomes	33
Section 5: Youth's employment, earnings and job search	51
Section 6: Youth's family formation	60
Section 7: Youth's housing and income	68
Section 8: Youth's health	79
Section 9: Youth's attitudes and aspirations	93
Section 10: Youth's lifestyle and risk-taking	104
Section 11: Important events in youth's life	118
References	131

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1. The demographic characteristics of youth	15
Table 2.1. The living arrangements of youth	19
Table 2.2. The household composition of young adults living with parent, guardian or a parental figure.....	20
Table 2.3. The household structure of young adults living independently.....	21
Table 3.1. The nature of youth's relationships with their mothers and fathers.....	26
Table 3.2. The nature of youth's relationships with their stepparents.....	30
Table 4.1. Educational outcomes of youth.....	38
Table 4.2. Secondary school education.....	40
Table 4.3. Secondary school education of youth who left school between waves 1 and 2 after completing Year 12.....	44
Table 4.4. Post school studies of all school leavers.....	47
Table 4.5. Deferral and non-completion of study.....	49
Table 4.6. Future study expectations.....	50
Table 5.1. Employment status.....	54
Table 5.2. Employment outcomes of youth currently employed.....	54
Table 5.3. Employment outcomes of youth previously employed.....	56
Table 5.4. Employment outcomes of youth who ever worked.....	57
Table 5.5. Job search activities of those not currently working	58
Table 5.6. Main activity of those not in education or employment.....	59
Table 6.1. Family formation.....	63
Table 6.2. The characteristics of youth's partners.....	64
Table 6.3. Youth's children.....	67
Table 7.1. Youth's housing arrangements	72
Table 7.2. Youth's income.....	74
Table 7.3. Youth's government benefit receipt.....	78
Table 8.1. Youth's physical and mental health.....	83
Table 8.2. Youth's health behaviours	87
Table 9.1. Youth's opinions on government policies.....	98
Table 9.2. Youth's perspectives on getting ahead in life.....	100
Table 9.3. Youth's locus of control.....	101
Table 9.4. Youth's expectations about their future.....	102
Table 10.1. Youth's attitudes to risk.....	108
Table 10.2. Youth's lifestyle.....	111
Table 11.1. Youth's life events	121

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- The Youth in Focus (YIF) Project studies the consequences of growing up in an economically disadvantaged family. Specifically, we aim to assess the overall correlation between parents' and children's receipt of income support and investigate its causes.
- This report uses the survey data collected in the course of wave 2 of the YIF survey to provide a broad picture of ways in which economic disadvantage may be transferred from one generation to the next. We do so by comparing characteristics and outcomes of our youth respondents across six income-support stratification categories. These categories range from no parental history of income support (category A), to prolonged (more than 6 years) reliance on the income-support system (category B); the remaining categories C to F include families characterised by a shorter exposure to the income-support system.
- In addition to comparing outcomes across families with different economic circumstances, we also provide comparison between outcomes and characteristics of young men and women in the YIF survey sample, and discuss changes that occurred in the lives of the young adults since the time of wave 1 interview.
- Consistent with our findings from wave 1, categories A (no history of income-support use) and B (intensive reliance on income support) show the most significant disparities in the answers of the surveyed individuals. Respondents from the remaining four categories (C to F) usually report numbers that fall between those observed for the two polar categories.
- Our results point to a number of channels through which the intergenerational transmission of disadvantage may be occurring in Australia. In particular, this includes education, family formation and early fertility, health and health-related risky behaviours, as well as co-residential and financial transfers from parents.
- Although the education process of many of our young adult respondents is not completed, we find large differences in the educational experiences of YIF youth respondents across economic categories, with young people growing up in families with history of intensive income-support receipt being less likely to complete Year 12 before leaving school and less likely to have a university entry score.
- The more intensive income-support use is also found to be correlated with poorer health outcomes for the 20-year olds, and a higher prevalence of alcohol, tobacco and illicit drug use among the young adults. Mental health also seems to be worse among the more disadvantaged respondents.
- Young people across all income-support categories have similar beliefs about things that are important for getting ahead in life. Although the majority of the young people believes that they are in control of their own life, there is some evidence of correlation between a young person's locus of control and their income-support history. The expectations of young people regarding their labour market outcomes in 10 years' time also vary across income-support categories, with a higher proportion of young people from non-income-support-dependent families believing that they would have a job as a manager or a professional.

- There is not a great deal of difference in the propensity to take risks among youth who grew up in different economic circumstances. The gender gap in risk tolerance is much greater, with girls less willing to take risks. Recreational and leisure activities are also related to the income-support history of a young person's family. Finally, consistent with wave 1 findings, young people from income-support-dependent families are more likely to have experienced undesirable life events, such as alcohol or drug abuse problems or trouble with the police.

INTRODUCTION

This research is a follow-up to the SPRS Program Report 2007/06: *The relationship between income-support history and the characteristics and outcomes of Australian Youth*. This report uses the second wave of the survey data generated by the Youth in Focus project to assess the relationship between a young person's characteristics and outcomes on the one hand and the income-support history of his or her family on the other, as well as to trace the transformation of the survey respondents' characteristics over the two years that have passed between the waves of the YIF survey.

In the previous report, we found that parental history of reliance on income support is associated with a range of negative outcomes for young people. In particular, our findings indicated that young people who grew up in families with prolonged exposure to the income-support system (6 years or more) were significantly worse off than youth whose families had no recorded income-support history. This disadvantage was manifested in educational attainment, overall schooling experience, labour market outcomes, early fertility and family formation, and health outcomes and behaviours. On the other hand, we found no or little evidence of income-support-related differences in attitudes towards education and work and the locus of control of the young respondents.

The second wave of the Youth in Focus survey collects data from the same young people who have now turned 20 years of age. While wave 1 collected the data at the time when the young respondents have only recently left school, the new data will provide more insight into the development of their educational and labour market outcomes and their transition to independent adulthood. Moreover, wave 2 gathers more detailed information on young adults' future expectations, health, drug use, and risk-taking attitudes.

The purpose of the proposed report is thus two-fold:

- descriptive analysis of the current outcomes and characteristics of youth respondents with different family income-support histories.
- analysis of the changes in these characteristics that have occurred in the two-year period since the end of wave 1. We will also examine whether the extent of these depends on income-support exposure. This will help identify the most important areas for future research.

Although the previous report did find that having a history of interaction with the income-support system was associated with negative outcomes for young people, this was always viewed as only a correlation and not a causal impact. In fact, rigorous econometric analyses of a series of indicators have shown that the negative effect of the income-support history is eliminated or significantly reduced when other socio-economic factors are accounted for. The evidence includes analysis of risky behaviours of young people (Cobb-Clark, Ryan and Sartbayeva, 2008), attitudes and locus of control (Barón, Cobb-Clark and Erkal, 2008; Barón, 2008) and social inclusion indicators (Ryan and Sartbayeva, 2008).

This report provides a broad picture of the ways in which income-support histories might matter for young people and will be important in identifying the most important areas for future research. Moreover, this exercise will provide a deeper insight into the combined wave 1 and wave 2 data of the YIF survey. The analysis of the wave 1 data did not identify any major limitations in the dataset, therefore the main concern, due to the longitudinal nature of the survey, was to preserve the continuity of the collected data. Therefore, this report will be key in identifying any needed improvements to future waves of the survey.

Related research

There is a growing international debate about the extent to which young people growing up in households receiving public assistance have above average probabilities of adverse outcomes as adults. Haveman and Wolfe (1995) and Haveman *et al* (2001) review the research results of a large literature that attempts to establish the existence and strength of linkages between family and community investments in children and children's attainments (in particular, teen child-bearing, educational attainment, employment and earnings). In a related review, Israel and Seeborg (1998) focus specifically on a range of different factors influencing the likelihood that impoverished youth will escape poverty. These reviews demonstrate that – along with *family income* – 1) *family characteristics* (e.g., parental education/occupation, family assets, family size and structure, and income-support history), 2) *demographic characteristics* (e.g., gender, race, and immigrant status), and 3) *neighbourhood characteristics* (e.g., school quality and geographic moves) during childhood are important predictors of youth attainment. The limited Australian evidence suggests that young people from income-support families are more likely to leave school early, face unemployment, have children early, and receive income support themselves. Furthermore, the likelihood of negative outcomes for youth increases with the degree of parental disadvantage and income-support dependence (McCoull and Pech, 2000; Pech and McCoull, 1998).

Growing up in a poor household does not necessarily lead to poverty in adulthood. Studies have found a wide variance in the adult economic outcomes of poor children (Dearden, Machin, and Reed, 1997; Israel and Seeborg, 1998). As a result, much of the more recent research has focused on identifying the mechanisms through which poor children are able to break intergenerational cycles of poverty (e.g., Borjas, 1992; Cohen and Tyree, 1986). Identification of mechanisms by which young adults enter or avoid poverty is a necessary first step in formulating sensible policies targeted towards breaking any cycle of welfare dependence and promoting the social and economic independence of Australian youth.

While a great deal can be learned from international studies, institutional differences in labour markets, educational systems, and income-support policies in Australia point to the need for Australian evidence to inform Australian policy. To date, however, many studies of Australian youth have had limited relevance for the design of Australian welfare and social security policy due to small sample sizes of and limited information about young people living in families on income support. Research has instead concentrated on issues surrounding the transition of youth to adulthood from the perspective of the role of educational attainment and subsequent labour market outcomes. While clearly important, these studies tell us little about the extent to which transgenerational welfare dependency is an issue in Australia or about the interaction of income-support receipt with other factors in influencing longer-term outcomes for young people.

The Youth in Focus project as a whole offers an opportunity to fill this gap by exploring the correlation, and more importantly the causality, between the nature of parents' income-support histories and the outcomes of their children. This research, undertaken under the SPRS agreement, is an important step in realising this goal and in identifying the most pressing areas for future research.

Data: The Youth in Focus Survey

The YIF Survey is designed to collect a variety of information from a random sample of families who have appeared in the administrative data at least once since 1991. The survey design is based around a birth cohort of youth who turned 18 just before wave 1 interviews. For each 'youth', we identified all individuals who received any type of payment on behalf of that youth in the history of the administrative data. From these individuals, who we refer to as

'parents', we selected the person who had the longest duration of care (as measured by receiving a payment on behalf of the youth or claiming the youth as a dependent) over the history of the administrative data set. We further implemented a set of rules designed to identify the natural mother from the administrative data. Although the administrative data do not contain information on the actual family relationships, the chosen method proved extremely successful in identifying the natural parents. Among wave 1 respondents, a natural mother was selected in 96.5 per cent and a natural parent in 98.6 per cent of cases.

The parents were interviewed once and the children were interviewed twice with a gap of two years. Respondents were asked to provide information on topics such as employment, education, physical and mental health, attitudes and values, family relationships and other psycho-social factors, the children's experiences while growing up, neighbourhood and school quality, etc. More details about the survey can be found in the User's Guide to the YIF Data (Breunig *et al*, 2007).

Methodology

The methodological approach has been to conduct a descriptive analysis of the survey data arising from wave 2 of the Youth in Focus project. We provide a cross-tab analysis of the key variables in the youth survey by gender and the stratification variable. This stratification variable is important in that it provides a neat summary of income-support history. This will result in a broad overview of the ways in which income-support histories affect the outcomes of young people and, as such, will provide a foundation for identifying the key research areas to be pursued in the future.

The stratification variable was created by classifying the young people into six economic categories based on the income-support histories of their parents as follows:

**Stratification Category:
Income-Support History¹**

- A** No income support or unknown
- B** Heavy exposure to income support: more than 6 years
- C** First income support after 1998 and less than 6 years
- D** First income support between 1994 and 1998, and less than 3 years
- E** First income support before 1994, and less than 6 years
- F** First income support between 1994 and 1998, and more than 3 but less than 6 years

¹ While the "No income support" category represents 41 per cent of the administrative dataset, its share in the survey sample was lowered to around 25 per cent. On the other hand, categories B to F were over-sampled relative to their representation in the administrative data. As a result, the unweighted 'total' percentages reported in the tables reflect the overall characteristics of the survey participants but cannot be applied to the birth cohort in general.

Results are presented in the following 9 sections of the report. The data on which the report is based were provided by 2,362 young people who participated in both waves of the YIF survey, which included a telephone interview and a self-completion questionnaire (SCQ)² in each wave.

Structure of the Report

The following section provides a brief background of the YIF project including information about the project organization and research partners, project motivation, and main research questions. Subsequently, the results are presented in nine different sections. In each case, our goal was to provide a broad overview of the ways in which income-support histories affect the outcomes of young people. Consequently, in our discussion we focus most intensely on comparing the outcomes of young people in economic categories A and B because this provides the sharpest contrast in the economic circumstances of young people. Brief conclusions and directions for future research are presented at the end of each section.

² Not all young people completing the survey answered the self-completion questionnaire. Therefore, the number of observations available for particular questions can be somewhat smaller. Also, due to the SCQ being filled in by youth, the filtering/routing is not as precise as in the telephone questionnaire. There are cases where respondents do not answer questions they are supposed to, and where they answer questions they do not need to.

BACKGROUND TO THE YOUTH IN FOCUS PROJECT³

Youth in Focus (YIF) is a joint research project between the Australian Government Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR)⁴ and a team of academic researchers. The research team includes Professor Deborah Cobb-Clark, Dr Robert Breunig, Dr Chris Ryan, and Dr Tue Gørgens of the Australian National University (ANU), Professor Jeff Borland of the University of Melbourne, Professors Barbara Wolfe and Robert Haveman of the University of Wisconsin-Madison, and Ms Jocelyn Pech of the Australian Fair Pay Commission Secretariat (previously with the Department of Family and Community Services).

The YIF project is supported by a five-year Linkage-Project grant from the Australian Research Council (ARC).⁵ In addition to its initial commitment of resources for the project, FaHCSIA has provided support for background research relevant to the project. Centrelink has given in-kind support by providing staff time and expertise for work related to building the administrative data set. The ANU is the lead institution and has primary responsibility for coordinating the work of the research team, DEEWR, FaHCSIA, and Roy Morgan Research Pty Ltd (RMR) – the market research firm conducting the survey – and for reporting to the ARC.

Project Motivation

The overarching goal of the YIF project is to understand the ways in which economic and social disadvantage might be transferred from one generation to the next. To achieve this, the project explores some of the consequences for young Australians of growing up in disadvantaged families using an innovative combination of survey and administrative data. Our focus is on outcomes in the early adult years when young people are moving into higher education, entering the labour market, starting families, and generally establishing themselves as independent adults. Developing a fuller understanding of reasons that disadvantaged youth succeed – or fail to succeed – is a necessary first step in formulating sensible policies targeted towards breaking any cycle of dependence and promoting the social and economic independence of Australian youth. In particular, it is well-established that individuals who grow up in families that are dependent upon income support are themselves much more likely to be dependent upon income support as adults.

Although the association between growing up in an income-support dependent family and reliance upon social assistance as an adult are well-established, only limited research has assessed which factors underlie this relationship. A lack of educational qualifications, early child-bearing, poor health and disability all contribute to reducing a young person's labour market opportunities and increasing the chances of needing social assistance – see Haveman *et al* (2001). Determining the causal effect of these risk factors is difficult, since while all can cause dependence on income support, each may also result from a history of dependence on income support.

This project is designed to address and overcome the weaknesses of previous studies. By using a combination of administrative data going back to 1991 and survey data gathered

³ This section of the report is taken from the User's Guide to the Youth in Focus Data (Breunig *et al*, 2007).

⁴ From inception to May 2008, the Commonwealth Government partner in YIF was the Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs (FaHCSIA). Following the Australian Government's administrative changes in late 2007 responsibility for YIF passed to DEEWR, effective May 2008.

⁵ ARC Linkage Project LP0347164 entitled "The Intergenerational Transmission of Dependence on Income Support: Patterns, Causation and Implications for Australian Social Policy Research".

from both parents and children, issues of timing, intensity, and incidence of disadvantage can be studied while controlling for a range of background and demographic factors. The nature of the Australian payments system, managed by Centrelink, provides a population sampling frame of young Australians who grew up in a range of family circumstances. In particular, the same administrative database used to manage income-support payments is also used to manage childcare subsidies (which are not means tested) and tax rebates for dependent children (which are means tested and not paid to the top 15 per cent (approximately) of the income distribution). Thus this data source from which the survey sample is drawn provides consistent administrative data not only for disadvantaged families, but also for a large 'control group' of middle and upper-middle income families.

Main Research Questions

The data generated by the project will be the foundation for research on a wide variety of issues including youth health, education, and employment, as well as the influence of intergenerational factors on young people's socio-economic outcomes. The overarching goal of the YIF project is to understand the consequences of growing up in disadvantage on economic, social, and demographic outcomes in early adulthood.

To this end, the research project has two main objectives. The first objective is to describe the overall correlation between parents' and young adult children's outcomes. The second objective is to investigate the causal mechanisms behind these relationships paying particular attention to the intergenerational correlation in income-support receipt. The literature points to several mechanisms through which disadvantage might be passed from one generation to the next, however, little is known about their relative importance. Identifying which mechanisms are most important in accounting for the intergenerational correlation in disadvantage is a necessary first step in formulating evidence-based policies targeted towards breaking any cycle of welfare dependence.

Data collection is designed to focus on four possible transmission mechanisms: low educational attainment, early fertility, poor health and/or disability, and attitudinal factors. All of these may depend upon the socio-economic status and income-support history of a young person's family and may affect a youth's future receipt of income support. Information gathered from matched pairs of young adults and parents, lengthy administrative data, and a medium-length panel survey provide the mechanisms by which these research questions may be addressed.

Section 1:

THE DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF YOUTH

Overview of Findings:

This Section provides a brief overview of demographic characteristics of the continuing youth respondents in the Youth in Focus survey. A large amount of time-invariant information, such as the country of birth, the year of arrival in Australia, and parental background was not collected in wave 2 in order to simplify the interview process. The data summarized here are taken from the wave 1 dataset for the relevant youth respondent group.

Table 1.1 summarizes the main demographic characteristics of youth. Among wave 2 continuing respondents, slightly more than half were female. The respondents came from all states and territories of Australia, with the highest numbers of respondents living in New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland. About 90 per cent of respondents were born in Australia, and among those born overseas, the year of arrival in Australia is quite evenly distributed between their year of birth and 2006. However, looking at the six stratification categories separately, all of the young adults who arrived in Australia in 2000 or later belong to either category A (no parental income-support history) or C (recent parent income-support history), which can be explained by the stratification methodology and existing waiting periods for receiving income support by the new migrants.

Almost 40 per cent of foreign-born respondents spoke mostly English at home while growing up. This proportion is the highest (over 54 per cent) for category A respondents.

Just under 4 per cent of respondents identify themselves as having an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander status; the respondents with an Indigenous status mostly belong to categories B (prolonged parental income-support receipt), E and F (moderate and non-recent parental income-support receipt).

These results are to a great extent in line with the demographic characteristics of wave 1 young adult respondents, which suggests that the representativeness of the panel YIF sample of the Australian population did not diminish since wave 1.

Table 1.1
The Demographic Characteristics of Youth

	Stratification category						Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F	
Total continuing respondents	692	757	307	256	219	130	2,361
Gender							
Male	46.45	44.44	43.14	48.05	44.75	45.38	45.34
Female	53.55	55.56	56.86	51.95	55.25	54.62	54.66
State							
ACT	2.46	1.06	0.33	3.13	2.28	2.31	1.78
NSW	32.37	30.52	31.92	27.34	28.31	21.54	30.20
NT	0.14	0.40	0.33	0.00	0.91	0.00	0.30
QLD	19.51	21.40	16.94	18.75	19.18	27.69	20.12
SA	7.08	8.45	7.49	5.47	7.31	7.69	7.45
TAS	2.17	4.76	2.28	1.95	4.11	3.08	3.22
VIC	26.30	23.91	31.60	33.59	29.22	30.77	27.53
WA	9.97	9.51	9.12	9.77	8.68	6.92	9.40
Per cent born in Australia	89.60	90.75	85.39	88.28	89.50	90.77	89.33
Total foreign born	72	70	45	30	23	12	252
Year of arrival in Australia:							
1990 or earlier	25.00	34.29	11.11	23.33	39.13	25.00	26.19
1991 to 1994	25.00	35.71	4.44	46.67	56.52	8.33	28.97
1995 to 1999	18.06	28.57	26.67	26.67	4.35	66.67	24.60
2000 or after	30.56	0.00	57.78	0.00	0.00	0.00	19.05
Can't say	1.39	1.43	0.00	3.33	0.00	0.00	1.19
Language most spoken at home while growing up:							
English	54.17	30.00	20.00	50.00	39.13	41.67	38.89
Other language	45.83	70.00	80.00	50.00	60.87	58.33	61.11
ATSI Status:							
None	98.70	94.06	97.40	99.61	95.89	96.15	96.74
Aboriginal	1.01	4.89	1.62	0.39	4.11	3.85	2.71
Torres Strait Islander	0.14	0.40	0.65	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.25
Both Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander	0.00	0.26	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.08
Can't say	0.14	0.40	0.32	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.21

Section 2:

YOUTH'S LIVING ARRANGEMENTS AND HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

Overview of Findings:

One of the crucial issues the Youth in Focus data will help to investigate is the process by which the young people become financially independent and the factors that affect early or late independence. Both waves of the YIF survey collected information on the living arrangements of the young adults and the people they are living with.

At the time of wave 1, about 19 per cent of all interviewed young people lived without a parent, guardian or a parental figure in their households. The proportion of independent young adults was higher (around a quarter) among the respondents belonging to stratification categories B (prolonged parental income-support history) and F (moderate parental income-support history). The proportion of those living independently was higher for female respondents (over 22 per cent) than for males (15 and a half per cent).

Wave 2 data show that, two years later, fully 31 per cent of young people are living independently. The difference between the genders has diminished somewhat (33 per cent of female respondents are living without parents or a parental figure vs. 29 per cent for male respondents), however, the differences between the stratification categories persist. While 37 per cent of young adults whose parents had a history of intensive income-support receipt (category B) were living independently at the time of wave 2 interview, the same could be said about only 25 per cent of youth in category A (no parental income-support history). Category F also has a high proportion (37 per cent) of independent youth, while the remaining categories have about 29 per cent of youth living on their own at the time of the interview.

Slightly more than 11 per cent of the interviewed 20-year olds were either married or living in a *de facto* relationship at the time of the interview, compared to just over 5 per cent of wave 1 respondents. Youth in category A are about twice less likely to be partnered as the rest of the respondents. Young girls are also about twice as likely to have a spouse or a partner as young men (16 vs. 8 per cent).

Table 2.1 also details the proportions of respondents living in large-group or share accommodation. While the respondents living in the large-group accommodation are likely to be studying at a university or TAFE, those living in shared accommodation might be doing so due to moving out of their parents' house for a variety of reasons, including study.

Table 2.2 describes the household composition of young people living with one or both parents, guardian or a parental figure. While the vast majority of these young people are single and do not have children, there are cases of married young adults, or young adults with children, who do not live independently. About 3 per cent of young people living with their parents or guardians are married or in a *de facto* relationship. This proportion is higher for categories B (intensive parental income-support history), C (very recent parental income-support history) and F (moderate non-recent income-support history).

Among those young adults who live with their parents or guardians, the composition of the household varies greatly depending on the income-support stratification category. While the vast majority of respondents in categories A and D (no parental income-support history and minor non-recent parental income-support history) – around 85 per cent – live with both their parents, only 42 per cent of young adults in category B (heavy parental income-support history) report the same. This difference of more than 40 percentage points is the same as was observed at wave 1. The young people who live with one parent only are much more likely to live with their mother (the proportion of those living with mothers only is six and a half times greater than the proportion of young adults living with their father in a single-parent family).

Table 2.3 reports the household composition of youth living independently. In this group of respondents, about 32 per cent are partnered and just under 5 per cent have children. Category A has the highest proportion of single young adults without children who live on their own (just over 73 per cent compared to 56 to 68 per cent for other categories) and the second lowest proportion of young adults with children (2 per cent, compared with just 1 per cent for category C (recent income-support exposure) and 4 to almost 8 per cent in other categories).

The family composition of youth just before independence – for the respondents who became independent between the two waves of interviews – mirrors the household structure of the non-independent young adults. In particular, while almost 85 per cent of young people in category A lived with their fathers just before moving out to live on their own, this is true for only 42 per cent of category B respondents, with the remaining categories falling in between.

There is some variation across categories as to the main reasons for young people moving away. More than 40 per cent of category A respondents cite education as one of the main reasons for moving away from their parents' place. This proportion is much lower (17 to 24 per cent) for all other categories. Respondents in categories B and F (heavy or moderate non-recent exposure to income support) are much more likely to give poor relationships as one of the reasons for leaving home; inability to live at home for economic reasons is more prominent for respondents in category C (recent income-support exposure) and E (early income-support exposure).

The overall findings support the conclusions made as a result of the analysis of wave 1 data: exposure to income support is correlated with early fertility decisions. Young people who have grown up on income support are also more likely to have experienced family break-up and to have poorer relationships at home. These factors seem to play a significant role in the decision of young people who grew up on income support to move out of their parents' house. On the other hand, young adults whose parents did not have any history of income support are more likely to become independent when they leave home to study.

Table 2.1
The Living Arrangements of Youth

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Total continuing respondents	691	756	306	256	219	130	1,069	1,289	2,358
Youth's current living arrangement:									
Not independent (with parent, guardian or a parental figure)	74.24	62.96	70.26	70.70	70.78	62.31	70.91	66.95	68.74
Independent	25.76	37.04	29.74	29.30	29.22	37.69	29.09	33.05	31.26
Currently married or living in <i>de facto</i> relationship?									
yes, married	1.01	0.93	1.96	1.56	1.37	0.77	0.47	1.78	1.19
yes, de facto	6.95	13.10	12.09	12.50	12.33	16.92	7.67	14.20	11.24
no	92.04	85.98	85.95	85.94	86.30	82.31	91.86	84.02	87.57
Living in large-group accommodation?									
yes	4.05	2.25	2.29	1.95	3.65	4.62	3.55	2.56	3.01
no	95.22	97.62	97.39	97.27	95.89	95.38	95.98	97.05	96.56
can't say	0.72	0.13	0.33	0.78	0.46	0.00	0.47	0.39	0.42
Total not in large-group accommodation:	663	739	299	251	211	124	1,031	1,256	2,287
Currently living in share accommodation?									
yes	16.14	24.76	18.06	19.12	16.11	23.39	20.08	19.75	19.90
no	83.41	75.10	81.94	80.48	83.41	76.61	79.53	80.10	79.84
can't say	0.45	0.14	0.00	0.40	0.47	0.00	0.39	0.16	0.26
Total in group or share accommodation and NOT in <i>de facto</i> relationship	116	153	50	38	30	26	205	208	413
Does partner/relative live at the same place?									
yes	13.79	20.92	18.00	23.68	33.33	15.38	20.49	18.27	19.37
no	86.21	79.08	82.00	76.32	66.67	84.62	79.51	81.73	80.63

Table 2.2
The Household Composition of Youth Living with Parent, Guardian or a Parental Figure

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Total respondents living with parent, guardian or a parental figure	513	476	215	181	155	81	758	863	1,621
<i>Household structure:</i>									
Partnered, with child(ren) and either one or both parents and/or other relatives	0.00	0.63	1.40	0.55	0.00	2.47	0.26	0.81	0.56
Partnered, no children and either one or both parents and/or other relatives	1.56	3.57	3.26	2.21	1.94	3.70	1.72	3.36	2.59
Single with child(ren) and either one or both parents and/or other relatives	0.78	1.26	2.33	0.55	1.29	3.70	0.00	2.43	1.30
Single, no children and either one or both parents and/or other relatives	97.66	94.54	93.02	96.69	96.77	90.12	98.02	93.40	95.56
<i>Living arrangements of those single, no children:</i>									
	501	450	200	175	150	73	743	806	1,549
Both own parents w/ or w/o other relatives	85.03	42.44	58.00	84.57	75.33	63.01	66.76	67.49	67.14
Own mother but not father in household	9.58	48.67	37.00	10.29	20.00	28.77	25.57	27.30	26.47
Own father but not mother in household	3.39	5.33	3.50	3.43	3.33	6.85	5.25	3.10	4.13
Other relatives only	2.00	3.56	1.50	1.71	1.33	1.37	2.42	2.11	2.26

Table 2.3
The Household Structure of Youth Living Independently

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Total respondents									
living independently	178	280	91	75	64	49	311	426	737
Household structure:									
Partnered, with child(ren)	2.25	6.07	0.00	2.67	4.69	2.04	2.25	4.69	3.66
Partnered, no children	24.16	23.93	35.16	37.33	37.50	32.65	19.94	34.74	28.49
Single with child(ren)	0.00	1.79	1.10	1.33	1.56	2.04	0.00	2.11	1.22
Single, no children	73.60	68.21	63.74	58.67	56.25	63.27	77.81	58.45	66.62
Total became independent between wave 1 and wave 2									
	121	149	58	52	36	17	198	233	433
Relatives youth lived with just before independence:									
Own mother (biological or adoptive as an infant)	95.87	82.55	82.76	88.46	75.00	70.59	82.32	89.70	85.91
Stepmother	0.00	4.03	1.72	1.92	2.78	11.76	3.54	1.72	2.54
Foster mother	0.00	0.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.43	0.23
Own father (biological or adoptive as an infant)	84.30	42.28	68.97	73.08	66.67	64.71	68.69	60.94	64.20
Stepfather	0.83	6.71	5.17	1.92	8.33	5.88	3.03	5.58	4.39
Foster father	0.00	0.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.43	0.23
Sister/ half-sister	37.19	40.27	25.86	38.46	36.11	29.41	35.86	37.34	36.49
Stepsister/ foster sister	6.61	2.68	10.34	7.69	2.78	0.00	5.05	5.58	5.31
Brother/half-brother	50.41	40.94	32.76	42.31	50.00	41.18	42.42	44.64	43.42
Stepbrother/ foster brother	0.00	0.67	0.00	0.00	2.78	0.00	0.51	0.43	0.46
Grandmother	0.00	0.67	1.72	3.85	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.72	0.92
Grandfather	0.00	0.67	1.72	1.92	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.29	0.69

Table 2.3
The Household Structure of Youth Living Independently (continued)

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Total became independent between wave 1 and wave 2	121	149	58	52	36	17	198	233	433
Reasons for starting to live independently:									
Wanted to move away and be independent	25.62	32.89	36.21	26.92	33.33	35.29	31.82	30.04	30.72
Wanted to live with a partner	14.88	10.74	17.24	13.46	19.44	0.00	7.07	18.88	13.39
For educational reasons	41.32	24.16	22.41	21.15	19.44	17.65	27.78	27.90	27.71
For employment reasons	14.05	14.77	13.79	25.00	16.67	35.29	19.19	14.59	16.63
Unable to live at home for economic reasons or no space	0.00	3.36	6.90	1.92	5.56	0.00	2.02	3.43	2.77
Unable to live at home due to poor relationships	0.83	7.38	5.17	3.85	0.00	11.76	5.05	3.86	4.39
Could not accept the rules at home	0.00	0.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.43	0.23
To go travelling	1.65	1.34	0.00	3.85	0.00	0.00	1.52	1.29	1.39
Parent moved out	0.83	4.70	0.00	7.69	2.78	0.00	4.55	1.72	3.00
Fell pregnant/ had a baby	1.65	0.67	0.00	0.00	5.56	0.00	0.51	1.72	1.15
Wanted to live with other relative(s)	0.00	0.00	1.72	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.43	0.23
Was asked/told to leave (unspec)	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.92	0.00	5.88	1.01	0.00	0.46

Section 3:

**YOUTH'S PERSPECTIVES ON THEIR RELATIONSHIP
WITH THEIR PARENTS**

Overview of Findings:

Previous studies of adolescent outcomes have shown that the quality of parent-child relationships is correlated with a range of outcomes for both parents and children. Children who grow up in families where parents are more supportive, attentive, more engaged in the child's schoolwork, tend to have better health, are less likely to engage in risky behaviours, achieve better educational outcomes, and are better able to cope with stressful events. Therefore it is important to monitor the quality of relationships in the young person's family and between the young person and his or her parents to see whether the parental support may help overcome or mitigate the negative effects of low socio-economic background.

The Youth in Focus project provides a range of data that could help investigate this issue. In wave 1 of the survey, both parent and young adult respondents were asked questions on the quality of the intergenerational relationships. Moreover, although there were no direct questions on the parenting style of parent respondents, the young people were asked to provide information on whether their parents helped them with homework while at school or read to them at night when they were little. These variables, especially the 'reading at night' indicator, proved to be an important proxy for parental investment in the child's education and have been shown to contribute significantly to the young person's outcomes ranging from risky behaviours to social inclusion (Cobb-Clark *et al*, 2008; Ryan and Sartbayeva, 2008). In wave 2 of the YIF survey, the information on the quality of parent-youth relationship was collected again, this time from the youth's perspective only.

Wave 1 data have shown that, overall, young adults had friendly and supportive relationships with their mothers. The vast majority (75 per cent) of the then 18-year-olds reported that they respected their mothers' ideas and opinions about important things in life and that their mothers, in turn, respected their ideas. The majority of the young people (more than 70 per cent) also said that they found it easy to understand their mothers and more than half (about 53 per cent) said that their mothers never or hardly ever made too many demands on them. The quality of the youth's relationship with their mothers did not appear to be strongly linked to the family history of income support.

The young adults' perspectives on relationship with their mothers do not appear to have changed between the first and the second waves of data collection. Two years after the wave 1 interview, the young people continue to enjoy warm and supportive relationships with their mothers. Three quarters of the young adult respondents say that they always or often respect their mother's ideas and opinions about life, and 73 per cent report that their mothers respect theirs. Almost 75 per cent of youth find it easy to understand their mother most of the time, and just under 60 per cent feel that their mother never or hardly ever makes too many demands on them. Around 85 per cent of youth report that, overall, their relationship with mother and the mother's behaviour towards them is always or often friendly.

As in wave 1, the quality of young adults' relationships with mothers does not seem to be related to either the family income-support history or the youth's gender.

The quality of relationship with the youth's fathers, on the other hand, does appear to be correlated with parental income-support history in both waves of the data. Firstly, about 5 per cent of wave 2 youth respondents who grew up in families with intensive history of income support (category B) refuse to talk about their fathers, compared to only 1 per cent of youth with no income-support exposure (category A). Moreover, while the young people belonging to category A view their relationship with their fathers as only slightly less positive than their relationship with their mothers, this difference is quite pronounced for the category B respondents. For example, while three quarters of the youth with no income-support exposure (category A) report that they can always or often respect their father's ideas and

opinions about life, and about 73 per cent report that their fathers respect their ideas most of the time, only 57 per cent of young people in category B do so. Less than 60 per cent of young people who grew up in families with a prolonged history of income support (category B) say that they find it easy to understand their fathers most of the time, compared to just under 73 per cent of category A respondents. This question also reflects some gender differences: 70 per cent of young men and 62 per cent of young women report that they can always or often easily understand their father.

In respect to fathers making too many demands on the young people, there does not appear to be a significant difference across income-support histories: about 65 per cent of wave 2 respondents report that their fathers never or hardly ever make too many demands on them. As to the overall quality of the father-youth relationship, again some variation between the categories can be observed: while 83 per cent of the young people with no income-support exposure (category A) characterise their overall relationship with their fathers and the father's overall behaviour towards them as always or often friendly, only 73 to 75 per cent of respondents in category B (youth with parental history of intensive income support) report the same.

There are only a handful of cases where the youth has recently lived with their stepmother (26 in total), so it quite difficult to judge the overall quality of this relationship. Living with a stepfather is somewhat more common, particularly for the young people who grew up in families with intensive income-support exposure (category B). An interesting finding of wave 1 was that the levels of young people's satisfaction with their relationships with their stepfathers were similar to those with their fathers. This result does surface again in wave 2, especially in the questions on mutual respect and the ease with which they young adults understand their stepfathers. However, the overall youth's relationship with their stepfather appears to be less friendly (about 10 percentage points difference) than with their fathers.

Overall, the quality of youth's relationships with their parents and stepparents appears to be constant across the categories and consistent with the wave 1 findings. As in wave 1, the only exception to this is the quality of the youth's relationship with their fathers which appears to be worse for the young people who grew up in families with an intensive income-support history.

Table 3.1
The Nature of Youth's Relationships with their Mothers and Fathers

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Total respondents who ever lived with their mother	689	746	305	255	218	129	1,062	1,280	2,342
Does youth respect mother's ideas/opinions about important things in life?									
always	45.28	39.68	43.61	49.41	41.28	43.41	41.43	44.77	43.25
often	32.22	30.70	30.82	33.33	33.94	32.56	33.15	30.78	31.85
usually	12.77	14.08	12.46	10.59	12.39	11.63	13.75	12.03	12.81
sometimes	8.42	10.72	8.85	4.71	9.17	7.75	8.00	9.53	8.84
hardly ever	0.44	1.88	0.98	0.78	0.00	3.10	1.13	1.09	1.11
never	0.29	0.80	0.66	0.00	0.46	0.78	0.38	0.63	0.51
can't say	0.00	0.13	0.33	0.00	0.46	0.00	0.19	0.08	0.13
mother deceased	0.15	0.80	1.31	0.78	1.38	0.00	0.66	0.70	0.68
doesn't want to talk about mother	0.44	1.21	0.98	0.39	0.92	0.78	1.32	0.39	0.81
Total respondents whose mother is alive and who are willing to talk about mother	685	731	298	252	213	128	1,041	1,266	2,307
Does youth's mother respect youth's ideas and opinions about important things in life?									
always	44.53	39.95	41.28	43.65	46.01	42.97	42.07	43.05	42.61
often	29.49	31.74	30.54	33.73	28.64	30.47	31.60	30.09	30.78
usually	14.89	13.54	15.10	13.89	15.02	13.28	14.70	13.98	14.30
sometimes	9.49	11.35	10.07	8.33	8.45	9.38	9.61	10.19	9.93
hardly ever	1.17	1.92	2.01	0.40	0.94	3.13	1.44	1.58	1.52
never	0.44	1.37	0.67	0.00	0.47	0.78	0.38	1.03	0.74
can't say	0.00	0.14	0.34	0.00	0.47	0.00	0.19	0.08	0.13
Does youth find it easy to understand their mother?									
always	46.28	45.96	52.01	51.59	47.89	50.78	48.80	47.16	47.90
often	28.32	24.62	23.83	28.97	24.41	24.22	27.47	24.88	26.05
usually	13.14	12.86	10.07	10.32	15.49	9.38	12.20	12.48	12.35
sometimes	10.66	13.00	11.41	7.54	10.80	12.50	9.13	13.03	11.27
hardly ever	0.73	1.92	1.34	1.19	1.41	2.34	1.73	1.11	1.39
never	0.88	1.50	1.01	0.40	0.00	0.78	0.58	1.26	0.95
can't say	0.00	0.14	0.34	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.08	0.09

Table 3.1
The Nature of Youth's Relationships with their Mothers and Fathers (continued)

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F	Male	Female	Total
Total respondents whose mother is alive and who are willing to talk about mother	685	731	298	252	213	128	1,041	1,266	2,307
How often does youth feel that their mother makes too many demands on them?									
always	2.34	3.97	4.36	3.97	1.88	3.91	3.55	3.16	3.34
often	7.01	6.84	9.06	8.33	7.04	10.16	6.53	8.37	7.54
usually	5.84	6.16	4.36	5.16	7.04	7.03	6.53	5.29	5.85
sometimes	24.23	24.35	27.18	19.84	20.66	18.75	23.73	23.38	23.54
hardly ever	39.85	34.06	31.21	40.48	33.33	30.47	36.02	35.70	35.85
never	20.58	24.49	23.15	22.22	30.05	29.69	23.54	23.85	23.71
can't say	0.15	0.14	0.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.24	0.17
Overall characteristic of youth's relationship with their mother:									
always friendly	58.25	55.54	60.40	61.11	54.93	55.47	59.27	56.08	57.52
often friendly	28.61	25.44	24.50	27.38	32.86	26.56	26.80	27.57	27.22
usually friendly	10.80	14.36	11.41	9.52	8.92	12.50	10.95	12.48	11.79
sometimes friendly	2.04	2.87	2.35	1.98	2.35	4.69	1.83	3.08	2.51
hardly ever friendly	0.15	0.68	1.01	0.00	0.47	0.00	0.48	0.39	0.43
never friendly	0.15	0.96	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.78	0.48	0.32	0.39
can't say	0.00	0.14	0.34	0.00	0.47	0.00	0.19	0.08	0.13
Mother's overall behaviour towards youth:									
always friendly	59.71	58.28	61.41	65.08	59.15	56.25	63.30	56.95	59.82
often friendly	27.88	24.76	24.83	26.59	31.46	30.47	25.17	28.20	26.83
usually friendly	9.64	12.45	9.06	6.75	6.57	8.59	8.74	10.66	9.80
sometimes friendly	2.04	2.87	3.02	1.59	2.82	3.13	1.83	3.08	2.51
hardly ever friendly	0.44	0.68	1.01	0.00	0.00	0.78	0.38	0.63	0.52
never friendly	0.29	0.82	0.34	0.00	0.00	0.78	0.48	0.39	0.43
can't say	0.00	0.14	0.34	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.08	0.09

Table 3.1
The Nature of Youth's Relationships with their Mothers and Fathers (continued)

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Total respondents who ever lived with their father	682	605	283	249	205	127	992	1,159	2,151
Does youth respect their father's ideas and opinions about important things in life?									
always	43.55	31.40	34.98	45.78	32.68	37.01	39.01	36.84	37.84
often	32.26	25.45	28.98	28.11	30.24	23.62	29.23	28.30	28.73
usually	13.64	13.06	14.49	12.05	16.59	15.75	13.10	14.41	13.81
sometimes	7.33	13.55	10.25	10.44	12.68	10.24	10.58	10.44	10.51
hardly ever	0.88	3.97	3.89	1.20	3.41	3.94	2.52	2.67	2.60
never	0.88	4.63	2.12	1.61	1.95	3.15	1.41	3.28	2.42
can't say	0.00	0.66	0.35	0.40	0.00	1.57	0.40	0.35	0.37
father deceased	0.44	2.31	2.12	0.00	0.49	1.57	1.21	1.21	1.21
doesn't want to talk about father	1.03	4.96	2.83	0.40	1.95	3.15	2.52	2.50	2.51
Total respondents whose father is alive and who do not refuse to talk about father									
	672	561	269	248	200	121	955	1,116	2,071
Does youth's father respect youth's ideas/opinions about important things in life?									
always	40.03	35.83	37.17	40.32	35.50	34.71	37.17	38.35	37.81
often	33.18	21.57	29.00	31.85	30.00	26.45	31.20	26.43	28.63
usually	14.88	14.80	16.36	11.69	16.00	18.18	14.55	15.32	14.97
sometimes	10.12	17.29	11.52	11.29	15.50	13.22	12.67	13.44	13.09
hardly ever	1.04	3.74	2.60	2.02	1.50	3.31	1.78	2.69	2.27
never	0.60	5.88	2.97	2.02	1.50	2.48	2.09	3.23	2.70
can't say	0.15	0.89	0.37	0.81	0.00	1.65	0.52	0.54	0.53
Does youth find it easy to understand their father?									
always	45.54	38.68	39.41	47.18	40.00	36.36	45.65	38.89	42.01
often	27.23	21.03	27.14	21.37	23.50	21.49	24.71	23.66	24.14
usually	14.43	11.59	11.90	16.13	14.00	17.36	13.72	13.62	13.66
sometimes	10.57	16.93	13.75	10.08	18.00	19.01	11.31	16.04	13.86
hardly ever	1.34	5.35	4.83	2.82	3.50	0.83	2.62	3.76	3.24
never	0.74	5.70	2.97	2.02	1.00	4.13	1.68	3.67	2.75
can't say	0.15	0.71	0.00	0.40	0.00	0.83	0.31	0.36	0.34

Table 3.1
The Nature of Youth's Relationships with their Mothers and Fathers (continued)

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Total respondents whose father is alive and who do not refuse to talk about father									
to talk about father	672	561	269	248	200	121	955	1,116	2,071
How often does youth feel that their father makes too many demands on them?									
always	1.04	3.74	2.97	3.63	2.00	1.65	2.20	2.69	2.46
often	4.76	6.77	7.81	3.23	8.00	9.92	7.64	4.84	6.13
usually	3.57	4.10	4.46	2.02	4.00	2.48	3.04	4.12	3.62
sometimes	24.85	16.93	18.96	26.61	15.50	23.14	23.14	19.44	21.15
hardly ever	38.99	33.51	37.17	34.27	38.00	32.23	36.54	35.93	36.21
never	26.64	33.87	28.62	29.84	32.50	28.93	27.12	32.35	29.94
can't say	0.15	1.07	0.00	0.40	0.00	1.65	0.31	0.63	0.48
Overall relationship with father:									
always friendly	54.91	48.13	51.30	54.03	49.00	48.76	52.04	51.16	51.57
often friendly	28.57	25.49	23.42	27.82	26.50	23.97	27.64	25.54	26.51
usually friendly	13.54	14.08	14.13	11.69	15.50	17.36	14.66	13.35	13.95
sometimes friendly	1.79	5.17	6.69	2.82	6.50	6.61	2.83	5.38	4.20
hardly ever friendly	0.74	3.21	2.60	1.21	1.50	0.00	1.47	1.97	1.74
never friendly	0.30	3.21	1.86	2.02	1.00	1.65	1.15	2.06	1.64
can't say	0.15	0.71	0.00	0.40	0.00	1.65	0.21	0.54	0.39
Father's overall behaviour towards youth:									
always friendly	57.14	51.16	54.65	56.45	56.00	56.20	54.14	55.65	54.95
often friendly	26.79	24.60	24.16	25.81	25.00	19.83	27.02	23.57	25.16
usually friendly	12.65	11.76	12.64	10.89	13.50	14.05	12.88	11.92	12.36
sometimes friendly	2.23	6.60	4.46	3.63	4.00	6.61	3.46	5.02	4.30
hardly ever friendly	0.74	1.96	2.97	1.61	0.00	0.00	0.84	1.79	1.35
never friendly	0.45	2.85	1.12	1.21	1.00	2.48	1.26	1.61	1.45
can't say	0.00	1.07	0.00	0.40	0.50	0.83	0.42	0.45	0.43

Table 3.2
The Nature of Youth's Relationships with their Stepparents

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Total respondents who live or recently lived with stepmother	3	10	3	2	3	5	17	9	26
Can youth respect their stepmother's ideas/opinions about important things in life?									
always	0.00	70.00	33.33	0.00	33.33	80.00	52.94	44.44	50.00
often	33.33	20.00	33.33	50.00	33.33	20.00	35.29	11.11	26.92
usually	33.33	10.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.88	11.11	7.69
sometimes	33.33	0.00	33.33	50.00	33.33	0.00	5.88	33.33	15.38
Does youth's stepmother respect youth's ideas/opinions about important things in life?									
always	0.00	60.00	33.33	0.00	0.00	60.00	41.18	33.33	38.46
often	33.33	20.00	33.33	0.00	0.00	20.00	17.65	22.22	19.23
usually	33.33	10.00	0.00	0.00	66.67	20.00	17.65	22.22	19.23
sometimes	33.33	0.00	33.33	100.00	33.33	0.00	17.65	22.22	19.23
never	0.00	10.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.88	0.00	3.85
Does youth find it easy to understand their stepmother?									
always	33.33	60.00	33.33	0.00	0.00	60.00	47.06	33.33	42.31
often	0.00	20.00	33.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.88	22.22	11.54
usually	0.00	10.00	0.00	0.00	66.67	20.00	17.65	11.11	15.38
sometimes	66.67	10.00	33.33	50.00	0.00	20.00	17.65	33.33	23.08
hardly ever	0.00	0.00	0.00	50.00	33.33	0.00	11.76	0.00	7.69
How often does youth feel that their stepmother makes too many demands on them?									
always	0.00	10.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	20.00	5.88	11.11	7.69
often	66.67	10.00	66.67	50.00	66.67	0.00	23.53	44.44	30.77
usually	33.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	11.11	3.85
sometimes	0.00	10.00	33.33	0.00	0.00	20.00	11.76	11.11	11.54
hardly ever	0.00	10.00	0.00	50.00	33.33	20.00	23.53	0.00	15.38
never	0.00	60.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	40.00	35.29	22.22	30.77
Overall relationship with stepmother:									
always friendly	33.33	70.00	33.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	35.29	33.33	34.62
often friendly	0.00	10.00	66.67	50.00	33.33	80.00	23.53	55.56	34.62
usually friendly	66.67	10.00	0.00	0.00	33.33	20.00	23.53	11.11	19.23
sometimes friendly	0.00	10.00	0.00	50.00	33.33	0.00	17.65	0.00	11.54
Stepmother's overall behaviour towards youth:									
always friendly	0.00	70.00	33.33	0.00	0.00	60.00	47.06	33.33	42.31
often friendly	66.67	20.00	33.33	50.00	0.00	40.00	23.53	44.44	30.77
usually friendly	0.00	10.00	33.33	0.00	66.67	0.00	11.76	22.22	15.38
sometimes friendly	33.33	0.00	0.00	50.00	33.33	0.00	17.65	0.00	11.54

Table 3.2
The Nature of Youth's Relationships with their Stepparents (continued)

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Total respondents who live or recently lived with stepfather	6	44	13	8	18	8	43	54	97
Does youth respect their stepfather's ideas/opinions about important things in life?									
always	0.00	18.18	38.46	37.50	33.33	12.50	18.60	27.78	23.71
often	33.33	34.09	30.77	0.00	22.22	25.00	41.86	16.67	27.84
usually	33.33	29.55	15.38	50.00	27.78	50.00	27.91	33.33	30.93
sometimes	16.67	11.36	7.69	12.50	11.11	0.00	4.65	14.81	10.31
hardly ever	0.00	6.82	0.00	0.00	0.00	12.50	6.98	1.85	4.12
never	16.67	0.00	7.69	0.00	5.56	0.00	0.00	5.56	3.09
Does youth's stepfather respect youth's ideas/opinions about important things in life?									
always	0.00	22.73	38.46	50.00	27.78	25.00	23.26	29.63	26.80
often	33.33	31.82	30.77	12.50	44.44	37.50	39.53	27.78	32.99
usually	50.00	29.55	15.38	12.50	16.67	37.50	25.58	25.93	25.77
sometimes	0.00	11.36	7.69	25.00	5.56	0.00	6.98	11.11	9.28
hardly ever	0.00	2.27	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.33	0.00	1.03
never	16.67	2.27	7.69	0.00	5.56	0.00	2.33	5.56	4.12
Does youth find it easy to understand their stepfather?									
always	0.00	29.55	38.46	62.50	22.22	25.00	30.23	29.63	29.90
often	33.33	27.27	38.46	12.50	38.89	0.00	32.56	24.07	27.84
usually	33.33	13.64	15.38	25.00	22.22	50.00	20.93	20.37	20.62
sometimes	16.67	25.00	0.00	0.00	16.67	25.00	13.95	20.37	17.53
hardly ever	0.00	2.27	7.69	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.70	2.06
never	16.67	2.27	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.33	1.85	2.06
How often does youth feel that their stepfather makes too many demands on them?									
often	0.00	6.82	0.00	12.50	11.11	0.00	6.98	5.56	6.19
usually	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.56	0.00	2.33	0.00	1.03
sometimes	33.33	29.55	23.08	25.00	38.89	25.00	30.23	29.63	29.90
hardly ever	33.33	43.18	46.15	37.50	11.11	25.00	34.88	35.19	35.05
never	33.33	20.45	30.77	25.00	33.33	50.00	25.58	29.63	27.84
Overall relationship with stepfather:									
always friendly	16.67	29.55	30.77	50.00	33.33	37.50	37.21	27.78	31.96
often friendly	50.00	34.09	46.15	25.00	44.44	37.50	39.53	37.04	38.14
usually friendly	16.67	27.27	7.69	25.00	16.67	12.50	18.60	22.22	20.62
sometimes friendly	0.00	4.55	15.38	0.00	5.56	12.50	2.33	9.26	6.19
hardly ever friendly	0.00	2.27	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.85	1.03
never friendly	16.67	2.27	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.33	1.85	2.06

Table 3.2
The Nature of Youth's Relationships with their Stepparents (continued)

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Total respondents who live or recently lived with stepfather	6	44	13	8	18	8	43	54	97
Stepfather's overall behaviour towards youth:									
always friendly	33.33	34.09	38.46	50.00	38.89	50.00	32.56	42.59	38.14
often friendly	33.33	31.82	38.46	12.50	27.78	0.00	27.91	27.78	27.84
usually friendly	16.67	25.00	15.38	37.50	27.78	37.50	32.56	20.37	25.77
sometimes friendly	0.00	6.82	7.69	0.00	5.56	0.00	2.33	7.41	5.15
hardly ever friendly	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	12.50	2.33	0.00	1.03
never friendly	16.67	2.27	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.33	1.85	2.06

Section 4:

YOUTH'S EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES

Overview of Findings:

Social and economic disadvantage may limit parents' ability to invest in the education of their children perpetuating economic disadvantage across the generations. The OECD (2007), for example, recently pointed to the importance of education in understanding social mobility. After reviewing the research evidence on the extent of intergenerational mobility in OECD countries, it concluded that "education is a major contributor to intergenerational income mobility and education differences tend to persist across generations". This latter conclusion is particularly troubling given the importance of education in driving labour market outcomes, overall health status, income levels, family formation, as well as wellbeing more generally.

The Youth in Focus survey collects a vast amount of detailed data on the educational experience and achievement of the young people in our sample. This section of the report discusses the variation in the educational outcomes of young Australians across different family types. The principal comparison in the discussion here will be between those young people growing up in families with a history of intensive income-support receipt and those young people growing up in families with no history of interaction with the income-support system. We will also talk briefly about gender differences in outcomes.

Overview of Educational Outcomes at Wave 2:

We begin by considering the highest educational qualification received by age 20 for the 2,358 young people responding to the wave 2 survey. These results are outlined in Table 4.1 for individuals with different family backgrounds.

Although, at 20 years of age, the education process of many YIF respondents is not yet completed, there are important differences in the educational qualifications obtained by the time of wave 2 interview by those youth growing up in families with a history of intensive income-support receipt (category B) relative to young people in families with no history of interaction with the income-support system (category A). Approximately 40 per cent of 20-year-olds in income-support families report some type of post-secondary-school qualification (often a TAFE certificate) as their highest educational qualification. In contrast, only 33 per cent of those in non-income-support families have received a post-secondary-school qualification. A much higher proportion of these young people have a secondary school qualification only. In particular, the highest qualification for 66.7 per cent of youth in families with no interaction with the income-support system is a secondary school qualification. This is true of only 59.4 per cent of young people in families with a history of intensive income-support receipt. It is important to note, however, that many youth have not completed their education by age 20 (see below) which implies that these patterns are unlikely to reflect the differentials that these groups will experience in completed education in the future.

There are also gender differences in the achieved educational qualifications of 20-year-olds. Young women are less likely than their male counterparts to hold only a secondary school qualification at age 20 (60.8 vs. 64.4 per cent). They are more likely than young men to have some form of post-secondary school qualification.

It is important to note that – among those whose highest qualification is a secondary school qualification – there is variation across family background in the nature of the qualification held. For example, among those with a secondary school qualification only, youth in income-support families (category B) are approximately eight times as likely to have left secondary school with a Year 10 qualification (4.5 vs. 0.6 per cent). They are also substantially less likely to have a Year 12 qualification (45.6 vs. 61.9 per cent).

It is also important to note that many 20 year-olds have not yet completed their educations. Many continue to study or train for higher qualifications. Young people in non-income-support families (category A) are more likely to be continuing their studies at age 20 than their counterparts who grew up in income-support families. Specifically, almost 70 per cent of 20-year-olds in families with no interaction with the income-support system are continuing to work towards a post-secondary-school qualification, while the same is true of just over half (54 per cent) of those youth in families with a history of intensive income-support receipt (category B). Interestingly, young women are somewhat more likely than young men to report that they are continuing their education (61 vs. 58 per cent).

Moreover, there are differences across family backgrounds in the type of qualification those youth who are continuing to study are working towards. Youth in families with no income-support history are more likely to be studying towards university Bachelor or Honours degrees, while a larger proportion of youth in income-support families are studying for TAFE certificates or trade qualifications. These patterns in educational qualifications and further study are consistent with the differences in educational outcomes identified at wave 1 (Cobb-Clark and Sartbayeva, 2007; Barón, 2008).

Finally, there are also large gender differences in the types of qualifications that young men and women are studying for at age 20. Young men are much more likely to be working towards a TAFE certificate or trade qualification, while almost 70 per cent of young women who are continuing to study are working towards a university Bachelor's or Honours degree.

Taken together these results indicate that – given the large proportion of youth still studying and training – it is still too early to completely predict how the completed education of Youth in Focus respondents will vary across family background. It seems likely, however, that those who grew up in a family with a history of income-support receipt will be more likely to end up with trade or TAFE certifications and less likely to receive university qualifications than their counterparts in non-income-support families.

Detailed Educational Outcomes for Specific Subsamples of Students:

The previous results provide an overview of educational outcomes at age 20. In order to gain further understanding of the ways that disadvantage in childhood might affect the educational outcomes of young Australians, we turn now to consider more detailed outcomes for specific subsamples of students.

First, we assess secondary school outcomes for those individuals who were still in secondary school at wave 1 (see Table 4.2). Youth respondents were 18 years old at wave 1. Many of them had completed their secondary schooling by the time of the first interview, though others – particularly younger individuals born early in 1988 – had not. At wave 2, the young people in the sample are on average 20 years old. Not surprisingly, nearly all young people who were still in secondary school at wave 1 (223 individuals) had left secondary school by the time they were interviewed at wave 2 two years later. Almost none (less than 5 per cent) of the individuals who had left school at wave 1 before completing Year 12 (446 individuals) returned to school at some point between the two interview dates.

There is evidence that completing secondary school between waves 1 and 2 (rather than having completed at wave 1) is less likely to represent normal age progression for young people in income-support intensive families. It appears to be more likely to reflect poor performance. Specifically, 86 per cent of youth in non-income-support families (category A) who completed between waves did so in 2006. This is true of only 72 per cent of youth in income-support intensive families (category B). Moreover, more than half of young people in families with a history of intensive income-support receipt who completed secondary school between waves reported having repeated a year at school in comparison with only a quarter

of their counterparts in families with no history of income-support receipt. Youth growing up in income-support families are less likely to complete Year 12, receive a certificate, or report positive educational outcomes in their final year of school (well above/above average English, math or overall study results) in comparison to young people in non-income-support families who also left school between waves.

Table 4.3 presents educational outcomes for those (214 individuals) who left secondary school between waves 1 and 2 after completing Year 12. The vast majority (90 per cent) of these young people received their Year 12 certificate – a proportion which is somewhat higher among youth growing up in families with a history of intensive income-support receipt. More than half (52 per cent) of young people in income-support families also report receiving another certificate as the result of their Year 12 studies. Thus, although completing Year 12 is less likely for these individuals (see Table 4.2) when they do, they are somewhat more likely to receive a qualification. At the same time, they are less likely to have received a university entrance score – 64 per cent for those in income-support families vs. 89 per cent for those in non-income-support families – and receive a lower score when they do. These patterns are consistent with the evidence in Table 4.1 that the type of qualification sought varies substantially across socio-economic background.

We turn now to consider the educational attainment at wave 2 for those young people who at wave 1 were already engaged in post-secondary education (1,149 individuals). These results are presented in Table 4.4. Overall, at wave 2 slightly more than half of young people (51.6 per cent) were continuing to study for the qualification they had begun at wave 1, while almost one-third (30.2 per cent) had completed that qualification. About one in ten (11.6 per cent) had stopped studying for that qualification for various reasons (often because they had lost interest in that qualification or wanted to study something else). Young people in non-income-support families (category A) are somewhat more likely to be continuing to study for the qualification they had begun at wave 1 (57.4 vs. 45.2 per cent) suggesting that on average they had enrolled in longer courses.

The vast majority of youth who were studying at the time of wave 2 interview report studying full-time (81.2 per cent). Studying full-time is somewhat more common among those in non-income-support families (category A) than among youth growing up in families with a history of intensive income-support receipt (category B).

Table 4.5 presents educational outcomes for the vast majority of our sample (2,263 individuals) who at wave 2 were not still in secondary school or who had not deferred their studies. Of these, 22 per cent report having at some point since secondary school ever enrolled in a course of study that they did not complete. Beginning – but not completing – a course of study is somewhat more common among young women than young men and among youth in income-support rather than non-income-support families. In total, there are 559 young people in wave 2 who had either deferred or not completed a study course that they had begun. Just over one quarter report intending to resume their planned course of study at some point. Interestingly, the intention to resume studying is higher among youth in income-support families.

Table 4.6 presents information about the future study plans of the 20-year-olds captured in wave 2 of the YIF survey. Of the total sample of 2,358 there are 1,409 respondents who are currently studying (see Table 4.1) and 949 respondents who are not. Almost two-thirds of those young people not currently studying report intending to study in the future. Consistent with our results above, young people growing up in families with a history of intensive income-support receipt (category B) are more likely (65.1 vs. 60.0 per cent) to report intending to study in the future. Finally, students at wave 2 were asked about the highest qualification they planned to obtain. These results indicate substantial differences in the educational aspirations of young people growing up in different family circumstances. Just

over half (53.3 per cent) of youth in income-support families intend to obtain either an undergraduate degree or a post-graduate qualification. In contrast, 70.8 per cent of youth in non-income-support families (category A) intend to receive these qualifications.

Summary:

Taken together, these results point to several important conclusions. First, given the large numbers of 20-year-olds either still studying or intending to study in the future, it is still too early to assess the completed educational attainment of the young people in the YIF sample. Second, it appears that young adults in income-support families will be more likely to obtain TAFE or trade qualifications while those in non-income-support families will be more likely to obtain university qualifications. Third, although young people growing up in families with a history of intensive income-support receipt are less likely to be currently studying, they are more likely to say that they intend to study in the future. This suggests that perhaps socio-economic disadvantage is associated with a delay in enrolment in training or study courses.

Table 4.1
Educational Outcomes of Youth

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Total respondents	691	756	306	256	219	130	1,069	1,289	2,358
Highest qualification obtained by wave 2:									
Post-school qualification:									
Year 10 or lower at TAFE	0.00	0.13	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.08	0.04
Year 11 or lower at TAFE	0.00	0.13	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.08	0.04
Year 12 or lower at TAFE	0.29	0.53	0.00	0.00	0.91	1.54	0.28	0.54	0.42
Traineeship	1.59	2.38	0.98	1.56	2.74	0.77	1.50	2.09	1.82
Trade certificate or apprenticeship	2.60	3.04	1.96	3.52	1.83	2.31	5.14	0.62	2.67
Technician's certificate / advanced certificate	0.00	0.00	0.33	0.39	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.16	0.08
TAFE certificate, level I	0.43	1.06	1.63	1.17	1.37	1.54	1.03	1.01	1.02
TAFE certificate, level II	1.74	6.22	3.27	3.13	6.39	5.38	4.02	4.27	4.16
TAFE certificate, level III	7.24	9.13	8.82	8.20	6.85	13.08	6.83	9.78	8.44
TAFE certificate, level IV	4.92	3.17	4.90	4.69	7.31	3.85	3.37	5.43	4.50
TAFE certificate, level unknown	0.72	1.59	0.65	0.78	0.91	0.00	1.22	0.78	0.98
TAFE diploma	4.05	3.97	2.61	5.47	3.20	3.85	3.27	4.42	3.90
TAFE advanced diploma	1.16	0.93	0.65	1.95	0.46	1.54	1.12	1.01	1.06
Associate diploma/ diploma	0.58	0.66	0.33	0.78	0.91	0.00	0.47	0.70	0.59
Associate degree	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.46	0.00	0.00	0.08	0.04
Undergraduate diploma	0.58	0.40	0.98	0.78	0.91	0.00	0.37	0.78	0.59
Undergraduate degree/ University bachelor or Honours degree	4.78	2.25	3.59	2.34	2.28	7.69	2.99	3.88	3.48
Graduate certificate	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.39	0.00	0.00	0.09	0.00	0.04
Short course	1.30	2.25	1.31	0.78	0.91	1.54	1.78	1.32	1.53
Hospitality qualification	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.39	0.46	0.00	0.00	0.16	0.08
Hairdressing/ beautician qualification	0.14	0.00	0.00	0.39	0.00	0.77	0.00	0.23	0.13
Retail qualification	0.14	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.08	0.04
Real estate qualification	0.14	0.13	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.09	0.08	0.08
Something else	0.72	1.59	1.96	0.78	0.91	2.31	1.68	0.93	1.27
Total with a post-school qualification	33.12	39.56	33.97	37.49	38.81	46.17	35.25	38.51	37.00
Secondary school qualification only:									
Year 9 or lower	0.29	1.85	0.33	1.17	0.91	2.31	1.50	0.70	1.06
Year 10	0.58	4.50	2.61	1.56	4.57	0.77	3.18	2.09	2.59
Year 11	2.32	4.89	4.25	2.34	4.11	6.15	5.14	2.64	3.77
Year 12 (not completed)	1.59	2.25	0.98	0.78	2.28	1.54	2.06	1.40	1.70
Year 12 (completed)	61.94	45.63	57.19	56.25	47.95	43.08	52.29	53.84	53.14
Year 13	0.00	0.26	0.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.19	0.08	0.13
Total with secondary school qualification only	66.72	59.38	65.69	62.10	59.82	53.85	64.36	60.75	62.39

Table 4.1.
Educational Outcomes of Youth (continued)

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Total respondents	691	756	306	256	219	130	1,069	1,289	2,358
Highest qualification obtained by wave 2 (continued):									
Still in school	0.00	0.66	0.33	0.39	0.46	0.00	0.19	0.47	0.34
Can't say	0.14	0.26	0.00	0.00	0.46	0.00	0.09	0.23	0.17
Refused	0.00	0.13	0.00	0.00	0.46	0.00	0.09	0.08	0.08
Student status at the time of wave 2 interview:									
Not studying	30.91	45.97	39.09	42.19	43.84	49.23	42.08	38.63	40.25
Studying in school or towards post-school qualification	69.09	54.03	60.91	57.81	56.16	50.77	57.92	61.37	59.75
Total students	476	409	187	148	123	66	618	791	1,409
Qualification studying towards at the time of wave 2 interview:									
Year 9 or lower at TAFE	0.21	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.13	0.07
Traineeship	2.10	2.44	2.14	4.73	1.63	1.52	3.24	1.77	2.41
Trade certificate or apprenticeship	9.03	10.27	13.37	13.51	13.82	9.09	22.33	1.90	10.86
Technician's certificate	0.00	0.24	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.16	0.00	0.07
TAFE certificate, level I	0.21	0.24	0.53	0.00	0.00	1.52	0.16	0.38	0.28
TAFE certificate, level II	0.84	2.20	1.60	0.00	1.63	1.52	0.97	1.64	1.35
TAFE certificate, level III	3.57	11.49	6.95	6.76	6.50	7.58	6.80	7.33	7.10
TAFE certificate, level IV	2.52	4.16	3.21	1.35	1.63	4.55	2.59	3.29	2.98
TAFE certificate, level unknown	0.63	1.22	1.60	0.68	1.63	0.00	1.29	0.76	0.99
TAFE diploma	3.15	3.18	5.88	3.38	4.88	0.00	2.91	4.05	3.55
TAFE advanced diploma	0.63	3.18	1.60	2.70	1.63	3.03	2.10	1.77	1.92
Associate diploma/diploma	1.05	0.49	0.00	1.35	1.63	1.52	0.97	0.76	0.85
Associate degree	0.63	0.49	0.53	0.00	2.44	1.52	0.65	0.76	0.71
Undergraduate diploma	2.94	2.69	2.14	2.03	2.44	3.03	2.43	2.78	2.63
Undergraduate degree/University bachelor or Honours degree	68.91	55.01	57.75	60.14	58.54	62.12	51.29	69.03	61.25
Graduate certificate	0.63	0.00	0.53	1.35	0.81	0.00	0.49	0.51	0.50
Post-graduate qualification	0.84	0.24	1.07	0.68	0.00	1.52	0.32	0.88	0.64
Short course	0.63	0.49	0.53	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.32	0.51	0.43
Total studying for post-school qualification	100.00	98.54	99.47	98.64	99.19	100.00	99.68	98.99	99.29
Still in school	0.00	1.22	0.53	0.68	0.81	0.00	0.32	0.76	0.57
Can't say	0.00	0.24	0.00	0.68	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.25	0.14

Table 4.2
Secondary School Education

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Total respondents still in school at the time of wave 1 interview	63	65	32	28	21	14	105	118	223
Number of schools youth attended:									
Two or less	41.27	36.93	31.25	42.85	33.33	21.43	33.33	39.83	36.77
Three	38.10	30.77	37.50	25.00	28.57	35.71	40.00	27.12	33.18
Four or more	20.63	30.77	31.26	32.14	38.09	42.85	26.66	32.20	29.61
Can't say	0.00	1.54	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.85	0.45
Is youth still going to secondary school or has left school?									
still going to school	0.00	1.54	3.13	0.00	4.76	0.00	0.95	1.69	1.35
left school	100.00	98.46	96.88	100.00	95.24	100.00	99.05	98.31	98.65
Total respondents who left school at wave 1 before completing Year 12	72	207	55	39	47	26	249	197	446
After leaving school, has youth ever gone back to school?									
not gone back to school	95.83	96.14	98.18	87.18	97.87	96.15	97.19	93.91	95.74
returned to school and still in school	0.00	1.93	0.00	2.56	0.00	0.00	0.40	2.03	1.12
returned to school but now left	4.17	1.93	1.82	10.26	2.13	3.85	2.41	4.06	3.14

Table 4.2
Secondary School Education (continued)

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Total respondents who left school between wave 1 and wave 2 interviews	66	68	32	32	21	15	110	124	234
When did youth leave school?									
2006	86.36	72.06	78.13	75.00	80.95	93.33	76.36	82.26	79.49
2007	7.58	20.59	15.63	12.50	9.52	0.00	14.55	11.29	12.82
2008	1.52	1.47	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.91	0.81	0.85
Other	4.55	5.88	6.25	12.52	9.52	6.67	8.18	5.65	6.85
Type of last school attended:									
government	60.61	73.53	75.00	59.38	80.95	46.67	69.09	65.32	67.09
catholic	22.73	14.71	6.25	25.00	9.52	13.33	15.45	17.74	16.67
other non- government	15.15	10.29	9.38	12.50	9.52	40.00	13.64	13.71	13.68
can't say	1.52	1.47	9.38	3.13	0.00	0.00	1.82	3.23	2.56
Did youth ever repeat a year at school?									
yes	24.24	54.41	28.13	43.75	52.38	26.67	38.18	39.52	38.89
no	75.76	45.59	71.88	56.25	47.62	73.33	61.82	60.48	61.11
Year left school:									
year 9 or lower	0.00	1.47	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.67	0.91	0.81	0.85
year 10	0.00	7.35	3.13	3.13	0.00	0.00	1.82	4.03	2.99
year 11	3.03	2.94	3.13	3.13	0.00	0.00	1.82	3.23	2.56
year 12 (did not complete the year)	3.03	2.94	3.13	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.91	3.23	2.14
year 12 (completed the year)	93.94	83.82	84.38	93.75	95.24	93.33	91.82	87.90	89.74
year 13	0.00	1.47	6.25	0.00	4.76	0.00	2.73	0.81	1.71
Total left school between wave 1 and wave 2 interviews before completing Year 12	4	10	3	2	0	1	6	14	20
Did youth receive any certificate as a result of school studies?									
yes	75.00	60.00	33.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	33.33	57.14	50.00
no	25.00	40.00	66.67	100.00	0.00	100.00	66.67	42.86	50.00

Table 4.2
Secondary School Education (continued)

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Total respondents left school between wave 1 and wave 2 interviews	66	68	32	32	21	15	110	124	234
How good was youth at English in the final year of school?									
well above average	9.09	16.18	0.00	21.88	28.57	0.00	10.00	15.32	12.82
above average	42.42	27.94	37.50	31.25	33.33	60.00	36.36	36.29	36.32
average	42.42	41.18	53.13	46.88	38.10	26.67	43.64	41.94	42.74
below average	3.03	7.35	6.25	0.00	0.00	13.33	7.27	2.42	4.70
well below average	3.03	2.94	3.13	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.82	2.42	2.14
can't say	0.00	4.41	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.91	1.61	1.28
How good was youth at maths in the final year of school?									
well above average	15.15	10.29	3.13	6.25	9.52	26.67	15.45	7.26	11.11
above average	36.36	23.53	15.63	21.88	19.05	6.67	26.36	22.58	24.36
average	27.27	38.24	56.25	43.75	33.33	40.00	40.00	36.29	38.03
below average	9.09	11.76	12.50	15.63	9.52	20.00	9.09	14.52	11.97
well below average	3.03	4.41	3.13	0.00	4.76	0.00	0.91	4.84	2.99
did not study mathematics	9.09	11.76	9.38	12.50	23.81	6.67	8.18	14.52	11.54
How well did youth study overall in the final year of school?									
well above average	9.09	8.82	6.25	9.38	19.05	6.67	9.09	9.68	9.40
above average	42.42	32.35	34.38	34.38	23.81	46.67	34.55	37.10	35.90
average	46.97	50.00	50.00	50.00	57.14	46.67	49.09	50.00	49.57
below average	1.52	7.35	9.38	6.25	0.00	0.00	7.27	2.42	4.70
well below average	0.00	1.47	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.81	0.43
Per cent of youth ever suspended from school	6.06	29.41	15.63	18.75	23.81	20.00	29.09	8.87	18.38
Per cent of youth ever expelled from school	1.52	1.47	0.00	0.00	9.52	0.00	3.64	0.00	1.71
Per cent of youth ever skipped school	42.42	52.94	53.13	43.75	61.90	40.00	52.73	45.16	48.72

Table 4.2
Secondary School Education (continued)

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Total respondents who skipped school	28	36	17	14	13	6	58	56	114
How often did youth skip school?									
more than 3 days a week	0.00	2.78	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.79	0.88
2-3 days a week	7.14	13.89	5.88	14.29	0.00	16.67	8.62	10.71	9.65
1 day a week	3.57	11.11	5.88	14.29	7.69	0.00	5.17	10.71	7.89
2-3 days a month	25.00	25.00	47.06	7.14	15.38	0.00	22.41	25.00	23.68
1 day a month	14.29	19.44	11.76	42.86	38.46	33.33	25.86	19.64	22.81
1 day a term	28.57	13.89	11.76	7.14	30.77	16.67	24.14	12.50	18.42
less than one day a term	17.86	13.89	17.65	14.29	7.69	33.33	12.07	19.64	15.79
can't say	3.57	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.72	0.00	0.88

Table 4.3
Secondary School Education of Youth who Left School between Waves 1 and 2
after Completing Year 12

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Total respondents who left school between wave 1 and wave 2 after completing Year 12	62	58	29	30	21	14	104	110	214
State or territory the youth last went to school in:									
Australian Capital Territory	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.67	9.52	0.00	0.96	2.73	1.87
New South Wales	16.13	34.48	20.69	23.33	33.33	7.14	25.96	21.82	23.83
Victoria	51.61	36.21	51.72	43.33	33.33	50.00	43.27	45.45	44.39
Queensland	3.23	8.62	0.00	13.33	4.76	0.00	4.81	6.36	5.61
South Australia	9.68	6.90	6.90	6.67	4.76	14.29	7.69	8.18	7.94
Western Australia	8.06	1.72	6.90	0.00	4.76	7.14	5.77	3.64	4.67
Tasmania	11.29	12.07	10.34	6.67	9.52	21.43	10.58	11.82	11.21
Northern Territory	0.00	0.00	3.45	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.96	0.00	0.47
Did youth study for International Baccalaureate in their last year of school?									
yes	3.23	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	7.14	1.92	0.91	1.40
no	93.55	100.00	96.55	100.00	95.24	92.86	96.15	97.27	96.73
can't say	3.23	0.00	3.45	0.00	4.76	0.00	1.92	1.82	1.87
Total respondents who studied for IB	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	3
Did youth obtain IB?									
Yes	100.00	-	-	-	-	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Total respondents who left school between wave 1 and wave 2 after completing Year 12 and did not obtain IB									
IB	60	58	29	30	21	13	102	109	211
Has youth been awarded the Year 12 certificate?									
yes	88.33	91.38	96.55	93.33	80.95	84.62	89.22	90.83	90.05
no	8.33	8.62	3.45	6.67	19.05	15.38	9.80	8.26	9.00
can't say	3.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.98	0.92	0.95

Table 4.3
Secondary School Education of Youth who Left School between Waves 1 and 2
after Completing Year 12 (continued)

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Total respondents who left school between wave 1 and wave 2 after completing Year 12	62	58	29	30	21	14	104	110	214
Was youth awarded any other certificate as a result of Year 12 studies?									
yes	29.03	51.72	37.93	23.33	28.57	42.86	33.65	39.09	36.45
no	70.97	48.28	62.07	73.33	52.38	42.86	64.42	56.36	60.28
can't say	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.33	19.05	14.29	1.92	4.55	3.27
Total respondents who received additional certificate:	18	30	11	7	6	6	35	43	78
Type of certificate received by youth:									
TAFE certificate	5.56	23.33	27.27	14.29	0.00	16.67	20.00	13.95	16.67
Secondary college record	0.00	3.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.33	1.28
Certificate of completion awarded by the school	0.00	3.33	0.00	14.29	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.65	2.56
Certificate in vocational (vet) studies	33.33	16.67	18.18	14.29	33.33	50.00	28.57	20.93	24.36
Statement of attainment of vet subjects completed	5.56	3.33	0.00	14.29	0.00	0.00	5.71	2.33	3.85
Academic achievement award	27.78	43.33	54.55	42.86	33.33	0.00	37.14	37.21	37.18
Dux of class/year/school	5.56	3.33	0.00	0.00	16.67	16.67	5.71	4.65	5.13
In-school encouragement/achievement award (non-academic)	5.56	0.00	0.00	0.00	16.67	0.00	2.86	2.33	2.56
Extra-curricular award	0.00	3.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.86	0.00	1.28
VCAL certificate	5.56	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	16.67	0.00	4.65	2.56
Other	11.11	10.00	9.09	14.29	33.33	0.00	8.57	13.95	11.54
Can't say	11.11	3.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.86	4.65	3.85

Table 4.3
Secondary School Education of Youth who Left School between Waves 1 and 2
after Completing Year 12 (continued)

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Total respondents who were awarded IB/ Year 12 certificate									
12 certificate	55	53	28	28	17	12	93	100	193
Did youth obtain a university admission/ entrance score?									
yes	89.09	64.15	82.14	71.43	82.35	83.33	78.49	77.00	77.72
no	10.91	35.85	14.29	28.57	17.65	16.67	20.43	23.00	21.76
can't say	0.00	0.00	3.57	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.08	0.00	0.52
Youth who obtained university admission score									
	49	34	23	20	14	10	73	77	150
Youth's university admission score:									
94+	14.29	8.82	0.00	5.00	14.29	10.00	10.96	7.79	9.33
70 - 93.99	38.78	55.88	26.09	50.00	14.29	40.00	34.25	45.45	40.00
40 - 69.99	30.61	11.76	39.13	35.00	42.86	10.00	32.88	23.38	28.00
39.99 or lower	6.12	5.88	17.39	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.48	6.49	6.00
Can't say/refuse	10.20	17.65	17.39	10.00	28.57	40.00	16.44	16.88	16.67

Table 4.4
Post School Studies of All School Leavers

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Total respondents engaged in post-school education at wave 1	483	394	185	142	133	82	643	774	1,419
Has youth completed the qualification they were studying towards at wave 1?									
studying towards the same qualification	57.35	45.18	57.84	47.18	49.62	45.12	51.32	51.94	51.59
obtained that qualification	25.47	33.76	28.11	36.62	32.33	31.71	28.93	31.40	30.23
deferred that qualification	5.18	4.82	5.41	4.23	2.26	9.76	5.91	4.26	5.00
stopped studying for that qualification	10.35	13.96	7.57	10.56	15.04	13.41	12.44	10.98	11.63
did not study towards that qualification	1.04	2.28	0.54	0.70	0.75	0.00	1.09	1.29	1.20
refused/ can't say	0.62	0.00	0.54	0.70	0.00	0.00	0.31	0.13	0.35
Total respondents who deferred or stopped studying for wave 1 qualification	75	74	24	21	23	19	118	118	236
Reasons for stopping or deferring the qualification:									
Not interested/ enjoying the course anymore/ not what youth thought it would be	20.00	13.51	25.00	14.29	30.43	10.53	16.95	19.49	18.22
Change of interest/wanted to study something else/ transferred to a different degree	21.33	14.86	16.67	4.76	8.70	0.00	9.32	19.49	14.41
Course was never something youth wanted to do/ parents wanted youth to do it	1.33	0.00	0.00	4.76	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.69	0.85
Did not like the industry/ career path	5.33	1.35	8.33	4.76	0.00	0.00	2.54	4.24	3.39
Did not want to/was not ready to study	1.33	1.35	0.00	0.00	4.35	0.00	0.00	2.54	1.27
Employment/ job offer/ wanted or needed to earn/save money	13.33	16.22	16.67	19.05	8.70	15.79	17.80	11.86	14.83

Table 4.4
Post School Studies of All School Leavers (continued)

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Total respondents who deferred or stopped studying for wave 1 qualification	75	74	24	21	23	19	118	118	236
Reasons for stopping or deferring the qualification: (continued)									
To take a break	4.00	1.35	4.17	4.76	0.00	15.79	4.24	3.39	3.81
To go travelling	8.00	0.00	0.00	4.76	0.00	5.26	3.39	3.39	3.39
Health reasons/ illness or injury	0.00	2.70	0.00	4.76	4.35	5.26	2.54	1.69	2.12
Had to look after (sick) parent or grandparent	0.00	2.70	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.85	0.85	0.85
Had to look after a child/ was having a baby	0.00	2.70	4.17	4.76	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.39	1.69
Course structure/quality/staff was unsatisfactory	5.33	1.35	0.00	0.00	4.35	0.00	2.54	2.54	2.54
Financial constraints	2.67	4.05	0.00	0.00	8.70	5.26	0.85	5.93	3.39
Difficult to travel to the institution	0.00	2.70	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.69	0.00	0.85
Not enough money in the industry	2.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.26	1.69	0.85	1.27
Did not get on with employer/ colleagues	0.00	1.35	0.00	0.00	4.35	0.00	1.69	0.00	0.85
Other reason	28.00	40.54	25.00	47.62	34.78	42.11	40.68	29.66	35.17
Total respondents who obtained their wave 1 qualification	123	133	52	52	43	26	186	243	429
Was this qualification the highest youth obtained since leaving secondary school?									
yes	90.24	87.97	86.54	86.54	90.70	76.92	89.25	86.83	87.88
no	9.76	12.03	13.46	13.46	9.30	23.08	10.75	13.17	12.12

Table 4.4
Post School Studies of All School Leavers (continued)

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Total respondents not in school and not studying towards wave 1 qualification	414	573	198	188	152	93	737	881	1,618
Is youth currently doing traineeship or apprenticeship or studying towards a qualification?									
yes	48.07	39.44	39.90	42.55	36.84	31.18	38.81	43.47	41.35
no	51.21	58.99	59.60	55.32	62.50	67.74	59.57	55.73	57.48
no, deferred	0.72	1.57	0.51	2.13	0.66	1.08	1.63	0.79	1.17
Total respondents currently studying towards a post-school qualification (including wave 1 qualification)	476	404	186	147	122	66	616	785	1,401
Is youth studying full-time or part-time?									
full-time	82.77	78.71	81.72	87.07	76.23	78.79	78.73	83.06	81.16
part-time	17.23	21.29	18.28	12.93	23.77	21.21	21.27	16.94	18.84

Table 4.5
Deferral and Non-Completion of Study

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Total respondents not in school and not deferred	663	725	294	246	214	121	1,019	1,244	2,263
Since secondary education, has youth ever enrolled in study they did not complete?									
yes	20.81	23.72	21.09	23.98	20.56	18.18	21.88	22.03	21.96
no	79.03	75.86	78.91	76.02	79.44	80.99	77.92	77.73	77.82
can't say	0.15	0.41	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.83	0.20	0.24	0.22
Total not completed or deferred	162	187	67	67	46	30	267	292	559
Does youth intend to resume the deferred course of study?									
yes	23.46	33.16	29.85	20.90	19.57	23.33	30.34	23.63	26.83
no	69.75	59.36	62.69	71.64	73.91	66.67	62.17	69.18	65.83
can't say	6.79	7.49	7.46	7.46	6.52	10.00	7.49	7.19	7.33

Table 4.6
Future Study Expectations

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Total not currently studying	215	347	119	108	96	64	451	498	949
Does youth intend to begin studying for another qualification in the future?									
yes	60.00	65.13	67.23	56.48	65.63	62.50	61.64	64.46	63.12
no	27.44	22.48	20.17	31.48	22.92	31.25	26.83	23.29	24.97
can't say	12.56	12.39	12.61	12.04	11.46	6.25	11.53	12.25	11.91
Total studying or intending to study in the future	614	634	269	211	185	109	906	1,116	2,022
The highest level of education youth is planning to obtain:									
year 10	0.00	0.95	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.92	0.55	0.18	0.35
year 11	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.47	0.00	0.00	0.11	0.00	0.05
year 12	0.16	1.10	0.00	0.47	1.62	0.92	0.55	0.72	0.64
traineeship	0.16	0.47	0.00	0.95	0.54	0.92	0.55	0.27	0.40
trade certificate or	4.72	6.62	5.20	8.53	5.41	6.42	12.14	0.90	5.93
technicians certificate	0.00	0.16	1.12	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.33	0.09	0.20
TAFE certificate, level I	0.00	0.16	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.11	0.00	0.05
TAFE certificate, level II	0.16	0.32	0.00	0.47	0.00	0.00	0.22	0.18	0.20
TAFE certificate, level III	1.63	3.31	4.09	2.84	2.16	1.83	3.09	2.33	2.67
TAFE certificate, level IV	1.63	3.47	2.60	2.37	3.78	1.83	3.09	2.24	2.62
TAFE certificate, level unknown	1.63	1.74	1.86	3.32	0.54	4.59	1.99	1.88	1.93
TAFE diploma	3.26	6.31	4.83	4.74	7.03	9.17	5.08	5.38	5.24
TAFE advanced diploma	1.95	2.05	2.97	4.27	3.24	4.59	2.87	2.42	2.62
associate diploma/ diploma	0.65	1.26	1.12	0.95	1.08	1.83	0.66	1.34	1.04
associate degree	0.33	0.16	0.37	0.47	0.54	0.00	0.55	0.09	0.30
undergraduate diploma	1.47	1.89	1.86	1.90	1.08	0.92	1.21	1.97	1.63
undergraduate degree/bachelor or honours degree	47.72	38.17	46.10	42.18	32.97	42.20	36.87	46.68	42.28
graduate certificate	0.98	0.32	0.00	0.00	0.54	0.00	0.33	0.54	0.45
post-graduate qualification	23.13	15.14	16.73	16.11	22.16	11.93	14.79	21.24	18.35
short course	0.00	0.16	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.09	0.05
something else	0.81	1.74	1.12	0.47	1.62	2.75	1.88	0.81	1.29
can't say	9.61	14.51	10.04	9.48	15.68	9.17	13.02	10.66	11.72

Section 5:

YOUTH'S EMPLOYMENT, EARNINGS AND JOB SEARCH

Overview of Findings:

The Youth in Focus survey tracks young people's transition into the labour force by collecting information on their current employment status, job characteristics, hours of work and earnings, as well as any job search activities of those currently not employed. This section summarizes the employment indicators for two groups of respondents: (i) the young people currently employed, and (ii) those who were employed in the past but are currently not working. The discussion of these indicators is followed by the data depicting job search or other activities for those who currently do not have a job.

In summarizing such things as total hours worked by a young person, as well as their before- and after-tax earnings, we endeavoured to keep as much as possible to the format of the wave 1 report to be able to draw comparisons on these indicators for wave 1 and wave 2 respondents.

Almost 80 per cent of all youth surveyed were employed at the time of wave 2 interview, compared to overall 72 per cent employed at wave 1. The proportion of employed is much lower for the young people who grew up in families heavily dependent on income support (category B) or in families with moderate non-recent income-support history (category F) than in all other categories – 73 vs. 80 to 85 per cent. Category B also has the highest proportion of young adults who were never employed, while categories A (no parental income-support history) and D (minor non-recent income-support exposure) have the lowest. There do not appear to be any gender differences in employment status.

There are persisting disparities in the number of jobs held by those currently employed between category A and B and male and female respondents. Young people with prolonged income-support exposure (category B) and young men are more likely to have more than one job. There is 7 percentage points difference between categories A and B, and 6 percentage points difference between males and females in wave 2, both of which were about the same for wave 1 respondents.

Wave 1 data analysis has shown that young people who grew up in families with no income-support history (category A) were more likely to work fewer hours and earn less than the young people who had prolonged exposure to income support (category B), although this was most likely due to the higher proportion of students in category A who held part-time or casual jobs. This remains the case in wave 2. While 44 per cent of respondents in category A report working less than 20 hours per week, the same is true for only 35 per cent of category B respondents. On the other hand, the proportions of those working 30 hours a week or more are 43 for category A and 51 for category B. Females are also much more likely to work part-time (45 per cent of females vs. 28 per cent of males work less than 20 hours a week).

The difference in the hours of work between stratification categories is reflected in the before-tax earnings of respondents, since the occupations the young people have do not differ significantly based on the family history of income-support exposure. Consequently, the respondents in categories B-F (any parental history of income support) are more likely to receive weekly before-tax earnings of \$551 or more, compared to the "no parental history of income support" group (category A). Males also tend to earn much more than female respondents (more than half of young men in the YIF wave 2 sample earned more than \$551 a week, compared to only one third of young women). However, the gender pay difference also may be due to the types of occupations of the young people: while females are much more likely to hold clerical, sales or services positions (66 per cent vs. 35 per cent for males), the male respondents are more likely to work as tradespeople (26 vs. 3 per cent) or labourers (9 vs. 4 per cent).

About 30 per cent of all respondents who have ever worked look upon their current or most recent job as the one they would like to have as a career. This figure is slightly lower (28 per cent) for the youth whose families had never received income support. There is, however, a significant gender difference for this question (only a quarter of all female respondents view that job as the one they would like to have as a career, compared to almost 40 per cent of male respondents).

A half of all wave 2 respondents who were not employed at the time of the interview were looking for work. The proportion of young people who were not trying to find a job was the highest (around 57 per cent) for the respondents in categories A (no income-support exposure) and C (recent moderate income-support exposure), and the lowest for categories D (short non-recent exposure) and E (early exposure). There is also about 6 percentage points difference in the proportion of people looking for work between genders.

At wave 1, there were very significant differences in the types of jobs the respondents were looking for between the stratification categories, in particular between categories A and B. While 71 per cent of category A respondents were looking specifically for a part-time job at wave 1, only 41 per cent of category B respondents were doing the same; the rest were looking for full-time or any job. At wave 2, the differences have diminished: only half of category A respondents are now looking for a part-time job, compared to 46 per cent of category B respondents.

The methods employed by the young people looking for work at wave 2 also differ across stratification categories and between male and female respondents. Respondents in categories A and D (no or short non-recent income-support exposure) were much less likely to have checked factory noticeboards, used touchscreens at Centrelink Access or registered with Centrelink as a job seeker. Young people in category B (heavy exposure to income support) are also more likely than any other category to register with an employment agency when looking for work. On the other hand, young people from categories A (no family income-support history), D and F (non-recent income-support receipt) and young women were more likely to contact friends or relatives in search of work.

Those respondents who at the time of wave 2 interview were neither in full-time education, working nor looking for work, were also asked about their main current activity. The number of such individuals is very small, therefore it is not possible to make conclusive comparisons between stratification categories. It does appear, however, that the most prevalent activity of these young people was looking after children (this is especially true for female respondents and somewhat true for respondents in category B).

Table 5.1
Employment Status

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Total respondents	691	756	306	256	219	130	1,069	1,289	2,358
Employment status:									
currently working	84.52	73.15	81.05	85.55	84.02	73.85	80.92	79.05	79.90
previously working	12.45	19.44	12.09	11.72	10.05	21.54	14.50	15.13	14.84
never worked	3.04	7.41	6.86	2.73	5.94	4.62	4.58	5.82	5.26

Table 5.2
Employment Outcomes of Youth Currently Employed

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Total currently employed	584	553	248	219	184	96	865	1,019	1,884
Number of jobs:									
Only 1 job	81.68	88.43	85.08	81.28	82.61	83.33	87.86	81.16	84.24
More than 1 job	18.32	11.57	14.92	18.72	17.39	16.67	12.14	18.84	15.76
Total hours worked in all jobs:									
20 hrs or less	44.18	35.08	39.11	33.33	33.15	29.17	28.21	45.83	37.74
>20 to 30 hrs	12.50	12.66	11.69	13.24	16.30	14.58	10.52	15.11	13.00
>30 to 40 hrs	27.91	34.18	28.23	34.25	25.54	31.25	33.18	28.16	30.47
>40 hrs	15.07	17.54	20.97	19.18	23.91	23.96	27.86	10.30	18.37
Can't say/refused	0.34	0.54	0.00	0.00	1.09	1.04	0.23	0.59	0.42
Before tax weekly earnings from all jobs:									
\$150 or less	10.62	7.96	9.68	10.50	9.78	7.29	7.51	11.09	9.45
\$151 to \$250	15.58	11.75	13.71	9.13	11.96	8.33	7.86	16.88	12.74
\$251 to 350	15.58	10.67	12.10	12.33	11.96	11.46	9.83	15.21	12.74
\$351 to 550	20.21	24.23	18.55	22.83	21.74	14.58	20.46	22.08	21.34
\$551 or more	36.82	43.22	43.55	43.38	42.39	54.17	51.91	33.17	41.77
Incomparable payment	0.17	0.54	0.81	0.00	0.54	0.00	0.69	0.10	0.37
Can't say/refused	1.03	1.63	1.61	1.83	1.63	4.17	1.73	1.47	1.59
Type of (main) current job:									
wages/ salary	97.77	97.11	93.55	95.89	94.57	95.83	95.26	97.35	96.39
self-employed	1.88	1.63	4.03	3.65	3.26	2.08	3.12	1.86	2.44
other way	0.34	1.08	2.42	0.46	2.17	2.08	1.50	0.79	1.11
can't say	0.00	0.18	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.12	0.00	0.05

Table 5.2
Employment Outcomes of Youth Currently Employed (continued)

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Total respondents working for salary or other way:	573	543	238	211	178	94	837	1,000	1,837
Contract arrangements for the (main) current job:									
employed on a fixed-term basis	10.12	9.21	10.08	7.58	7.87	10.64	11.59	7.50	9.36
employed on a casual basis	52.36	44.01	43.70	44.08	43.26	41.49	39.31	52.30	46.38
employed on a permanent basis	36.47	45.67	44.12	47.39	47.19	45.74	47.43	39.20	42.95
works unpaid in family business	0.00	0.55	0.84	0.00	0.00	1.06	0.36	0.30	0.33
other	0.52	0.00	1.26	0.00	0.56	0.00	0.60	0.20	0.38
Total currently employed	584	553	248	219	184	96	865	1,019	1,884
Occupation:									
Manager	1.54	1.45	1.61	1.83	1.63	2.08	2.08	1.18	1.59
Professional Associate	9.59	6.15	11.69	4.57	5.98	7.29	6.71	8.73	7.80
professional	7.36	7.41	8.06	6.39	5.98	7.29	7.86	6.67	7.22
Tradesperson	11.47	14.29	15.32	16.89	11.96	17.71	26.71	2.85	13.80
Clerical, sales or services worker	53.25	52.62	45.16	53.42	52.72	52.08	35.26	66.05	51.91
Labourer	6.51	7.78	6.45	3.65	8.70	6.25	9.13	4.71	6.74
Other/can't say	10.27	10.31	11.69	13.24	13.04	7.29	12.25	9.81	10.93
Duration of the current job:									
Less than 6 months	19.18	28.03	21.77	18.72	19.57	25.00	22.77	22.08	22.40
6 months to less than 1 year	19.69	18.99	17.74	21.00	20.11	19.79	16.76	21.69	19.43
1 year to less than 2 years	24.66	20.25	22.18	21.46	23.91	17.71	20.35	23.85	22.24
2 years to less than 3 years	15.75	15.19	18.15	15.53	20.11	18.75	18.50	14.72	16.45
3 years or more	20.55	17.00	20.16	23.29	16.30	18.75	21.50	17.37	19.27
Can't say/refused	0.17	0.54	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.12	0.29	0.21

Table 5.3
Employment Outcomes of Youth Previously Employed

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Total previously employed:	86	147	37	30	22	28	155	195	350
Number of jobs:									
only 1 job	96.51	93.88	97.30	90.00	95.45	100.00	97.42	93.33	95.14
more than 1 job	3.49	6.12	2.70	10.00	4.55	0.00	2.58	6.67	4.86
Type of (main) current job:									
wages/ salary	96.51	93.20	91.89	100.00	95.45	89.29	94.84	93.85	94.29
self-employed	2.33	2.72	0.00	0.00	4.55	0.00	3.23	1.03	2.00
other way	1.16	2.72	5.41	0.00	0.00	7.14	1.94	3.08	2.57
can't say	0.00	1.36	2.70	0.00	0.00	3.57	0.00	2.05	1.14
Total working for salary or other way	84	141	36	30	21	27	150	189	339
Contract arrangements for the (main) past job:									
employed on a fixed-term basis	9.52	3.55	0.00	13.33	14.29	7.41	8.67	4.76	6.49
employed on a casual basis	67.86	71.63	80.56	70.00	85.71	70.37	70.00	74.07	72.27
employed on a permanent basis	21.43	20.57	16.67	13.33	0.00	18.52	18.00	18.52	18.29
works unpaid in family business	1.19	0.71	2.78	0.00	0.00	3.70	2.00	0.53	1.18
other	0.00	0.71	0.00	3.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.06	0.59
can't say	0.00	2.84	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.33	1.06	1.18
Total previously employed	86	147	37	30	22	28	155	195	350
Occupation:									
Manager	2.33	0.68	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.29	0.51	0.86
Professional	12.79	6.80	2.70	3.33	4.55	7.14	9.03	6.15	7.43
Associate professional	6.98	4.08	5.41	3.33	4.55	0.00	3.87	5.13	4.57
Tradesperson	5.81	7.48	8.11	0.00	4.55	7.14	11.61	2.05	6.29
Clerical, sales or services worker	47.67	40.82	56.76	70.00	72.73	57.14	34.84	62.05	50.00
Labourer	16.28	23.13	21.62	16.67	9.09	10.71	24.52	14.36	18.86
Other/can't say	8.14	17.01	5.41	6.67	4.55	17.86	14.84	9.74	12.00

Table 5.4
Employment Outcomes of Youth Who Ever Worked

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Total ever employed	670	700	285	249	206	124	1,020	1,214	2,234
Is/was this the job youth would like as a career?									
yes	28.96	33.00	31.93	36.14	31.07	31.45	39.02	25.62	31.74
no	68.81	64.71	65.61	62.25	63.59	65.32	57.75	72.41	65.71
can't say	2.24	2.29	2.46	1.61	5.34	3.23	3.24	1.98	2.55

Table 5.5
Job Search Activities of Those Not Currently Working

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Total not currently employed	107	203	58	37	35	34	204	270	474
Has youth been looking for work at any time in the last 4 weeks?									
yes	42.99	50.25	43.10	64.86	65.71	50.00	53.43	47.41	50.00
no	57.01	49.75	56.90	35.14	34.29	50.00	46.57	52.59	50.00
Total have been looking for work	46	102	25	24	23	17	109	128	237
Has youth been looking for full-time or part-time work?									
full-time work	28.26	25.49	40.00	29.17	34.78	41.18	33.03	27.34	29.96
part-time work	50.00	46.08	40.00	50.00	30.43	52.94	41.28	49.22	45.57
any work	21.74	28.43	20.00	20.83	34.78	5.88	25.69	23.44	24.47
Methods employed to look for work:									
Written, phoned or applied in person to employer	63.04	74.51	60.00	75.00	73.91	82.35	69.72	72.66	71.31
Answered an advertisement for a job	60.87	68.63	76.00	66.67	78.26	52.94	61.47	72.66	67.51
Checked factory noticeboards, used touchscreens at Centrelink Access	8.70	39.22	32.00	4.17	30.43	29.41	21.10	32.81	27.43
Was registered with Centrelink as a job seeker	10.87	46.08	44.00	16.67	30.43	35.29	29.36	37.50	33.76
Checked or registered with an employment agency	34.78	48.04	32.00	41.67	39.13	35.29	41.28	41.41	41.35
None of the above	15.22	3.92	4.00	8.33	8.70	0.00	11.01	3.13	6.75
Other methods mentioned by respondents:									
Advertised or tendered for work	2.17	3.92	0.00	0.00	4.35	0.00	3.67	1.56	2.53
Contacted friends or relatives about a job	21.74	16.67	12.00	25.00	8.70	29.41	24.77	12.50	18.14
Looked in newspapers but did not actually answer any job advertisements	19.57	21.57	16.00	20.83	34.78	41.18	17.43	28.13	23.21
Looked on Internet but did not actually answer any job advertisements	43.48	42.16	52.00	62.50	47.83	64.71	44.95	50.00	47.68
Other	10.87	14.71	12.00	8.33	13.04	5.88	9.17	14.84	12.24
Can't say	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.35	0.00	0.00	0.78	0.42
Nothing else	32.61	29.41	36.00	25.00	26.09	17.65	30.28	28.13	29.11

Table 5.6
Main Activity of Those Not in Education or Employment

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Total not in school, studying, working or looking for work	19	46	13	3	3	8	30	62	92
Main activity of youth:									
looking after children	31.58	43.48	38.46	33.33	33.33	75.00	3.33	61.29	42.39
own illness, injury	5.26	10.87	0.00	0.00	33.33	0.00	20.00	1.61	7.61
looking after ill or disabled relative	0.00	6.52	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.67	1.61	3.26
travel or on holiday	15.79	8.70	23.08	0.00	0.00	0.00	16.67	8.06	10.87
working in an unpaid job	10.53	6.52	15.38	33.33	0.00	0.00	10.00	8.06	8.70
study/ TAFE/ university	15.79	6.52	0.00	0.00	0.00	12.50	16.67	3.23	7.61
home duties (unspecified)	0.00	4.35	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.23	2.17
other	15.79	6.52	15.38	0.00	33.33	12.50	10.00	11.29	10.87
can't say	5.26	6.52	7.69	33.33	0.00	0.00	16.67	1.61	6.52

Section 6:
YOUTH'S FAMILY FORMATION

Overview of Findings:

One of the very important decisions that determines many of the future outcomes for the young people is the fertility decision, including early fertility. Having children at a relatively young age can affect the human capital investments – obtaining tertiary or vocational education, and early work experience – of the parents, and especially of mothers. The reduced human capital will adversely affect labour market outcomes, such as wages, hours the mother is able to work, and her job opportunities. Any labour market penalty faced by young mothers is problematic for two reasons. First, young married women's contribution to the total family income is becoming quite substantial (Dechter and Smock, 1994) and they are able to make less of a contribution if their wages are lower. Second, single mothers with young children are likely to remain unmarried while their children are young making them the sole providers for their families. For both reasons, the lower labour market earnings of young mothers may increase families' dependence on the income-support system (Klepinger *et al*, 1997).

At the time of wave 1 interview, about 5 per cent of the surveyed 18-year-olds were either married or living in a *de facto* relationship. This percentage was higher for girls than for boys (7 per cent vs. 3 per cent) and was the lowest for the young people whose parents had no history of income-support receipt (category A) at just under 3 per cent.

In the wave 2 sample, the overall proportion of those married or in a relationship is just over 12 per cent. Young women are more likely to be partnered than are male respondents (16 vs. 8 per cent). Across the stratification categories, respondents in category A are still less likely to be partnered than those young adults who grew up in families with any income-support history: among category A respondents, under 8 per cent report having a spouse/partner, while this percentage ranges from 13 to 18 per cent for all the other categories. Young people with a parental history of income-support receipt are also more likely to have lived with partners other than the current one.

The young adults who were partnered at the time of the wave 2 interview were also asked questions about their spouse's or partner's education, employment status, job characteristics, and other activities.

More than 60 per cent of partnered wave 2 respondents had a spouse or partner who had completed Year 12. This proportion is somewhat lower for female than for male respondents (60 vs. 66 per cent). Young adults who have intensive parental income-support history (category B) and those whose parents had moderate non-recent income-support history (category F) are much less likely to have a partner who has completed Year 12, compared to all other stratification categories.

Regarding the highest qualification that the youth's partner has obtained, wave 2 data show some quite significant disparities both between the stratification categories and between male and female respondents. Moreover, this picture is quite different from that observed at wave 1, when the then 18-year-old respondents were more likely to have partners who had only secondary school qualifications. Now the data show that the respondents' partners have a wider variety of qualifications.

Looking closer at the types of qualifications obtained by the youth's partners, it can be observed that while a little more than one half of all surveyed non-single 20 year olds' partners have obtained only a secondary school qualification (Year 9 or lower to Year 12), this proportion is much lower (less than 30 per cent) for the respondents in category A (no parental income-support history), whose partners are more likely to have attained some other qualification since finishing secondary school. In contrast, 60 per cent of respondents in

category B (heavy exposure to income support) report that the highest qualification of their partner is a secondary school one. Male respondents' partners are also more likely to have only obtained a secondary school qualification (there is a 12 percentage points difference between genders).

The partners of young people who grew up in families with no income-support history (category A) are much more likely to have obtained trade certificate (20 per cent compared to 4 to 16 per cent for other categories) or some TAFE qualification (36 per cent compared to 16 to 20 per cent for other categories). Female respondents' partners are also more likely to have obtained a trade certificate (12 vs. 4 per cent for male respondents) or a university degree.

The proportions of youth whose partners are employed is about even across the stratification categories, but young women are much more likely to have partners who are employed compared to male respondents (89 vs. 73 per cent).

The job characteristics of the youth's partners appear to be correlated with the income-support exposure of the youth and the youth's gender. Partners of young people with no income-support exposure (category A) are more likely to work longer hours and earn more than those of respondents in other income-support categories. The partners of female respondents are also more likely to work longer hours and have higher before-tax weekly earnings from all jobs.

The numbers of youth with unemployed partners are too low for us to be able to say anything conclusive about the partners' activities, although it can be observed that only the male respondents report that their unemployed partner's main activity is looking after children.

There are 107 young adults with children in YIF wave 2 data. The proportion of youth who have children is the highest for categories B and F (moderate non-recent family income-support history). Female respondents are also more likely to report having children than are male respondents (6 vs. 2 per cent).

There is some evidence that income-support exposure is related to the fertility decisions of youth. Young adults in category A who had no income-support exposure are not only the least likely to have children at the age of 20, but are also more likely to have only one child, and to have their first child at 18 years of age or older (years 2006-2008). The first-born children almost always live with their mothers (97 per cent report living with their first-born child, and 1 more per cent report living with the child half the time). However, the fathers report their first-born living with them at least some of the time in a little over 60 per cent of cases. Mothers are also the only ones who report receiving financial support for their child, while fathers mostly report paying financial support for the first-born child. However, two-thirds of young women with children and around one half of young men report neither paying nor receiving child support.

Table 6.1
Family Formation

	Stratification category								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	Male	Female	Total
Total respondents	691	756	306	256	219	130	1,069	1,289	2,358
Current marital status:									
married	1.01	0.93	1.96	1.56	1.37	0.77	0.47	1.78	1.19
living in <i>de facto</i> relationship	6.95	13.10	12.09	12.50	12.33	16.92	7.67	14.20	11.24
single	92.04	85.98	85.95	85.94	86.30	82.31	91.86	84.02	87.57
Has youth ever lived with someone (other than the current partner) for more than 3 months?									
yes	4.91	13.23	5.56	10.55	7.31	13.08	7.39	10.24	8.94
no	95.09	86.64	94.44	89.45	92.69	86.92	92.61	89.68	91.01
can't say	0.00	0.13	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.08	0.04
Total currently married or <i>de facto</i> who have lived in a relationship with someone other than the current partner	3	11	1	4	2	1	4	18	22
Number of relationships, including the current one:									
1	0.00	9.09	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	11.11	9.09
2	100.00	72.73	100.00	75.00	100.00	0.00	75.00	77.78	77.27
3	0.00	18.18	0.00	25.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	11.11	13.64
Total currently single who have lived in a relationship	31	89	16	23	14	16	75	114	189
Number of relationships:									
1	87.10	80.90	87.50	95.65	100.00	87.50	89.33	84.21	86.24
2	3.23	17.98	12.50	4.35	0.00	12.50	8.00	14.04	11.64
3	3.23	1.12	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.33	0.88	1.06
4	6.45	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.33	0.88	1.06
Total ever married or partnered	86	195	59	59	44	39	162	320	482
Year of first marriage/relationship:									
Before 2005	3.49	12.83	1.69	11.85	2.27	5.12	7.41	8.45	8.08
2005	4.65	14.36	5.08	8.47	9.09	17.95	11.11	10.31	10.58
2006	23.26	23.59	22.03	13.56	27.27	17.95	18.52	23.75	21.99
2007	33.72	25.64	40.68	27.12	20.45	33.33	32.72	27.50	29.25
2008	34.88	22.56	28.81	38.98	36.36	25.64	29.01	29.06	29.05
Refuse/can't say	0.00	1.03	1.69	0.00	4.55	0.00	1.24	0.94	1.03

Table 6.2
The Characteristics of Youth's Partner

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Total currently partnered	55	106	43	36	30	23	87	206	293
Has youth's spouse/partner completed Year 12?									
yes	69.09	55.66	65.12	69.44	66.67	52.17	66.67	60.19	62.12
no	30.91	43.40	27.91	27.78	33.33	47.83	32.18	37.86	36.18
can't say	0.00	0.94	6.98	2.78	0.00	0.00	1.15	1.94	1.71
Highest qualification of spouse/partner:									
year 9 or lower	0.00	2.83	2.33	0.00	3.33	0.00	1.15	1.94	1.71
year 10	7.27	17.92	9.30	11.11	16.67	17.39	9.20	15.53	13.65
year 11	0.00	14.15	6.98	2.78	6.67	21.74	11.49	7.77	8.87
year 12	21.82	25.47	30.23	38.89	30.00	17.39	37.93	22.33	26.96
traineeship	1.82	0.94	2.33	0.00	0.00	4.35	2.30	0.97	1.37
trade certificate or diploma	20.00	6.60	4.65	8.33	16.67	4.35	4.60	12.14	9.90
TAFE certificate, level I	0.00	0.00	2.33	0.00	3.33	0.00	1.15	0.49	0.68
TAFE certificate, level II	5.45	3.77	2.33	0.00	3.33	0.00	2.30	3.40	3.07
TAFE certificate, level III	10.91	4.72	2.33	2.78	3.33	4.35	5.75	4.85	5.12
TAFE certificate, level IV	10.91	4.72	4.65	2.78	3.33	8.70	5.75	5.83	5.80
TAFE certificate, level unknown	3.64	3.77	6.98	5.56	0.00	4.35	4.60	3.88	4.10
TAFE diploma	1.82	3.77	0.00	8.33	3.33	0.00	2.30	3.40	3.07
TAFE advanced diploma	3.64	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.97	0.68
associate diploma/diploma	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.78	0.00	4.35	0.00	0.97	0.68
undergraduate diploma	1.82	0.94	0.00	0.00	6.67	0.00	1.15	1.46	1.37
university bachelor or honours degree	5.45	7.55	11.63	8.33	0.00	4.35	4.60	7.77	6.83
post-graduate qualification	1.82	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.15	0.00	0.34
short course	0.00	0.94	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.49	0.34
something else	3.64	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.33	0.00	0.00	1.46	1.02
can't say	0.00	0.94	13.95	8.33	0.00	8.70	3.45	4.37	4.10
refused	0.00	0.94	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.15	0.00	0.34
Does youth's partner presently work in a job, business or a farm?									
yes	87.27	82.08	81.40	88.89	93.33	82.61	73.56	89.81	84.98
no	12.73	16.98	13.95	11.11	6.67	17.39	25.29	9.22	13.99
can't say	0.00	0.94	4.65	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.15	0.97	1.02

Table 6.2
The Characteristics of Youth's Partner (continued)

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Total youth with currently employed partner	48	87	35	32	28	19	64	185	249
Weekly hours youth's partner works in all jobs:									
30 hrs or less	6.25	12.64	11.43	28.13	17.86	26.32	26.56	10.81	14.86
31 to 40 hrs	37.50	33.33	37.14	28.13	42.86	21.05	42.19	31.35	34.14
More than 40 hrs	56.25	50.57	48.57	43.75	39.29	42.11	31.25	54.59	48.59
Refuse/can't say	0.00	3.45	2.86	0.00	0.00	10.53	0.00	3.24	2.41
Youth's partner's weekly before-tax earnings from all jobs:									
Less than \$400	6.25	11.49	11.43	18.75	0.00	15.79	18.75	7.57	10.44
\$400 to less than \$600	6.25	14.94	14.29	28.13	21.43	21.05	32.81	10.27	16.06
\$600 to less than \$800	22.92	31.03	25.71	12.50	35.71	15.79	28.13	24.86	25.70
\$800 or more	56.25	33.33	31.43	28.13	35.71	31.58	12.50	45.41	36.95
Refuse/can't say	8.33	9.20	17.14	12.50	7.14	15.79	7.81	11.89	10.84
Youth's partner's occupation:									
Manager	4.17	1.15	5.71	0.00	0.00	10.53	3.13	2.70	2.81
Professional	12.50	4.60	20.00	12.50	3.57	5.26	4.69	10.81	9.24
Associate professional	18.75	8.05	5.71	6.25	0.00	26.32	12.50	9.19	10.04
Tradesperson	25.00	22.99	22.86	15.63	21.43	15.79	4.69	27.57	21.69
Clerical, sales or services worker	25.00	33.33	34.29	46.88	50.00	21.05	59.38	25.95	34.54
Labourer	6.25	14.94	5.71	3.13	10.71	5.26	7.81	9.73	9.24
Other	8.33	14.94	5.71	15.63	14.29	15.79	7.81	14.05	12.45
Total respondents whose partner is not currently employed	7	19	8	4	2	4	23	21	44
Main activity of partner:									
looking for work	71.43	36.84	25.00	25.00	50.00	0.00	26.09	47.62	36.36
studying	14.29	21.05	37.50	75.00	50.00	25.00	21.74	38.10	29.55
looking after children	0.00	26.32	12.50	0.00	0.00	25.00	30.43	0.00	15.91
other	0.00	10.53	12.50	0.00	0.00	50.00	17.39	4.76	11.36
can't say	14.29	5.26	12.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.35	9.52	6.82
Has youth's partner ever worked for pay?									
yes	85.71	73.68	75.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	82.61	80.95	81.82
no	14.29	21.05	12.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	13.04	14.29	13.64
can't say	0.00	5.26	12.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.35	4.76	4.55

Table 6.2
The Characteristics of Youth's Partner (continued)

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Total respondents whose partner has ever worked for pay	6	14	6	4	2	4	19	17	36
Occupation of youth's partner:									
Manager	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	5.26	0.00	2.78
Associate professional	50.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	23.53	11.11
Clerical, sales or services worker	50.00	42.86	83.33	75.00	100.00	75.00	68.42	52.94	61.11
Labourer	0.00	21.43	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.26	11.76	8.33
Other	0.00	28.57	16.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	21.05	5.88	13.89
Can't say	0.00	7.14	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.88	2.78

Table 6.3
Youth's Children

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Total respondents	691	756	306	256	219	130	1,069	1,289	2,358
Youth who have children	1.59	7.41	4.25	3.13	4.11	7.69	2.43	6.28	4.54
Total respondents who have children	11	56	13	8	9	10	26	81	107
How many children does youth have, including those who do not currently live with them?									
1	100.00	67.86	84.62	87.50	88.89	100.00	73.08	81.48	79.44
2	0.00	28.57	15.38	12.50	11.11	0.00	23.08	17.28	18.69
3	0.00	3.57	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.85	1.23	1.87
Year of birth of the first child:									
2003	0.00	8.93	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	7.69	3.70	4.67
2004	0.00	8.93	0.00	12.50	11.11	10.00	7.69	7.41	7.48
2005	0.00	8.93	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	11.54	2.47	4.67
2006	45.45	17.86	23.08	25.00	33.33	20.00	15.38	25.93	23.36
2007	36.36	30.36	53.85	12.50	0.00	20.00	34.62	27.16	28.97
2008	18.18	23.21	23.08	50.00	55.56	50.00	23.08	32.10	29.91
Refuse/can't say	0.00	1.79	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.23	0.93
Does this child usually live with youth?									
yes	100.00	80.36	100.00	75.00	100.00	100.00	57.69	97.53	87.85
no	0.00	16.07	0.00	25.00	0.00	0.00	38.46	1.23	10.28
lives with respondent half the time	0.00	3.57	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.85	1.23	1.87
Total respondents with children who are partnered	6	31	5	3	5	5	13	42	55
Is youth's current spouse/ partner the mother/father or this child?									
yes	100.00	87.10	100.00	66.67	100.00	100.00	92.31	90.48	90.91
no	0.00	12.90	0.00	33.33	0.00	0.00	7.69	9.52	9.09
Total respondents who have children	11	56	13	8	9	10	26	81	107
Does youth pay or receive any financial support for this child?									
pays	0.00	21.43	7.69	12.50	11.11	0.00	42.31	4.94	14.02
receives	27.27	14.29	30.77	25.00	0.00	30.00	0.00	24.69	18.69
both pays and receives	9.09	1.79	0.00	25.00	0.00	0.00	3.85	3.70	3.74
no	63.64	62.50	61.54	37.50	88.89	70.00	53.85	66.67	63.55

Section 7:
YOUTH'S HOUSING AND INCOME

Overview of Findings:

Australian youth, like their counterparts in many other countries around the world, have become the subject of a recently increasing demographic phenomenon of delaying their moving out of their parents' home and of remaining financially dependent on their parents for longer (Hartley, 1993; Whittington and Peters, 1996; Schneider, 1999; Weston *et al*, 2001; Cobb-Clark, 2007). The young people are becoming less likely to leave home⁶, more likely to receive financial transfers from their parents when they do move away, and more likely to return to live with their parents if their circumstances change.

Therefore, at the stage in the young people's life when they make decisions regarding their education, employment, and family formation, co-residence and financial assistance from parents are important factors that affect many of the choices that the young people make. Since one of the main research questions of the Youth in Focus project is transgenerational transmission of disadvantage, it is important for us to investigate the determinants of co-residence and financial transfers from parents to their young adult children and to understand how parents' ability (and willingness) to provide these transfers is related to the economic circumstances of the family.

In order to study this question, the Youth in Focus survey, in addition to information about young adults' labour earnings, also collects information on other sources of income the young people and their partners might have received, like the amount of income from own business or rental property, as well as on financial assistance received by youth from parents. Moreover, a wide range of questions is asked about the youth's current housing arrangements and the amount of rent or mortgage payments on their dwellings. In addition, in wave 2 we also collected information on whether the young people were receiving any government benefits at the time of the interview, and how much these payments were.

The wave 2 results show that the economic circumstances of the parents' family and their history of income-support receipt are closely related to the amount of co-residential support and financial transfers provided by the parents. For example, young people who grew up in families with no income-support exposure (category A) are the least likely to pay rent or board if living with their parents; the contrast is especially stark when compared to the young adults whose parents had a prolonged history of income-support receipt (category B) – there is 30 percentage points difference in the proportion of youth paying rent (30 per cent for category A vs. 60 per cent for category B). The respondents with no family income-support history are also more likely to live rent free in their parents' investment property or elsewhere than young adults with any family history of income-support receipt (this proportion is around 22 per cent for category A respondents and ranges from 7 to 13 per cent for all other stratification categories). Young people in category A are also the ones most likely to be buying their own place.

The weekly rent payments of those respondents who live in large-group or share accommodation do not seem to differ significantly between stratification categories or between genders (although there appear to be substantial differences in the amounts paid by respondents in categories A and B living in large-group accommodation, the total numbers of respondents in those categories are too small for the difference to be statistically significant). For the young adults who either pay rent and board while living with their parents or live as a lodger or a boarder, the amount of rent and board paid tends to be higher for the young people with family history of prolonged income-support receipt (category B) compared to the respondents with no income-support exposure (category A): the proportions of those who

⁶ According to the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS), the proportion of young people aged 20 to 29 living with their parents increased from 20.7 to 29.9 per cent between 1976 and 2001 (ABS 2005).

pay \$70 or more weekly in rent or board is 42 per cent for category B and 33 per cent for category A. The respondents in category A, however, are more likely to pay higher rents if they are renting their own place (36 per cent of respondents in this category pay weekly rent of \$250 or more, compared to 21 per cent of respondents in category B).

The amount of wages income received by respondents and their partners support the conclusions drawn in the youth employment section of this Report. While the young people from families with no income-support history (category A) are the most likely to have received wages income in the previous financial year (2007-2008), the amount of income received is higher for youth respondents with a more intensive income-support exposure (compared to 22 per cent of category A respondents who have received wages income of \$30,000 or above, 27 per cent of respondents in category B report the same). Female respondents are also more likely to have received lower amount of wages income (55 per cent report receiving income under \$20,000, compared to 45 per cent of the male respondents).

The probability of receiving income from own business is higher for the youth respondents who grew up in families with moderate income-support history (categories C to F) than for the youth with either no or intensive income-support exposure (categories A and B). The youth in category A are also the most likely to receive income from shares, interest or dividends.

Wave 2 results also show that economic circumstances of the family are closely linked to the provision of financial assistance to youth by their parents. While only 38 per cent of youth in category B (heavy dependence on income support) receive any transfers from their parents, for the young people with no family history of income support (category A) this figure is much higher at 58 per cent, with the remaining categories falling in between (45 to 50 per cent). Young men are also somewhat less likely to receive assistance from parents than young women (43 vs. 50 per cent).

The nature of transfers also varies across the stratification categories, especially between categories A and B. Respondents in category A are more likely to report having received parental assistance to pay for their accommodation while studying (11 per cent vs. 5 per cent for category B), to pay HECS and tuition fees (21 vs. 8 per cent; this, of course, is related to the current educational activities of the young people), to pay their bills (27 vs. 19 per cent), and to have received a general living allowance (21 vs. 12 per cent). The proportion of the female respondents who receive a living allowance is also about 4 percentage points higher than that for the male respondents.

The amount of parental transfers provided to youth appears smaller in the more intensive income-support history categories: the majority of respondents in categories B, E and F have received less than \$2,000 in parental assistance throughout 2007-2008, and more than 55 per cent of respondents in category A have received more than \$2,000. Young women tend to receive larger amounts of assistance compared to the young men, and are less likely to report that they are expected to pay back at least some of the assistance paid to them by their parents. Not surprisingly, the proportion of respondents who say they will have to pay back some of the transfers is the highest for the young people who grew up in families with prolonged history of income-support dependence (category B) and for the young people with moderate non-recent income-support exposure (category F).

There are also large disparities in the current income-support receipt by the young people themselves. As expected, the highest proportion of youth receiving income-support payments at the time of wave 2 interview belongs to category B (39 per cent compared to 18 per cent in category A). The types of income-support payments received by the young people also differ depending on their history of income-support exposure: while the young people in category A are more likely to receive Youth Allowance for students and the

Commonwealth education costs scholarships, the receipt of the Youth Allowance for the unemployed is more often reported by the youth in category B.

Table 7.1
Youth's Housing Arrangements

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Total respondents who live with parents and not in share or group accommodation	504	465	210	177	151	80	742	844	1,587
Is youth paying rent or board?									
living rent free	69.25	38.92	52.86	62.71	62.91	48.75	50.54	60.43	55.83
paying rent or board	29.76	59.78	45.24	36.72	37.09	50.00	47.71	39.10	43.10
other	0.99	0.86	1.90	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.35	0.36	0.82
can't say	0.00	0.43	0.00	0.56	0.00	1.25	0.40	0.12	0.25
Total respondents who live independently and not in share or group accommodation	54	91	35	26	26	15	83	164	247
Housing arrangements of youth:									
lives as a lodger or a boarder	11.11	8.79	14.29	11.54	7.69	0.00	12.05	8.54	9.72
rents own place	46.30	71.43	54.29	65.38	69.23	66.67	50.60	68.29	62.35
is buying own place	16.67	4.40	11.43	11.54	7.69	13.33	9.64	9.76	9.72
owns a property outright	1.85	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.20	0.00	0.40
lives rent free in parents' investment property	9.26	4.40	2.86	3.85	7.69	0.00	6.02	4.88	5.26
lives rent free	12.96	8.79	11.43	3.85	3.85	13.33	15.66	6.10	9.31
other	1.85	2.20	5.71	3.85	3.85	6.67	4.82	2.44	3.24
Total respondents who live in large-group accommodation	28	17	7	5	8	6	38	33	71
Weekly amount of rent (and board) youth (and partner) pay:									
Nothing	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	12.50	0.00	2.63	0.00	1.41
Less than \$110	14.29	17.65	14.29	40.00	62.50	0.00	26.32	15.15	21.13
\$110 to less than \$180	35.71	52.94	28.57	60.00	12.50	16.67	26.32	48.48	36.62
\$180 or more	46.43	17.65	57.14	0.00	12.50	83.33	39.47	33.33	36.62
Can't say/refused	3.57	11.76	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.26	3.03	4.23

Table 7.1
Youth's Housing Arrangements (continued)

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Total respondents who live in share accommodation	107	183	54	48	34	29	207	248	455
Weekly amount of rent youth (and partner) pay:									
Nothing	6.54	6.01	3.70	4.17	11.76	10.34	7.73	5.24	6.37
Less than \$50	0.93	2.19	0.00	0.00	5.88	0.00	1.45	1.61	1.54
\$50 to less than \$80	8.41	12.57	7.41	4.17	8.82	3.45	14.49	4.84	9.23
\$80 to less than \$100	14.95	13.11	11.11	4.17	5.88	10.34	9.66	13.31	11.65
\$100 to less than \$200	49.53	46.45	59.26	62.50	41.18	48.28	48.79	51.21	50.11
\$200 or more	17.76	18.03	16.67	25.00	26.47	20.69	16.43	21.77	19.34
Can't say/refused	1.87	1.64	1.85	0.00	0.00	6.90	1.45	2.02	1.76
Total not in share or group accommodation who pay rent and board	156	286	100	68	58	40	364	344	708
Weekly amount of rent and board youth (and partner) pay:									
Less than \$40	19.23	9.44	14.00	22.06	13.79	12.50	10.16	18.02	13.98
\$40 to less than \$70	46.15	37.41	37.00	44.12	39.66	47.50	40.93	40.41	40.68
\$70 to less than \$110	26.28	39.51	33.00	23.53	32.76	30.00	37.64	28.20	33.05
\$110 or more	7.69	13.29	15.00	8.82	12.07	10.00	10.71	12.50	11.58
Can't say/refused	0.64	0.35	1.00	1.47	1.72	0.00	0.55	0.87	0.71
Total renting their own place	25	65	19	17	18	10	42	112	154
Weekly amount of rent youth (and partner) pay:									
Less than \$110	16.00	23.08	10.53	29.41	5.56	0.00	19.05	16.96	17.53
\$110 to less than \$170	20.00	23.08	15.79	5.88	27.78	20.00	23.81	18.75	20.13
\$170 to less than \$250	28.00	30.77	31.58	41.18	44.44	40.00	28.57	35.71	33.77
\$250 or more	36.00	21.54	42.11	23.53	22.22	40.00	28.57	27.68	27.92
Can't say/refused	0.00	1.54	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.89	0.65
Total buying own place	9	4	4	3	2	2	8	16	24
Weekly amount of mortgage payments youth (and partner) pay:									
Less than \$300	11.11	25.00	25.00	33.33	50.00	50.00	37.50	18.75	25.00
\$300 to less than \$500	44.44	25.00	75.00	33.33	50.00	50.00	50.00	43.75	45.83
\$500 or more	33.33	50.00	0.00	33.33	0.00	0.00	12.50	31.25	25.00
Can't say/refused	11.11	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.25	4.17

Table 7.2
Youth's Income

	Stratification category								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	Male	Female	Total
Total respondents	692	756	306	256	219	130	1,069	1,289	2,359
Last financial year, did youth (or partner) receive any income from wages?									
yes	93.35	81.48	85.62	91.80	89.50	86.92	87.28	87.98	87.66
no	6.50	18.12	14.05	8.20	10.50	12.31	12.25	11.95	12.08
Total respondents received income from wages									
	646	616	262	235	196	113	933	1,134	2,068
Amount of income from wages:									
Under \$10,000	27.86	24.35	22.90	20.00	22.45	27.43	23.15	26.10	24.76
\$10,000 to \$19,999	28.79	22.56	29.39	25.53	27.04	23.89	22.51	29.19	26.21
\$20,000 to \$29,999	18.11	20.62	21.76	19.15	21.94	18.58	22.40	17.72	19.83
\$30,000 to \$39,999	10.37	14.29	8.40	18.72	9.18	9.73	14.79	9.88	12.09
\$40,000 or more	12.23	13.47	14.50	13.19	14.80	19.47	14.58	12.87	13.64
Refuse/can't say	2.63	4.71	3.05	3.40	4.59	0.88	2.57	4.23	3.48
Total respondents	692	756	306	256	219	130	1,069	1,289	2,359
Last financial year, did youth (or partner) receive any income from own business?									
yes	2.75	1.85	3.92	4.30	3.20	4.62	3.46	2.48	2.92
no	97.25	97.88	96.08	95.31	96.35	95.38	96.26	97.44	96.91
Total respondents received income from own business:									
	19	14	12	11	7	6	37	32	69
Amount of income received:									
Under \$5,000	57.89	42.86	41.67	54.55	57.14	33.33	43.24	56.25	49.28
\$5,000 to 9,999	15.79	14.29	8.33	27.27	0.00	16.67	18.92	9.38	14.49
\$10,000 or more	26.32	42.86	33.33	18.18	42.86	50.00	37.84	28.13	33.33
Refuse/can't say	0.00	0.00	16.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.25	2.90
Total respondents	692	756	306	256	219	130	1,069	1,289	2,359
Last financial year, did youth (or partner) receive any income from workers' compensation?									
yes	1.59	2.91	1.63	1.56	2.28	0.77	2.81	1.40	2.03
no	98.12	96.96	98.37	97.66	97.26	99.23	96.82	98.45	97.71

Table 7.2
Youth's Income (continued)

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Youth who received income from workers' compensation									
Amount of income received:	11	22	5	4	5	1	30	18	48
Under \$300	27.27	22.73	0.00	25.00	60.00	100.00	36.67	11.11	27.08
\$300 to \$2,999	45.45	40.91	80.00	50.00	40.00	0.00	36.67	61.11	45.83
\$3,000 or more	18.18	18.18	20.00	25.00	0.00	0.00	23.33	5.56	16.67
Refuse/can't say	9.09	18.18	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.33	22.22	10.42
Total respondents	692	756	306	256	219	130	1,069	1,289	2,359
Last financial year, did youth (or partner) receive any income from interest, shares or dividends?									
yes	16.04	6.22	10.46	9.38	7.31	13.08	12.72	8.53	10.47
no	83.53	93.52	89.54	89.84	92.24	86.15	86.90	91.08	89.15
Total respondents received income from interest, shares or dividends									
Amount of income received:	111	47	32	24	16	17	136	110	247
Under \$100	13.51	21.28	31.25	16.67	18.75	23.53	17.65	20.00	18.62
\$100 to 499	45.95	46.81	43.75	45.83	37.50	41.18	47.79	40.91	44.94
\$500 or more	38.74	29.79	25.00	37.50	31.25	29.41	32.35	36.36	34.01
Refuse/can't say	1.80	2.13	0.00	0.00	12.50	5.88	2.21	2.73	2.43
Total respondents	692	756	306	256	219	130	1,069	1,289	2,359
Last financial year, did youth (or partner) receive any income from rental property?									
yes	0.87	0.53	0.98	0.00	0.46	0.77	0.65	0.62	0.64
no	99.13	99.47	99.02	99.61	99.09	99.23	99.25	99.30	99.28

Table 7.2
Youth's Income (continued)

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Total respondents	692	756	306	256	219	130	1,069	1,289	2,359
Assistance provided by parents or relatives:									
A real estate purchase	1.30	0.66	1.96	0.78	0.91	3.08	1.31	1.09	1.19
Purchasing a car or similar	15.61	10.58	13.07	11.72	17.35	10.77	12.07	13.96	13.14
Paying for accommodation while studying	11.42	4.89	6.86	4.30	6.39	9.23	6.17	8.38	7.38
Paying HECS or other tuition fees	20.81	8.47	8.50	14.06	10.05	7.69	11.32	14.04	12.80
Paying bills such as telephone, electricity or credit card	26.73	19.31	18.63	17.58	20.09	26.15	21.05	22.19	21.66
Paying fines	6.79	5.95	6.86	2.73	6.85	5.38	7.02	5.20	6.02
Paying a general living allowance	20.95	12.17	14.05	12.89	14.16	16.15	13.19	17.38	15.47
Paying off debt (other than credit card bills)	2.02	2.91	2.61	2.73	3.20	3.08	3.65	1.78	2.63
Allowing youth to live in their investment property for low rent	3.90	4.10	2.29	5.08	4.57	4.62	3.74	4.19	3.98
Other assistance	0.43	0.66	0.33	0.78	1.83	2.31	0.56	0.93	0.76
No financial assistance	42.20	62.04	54.58	55.86	50.23	53.08	56.88	49.81	52.99
Total respondents whose parents provided assistance	400	287	139	113	109	61	461	647	1,109
Amount of assistance:									
Under \$500	13.50	18.82	10.07	12.39	19.27	16.39	15.62	14.68	15.06
\$500 to \$1,999	25.25	34.84	33.09	34.51	35.78	36.07	33.62	29.68	31.29
\$2,000 to \$4,999	23.00	20.56	25.18	27.43	20.18	22.95	20.39	24.57	22.81
\$5,000 or more	33.25	18.47	24.46	19.47	16.51	19.67	22.99	25.50	24.53
Refuse/can't say	5.00	7.32	7.19	6.19	8.26	4.92	7.38	5.56	6.31
Total respondents who did not refuse to report the amount of assistance	380	266	129	106	100	58	427	611	1,039
Is youth expected to pay back any of this money?									
yes	26.58	32.71	30.23	25.47	28.00	43.10	33.02	27.17	29.55
no	71.05	65.79	69.77	73.58	72.00	53.45	65.34	71.36	68.91

Table 7.2
Youth's Income (continued)

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Youth who are expected to pay back the assistance provided by parents	101	87	39	27	28	25	141	166	307
How much is youth expected to pay back?									
a small portion of the amount	6.93	9.20	2.56	0.00	7.14	16.00	4.96	9.04	7.17
about half of the amount	11.88	13.79	12.82	11.11	7.14	16.00	10.64	13.86	12.38
most of the amount	18.81	14.94	10.26	14.81	25.00	4.00	9.22	21.08	15.64
the full amount	56.44	60.92	69.23	62.96	50.00	60.00	68.79	51.81	59.61
the full amount plus interest	4.95	1.15	2.56	11.11	10.71	4.00	5.67	3.61	4.56
can't say	0.99	0.00	2.56	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.71	0.60	0.65
Total respondents	692	756	306	256	219	130	1,069	1,289	2,359
Last financial year, did youth (or partner) received income from other sources?									
yes	18.79	26.32	21.57	13.67	16.89	26.92	21.52	21.10	21.28
no	80.78	73.54	78.10	85.94	83.11	73.08	78.30	78.59	78.47
Youth who received income from other sources	130	199	66	35	37	35	230	272	502
Amount of income received:									
Negative amount	0.00	0.00	1.52	0.00	0.00	2.86	0.43	0.37	0.40
Under \$500	6.92	4.52	3.03	8.57	8.11	2.86	5.65	5.15	5.38
\$500 to \$1,999	32.31	16.58	18.18	25.71	35.14	14.29	30.87	15.81	22.71
\$2,000 to \$9,999	46.15	52.76	54.55	54.29	40.54	42.86	44.35	54.41	49.80
\$10,000 or more	13.85	18.59	19.70	2.86	10.81	31.43	13.48	19.49	16.73
Refuse/can't say	0.77	7.54	3.03	8.57	5.41	5.71	5.22	4.78	4.98

Table 7.3
Youth's Government Benefit Receipt

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Total respondents	692	756	306	256	219	130	1,069	1,289	2,359
Does youth currently receive government pension, benefit or allowance?									
yes	17.77	38.76	30.07	16.80	13.70	29.23	23.39	28.63	26.24
no	82.08	61.11	69.93	83.20	86.30	70.00	76.61	71.14	73.63
can't say	0.14	0.13	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.77	0.00	0.23	0.13
Total respondents who receive government payments	123	293	92	43	30	38	250	369	619
Type of payment received:									
Newstart allowance	1.63	3.75	2.17	2.33	6.67	2.63	2.80	3.25	3.07
Disability support pension	6.50	6.48	4.35	4.65	6.67	5.26	10.00	3.25	5.98
Sickness allowance	0.00	0.68	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.80	0.00	0.32
Parenting Payment - Single	3.25	5.12	5.43	4.65	6.67	13.16	0.40	8.67	5.33
Parenting Payment - Partnered	0.81	3.41	0.00	0.00	3.33	2.63	0.40	3.25	2.10
Youth Allowance - for students	67.48	57.34	70.65	69.77	43.33	65.79	60.00	63.41	62.04
Youth Allowance - other (for the unemployed)	4.07	9.56	3.26	2.33	10.00	5.26	7.60	6.23	6.79
Austudy/Abstudy payment	1.63	3.07	3.26	2.33	3.33	0.00	1.60	3.25	2.58
Jobseeker allowance	0.81	2.73	0.00	2.33	6.67	0.00	0.80	2.71	1.94
Commonwealth education costs scholarship	7.32	1.37	3.26	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.80	2.44	2.58
Rent allowance/ assistance	8.13	1.71	5.43	4.65	0.00	2.63	4.00	3.52	3.72
Apprenticeship incentive/allowance/ wage top-up	2.44	2.73	3.26	0.00	3.33	0.00	5.20	0.54	2.42
Other	17.89	9.22	10.87	16.28	10.00	13.16	16.40	8.94	11.95
Can't say	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.33	0.00	0.00	0.27	0.16

Section 8:
YOUTH'S HEALTH

Overview of Findings:

There are many reasons to believe that health may be one mechanism through which socio-economic disadvantage is passed from parents to their children. Currie and Stabile (2002) argue, for example, that “the relationship between socio-economic status and health is one of the most well documented and robust relationships in social sciences”. Children growing up in disadvantaged circumstances experience worse health outcomes which tend to become more pronounced as they age (see Case *et al.*, 2003; Currie and Stabile, 2002). Moreover, socio-economic status explains a large component of the inequality in health outcomes for Australian children and youth (Nicholson *et al.*, 2004). The strong link between health status and labour market outcomes in adulthood makes poor health status a clear barrier to intergenerational social mobility.

Understanding the health outcomes of adolescents and young adults is especially important. Adolescence, in particular, is a time of increasing independence when young people themselves begin making more decisions about and accepting more responsibility for their own health. Decisions about diet, exercise, and risky health behaviours can have long-term consequences for their health and economic well-being. The consumption of alcohol, tobacco, or illicit substances, for example, is not only unhealthy, but in some cases addictive. This means that the choices made while one is young may have permanent long-run health effects as well as (perhaps unintended) consequences that limit young people’s options for completing their education and beginning a career (see ABS, 2008; Gruber, 2001).

This section of the report considers the physical and mental health of young Australians who grew up in different family circumstances. We also investigate the health decisions that young people are making regarding exercise and physical activity as well as alcohol, tobacco, and illicit drug use. As in other sections of the report, the primary focus will be on comparisons between young people growing up in families with a history of intensive vs. no income-support receipt and between young men and young women.

Overall Health Status

Table 8.1 presents information about the overall health outcomes for young people in our sample. Young people in families with no history of interaction with the income-support system (category A) are very positive about their overall health status. Almost one third (30.4 per cent) rate their general health as “excellent”, while an additional 43.4 per cent say that they are in “very good” health. In contrast, young people in families with a history of intensive income-support receipt (category B) are less likely to say that they have “excellent” (20.6 per cent) or “very good” (38.5 per cent) health. Young women are somewhat more pessimistic about their health than are young men.

Physical Health

The patterns in more detailed dimensions of physical health – in particular the ability to undertake physical activity, work limitations, diagnosed health-related conditions, and Body Mass Index (BMI) – are consistent with these broad trends. Youth in income-support families (category B), for example, are more likely to report that their health limits their ability to 1) undertake moderate activity (11.9 vs. 7.1 per cent); 2) climb a flight of stairs (16.9 vs. 10.1 per cent) and 3) accomplish what they would like (21.8 vs. 11.7). They are also more likely to report a health limitation to work or that they have ever been told by a health professional that they have 1) asthma (31.2 vs. 25.9 per cent); 2) ADD/ADHD (5.0 vs. 1.7 per cent); or 3) depression/anxiety (21.3 vs. 11.4 per cent). Finally, while 68.8 per cent of 20-year-olds growing up in families with no interaction with the income-support system (category A) have a BMI that puts them in the normal range, this is true of only 59.4 per cent of 20-year-olds growing up in income-support families.

The gender gap in physical health is typically somewhat smaller than that associated with socio-economic background. Young women are more likely than young men to report that their health limits their physical activity in some way with the gender gap in the difficulty in climbing stairs – 17.3 (young

women) vs. 10.3 (young men) per cent – being the largest. There is essentially no gender gap in the extent to which health limits the amount or type of work young people do or in the incidence of asthma. Not surprisingly, however, young men are much more likely than young women (5.9 vs. 1.6 per cent) to have ever been told that they had ADD/ADHD and much less likely (11.9 vs. 22.9 per cent) to have been told by a health professional that they have depression or anxiety. Finally, young women are somewhat more likely than young men (66.0 vs. 61.6 per cent) to have a BMI in the normal range.

Mental Health

Consistent with previous results at age 18 (Cobb-Clark and Sartbayeva, 2007), emotional problems appear to be worse for those 20-year-olds who grew up in income-support families. Specifically, youth in families with a history of intensive income-support receipt (category B) are more likely to say that: 1) they have accomplished less than they would have liked due to emotional problems; 2) they have worked/done activities less carefully because of emotional problems; and 3) emotional problems interfere with their social activities. Young women are slightly more likely than young men to report that emotional problems have affected how much they have accomplished or their work activities. As was true for health status generally, however, these gender gaps are smaller than those associated with family income-support history.

The YIF survey contains a range of other indicators of mental health status. These results indicate that young people in income-support families are also approximately twice as likely (6.9 vs. 3.6 per cent) to report feeling down “all” or “most” of the time in the previous four weeks. The differential in reported energy levels and feelings of calm and peacefulness is considerably smaller, however. Similar patterns are evident in the responses of young women versus young men.

Health Behaviours

We turn now to consider the health-related decisions that 20-year-olds are making for themselves (see Table 8.2). We focus on both positive behaviours (exercise) and negative behaviours (consumption of alcohol, tobacco, and illicit drugs). This information is derived from the YIF Self-Completion Questionnaire (SCQ) and so our sample is limited to those young people completing the SCQ.

The results indicate that young people growing up in income-support families exercise less. Almost a quarter (23.4 per cent) of young people growing up in income-support families (category B) report that they exercise “less than once a week” or “not at all”. In contrast, only 15.9 per cent of 20-year-olds in families with no contact with the income-support system (category A) report a similar lack of regular exercise. Cobb-Clark and Sartbayeva (2007) documented the disparity in the extracurricular activities (in particular, organized sports) that young people in different family circumstances participated in as children. In particular, growing up in disadvantage is associated with a relative lack of participation in after-school and weekend sporting activities. It would be useful in future research to investigate the extent to which the differential in exercise habits at age 20 is related to extracurricular activity in childhood. This issue is particularly relevant for young women who are much more likely to not exercise regularly. In particular, while only 14.4 per cent of 20-year-old men do not exercise at least 1 or 2 times per week on average, 22.4 per cent of 20-year-old women report exercising less than this.

Finally, we consider the consumption of tobacco, alcohol, and illicit drugs. The YIF survey asks young people about whether they have ever used these drugs and, if so, how frequently, how intensively, the social context in which they have used them, and the age at which they first began using them.

The results indicate that the relationship between socio-economic status and drug use varies by: 1) the type of drug considered and 2) the measure of use considered (e.g. incidence, frequency, or intensity). Young people in income-support families (category B), for example, are somewhat more likely to have ever smoked cigarettes (see Table 8.1 and 8.2) and to smoke more intensively. Almost a quarter (23.3 per cent) of smokers in income-support families report smoking more than 70 cigarettes per week (10 per day) in comparison to 10.4 per cent of current smokers in non-income-support families (category A). The incidence of smoking is virtually identical for young women and young men, though young men appear to smoke somewhat more intensively.

Interestingly, the incidence of alcohol consumption is lower among young people growing up in families with a history of intensive income-support receipt (category B). Almost half (48.4 per cent) report either 1) never having drunk alcohol; 2) no longer drinking alcohol; or 3) rarely drinking alcohol. Only 34.6 per cent of 20-year-olds in non-income-support families (category A) report the same. At the same time, young people in income-support families appear to drink more intensively than their peers in non-income-support families. Fully one in five (20.7 per cent) report drinking more than 8 standard drinks on a usual day when they are drinking. In comparison, only 16.9 per cent of youth in non-income-support families report drinking this quantity when they do drink. Overall, there is very little difference in the extent to which young people growing up in different family circumstances say that they “drink more than they want to”.

Unlike the case for smoking, the gender gap in alcohol consumption appears to be larger than that associated with socio-economic background. Young women 1) are less likely to consume alcohol regularly, 2) consume less when they do, and 3) are less likely to feel that their alcohol consumption poses problems.

The vast majority of 20-year-olds report never having tried a range of illicit drugs including: 1) marijuana; 2) ecstasy; 3) cocaine; 4) amphetamines; or 5) hallucinogens. Despite this, our results provide some evidence that experimentation with illicit drugs is more common for young people in families with a history of intensive income-support receipt (category B). With the exception of cocaine, young people in income-support families are more likely to report that they have ever used these drugs.

The intensity of drug use is also higher for youth in income-support families. Those who do report ever having tried these drugs are much more likely to have used them more than 150 times if their family has a history of intensive income-support receipt. For example, almost a quarter (22.2 per cent) of young people in income-support families (category B) who have ever tried marijuana report having used it at least 150 times. This is approximately 2.5 times the rate for users in non-income-support families (category A). Consistent with this increased intensity, the age of first drug use is much lower for young people in income-support families.

Summary

Taken together, these results point to an important gap in the health status and underlying health-related behaviours of young people growing up in different family circumstances. This makes it likely that poor health is one of the mechanisms through which socio-economic disadvantage is passed from one generation of Australians to the next. Given this, it is important for future researchers to begin assessing the source of the socio-economic gradient in health outcomes. In other words, we need to understand why it is that disadvantage in childhood can be linked to poorer health outcomes in young adulthood.

Table 8.1
Youth's Physical and Mental Health

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Total respondents	692	756	306	256	219	130	1,069	1,289	2,359
Youth's general health:									
excellent	30.35	20.63	26.14	24.22	26.94	16.92	28.16	22.27	24.97
very good	43.35	38.49	38.89	41.80	42.47	47.69	41.53	40.96	41.20
good	18.35	31.61	28.43	26.17	22.37	26.92	23.11	27.70	25.60
fair	7.23	7.54	5.88	6.25	5.94	8.46	6.08	7.76	6.99
poor	0.72	1.59	0.65	1.56	2.28	0.00	1.03	1.32	1.19
can't say	0.00	0.13	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.09	0.00	0.04
Does youth's health limit them in carrying out the following activities:									
Moderate activities (moving a table, pushing a vacuum cleaner etc)?									
limit a lot	2.46	2.91	2.29	2.34	2.28	0.77	2.53	2.40	2.46
limit a little	4.62	8.99	10.78	5.86	8.22	6.15	6.36	8.22	7.38
does not limit at all	92.77	87.83	86.60	91.02	89.50	93.08	90.93	89.06	89.91
can't say	0.14	0.26	0.33	0.78	0.00	0.00	0.19	0.31	0.25
Climbing several flights of stairs?									
limit a lot	1.59	3.57	2.29	3.13	4.11	2.31	2.99	2.56	2.76
limit a little	8.53	13.36	15.36	10.16	10.50	9.23	7.30	14.74	11.36
does not limit at all	89.88	82.80	82.03	85.94	85.39	88.46	89.52	82.47	85.67
can't say	0.00	0.26	0.33	0.78	0.00	0.00	0.19	0.23	0.21
In the past 4 weeks, has youth accomplished less than they would like due to physical health?									
yes	11.71	21.83	16.99	15.63	15.98	16.15	14.13	18.85	16.70
no	87.72	77.38	82.35	83.98	83.11	83.08	85.31	80.37	82.62
can't say	0.58	0.79	0.65	0.39	0.91	0.77	0.56	0.78	0.68
In the past 4 weeks, has youth accomplished less than they would like due to emotional problems?									
yes	16.18	23.68	19.93	18.75	20.55	20.00	18.24	21.41	19.97
no	83.38	75.93	79.41	80.86	78.54	78.46	81.10	78.12	79.48
can't say	0.43	0.40	0.65	0.39	0.91	1.54	0.65	0.47	0.55
In the past 4 weeks, has youth worked or done other activities less careful due to emotional problems?									
yes	12.86	17.33	16.67	15.63	13.24	19.23	14.03	16.68	15.47
no	86.56	82.28	82.35	83.59	85.84	79.23	85.31	82.62	83.85
can't say	0.58	0.40	0.98	0.78	0.91	1.54	0.65	0.70	0.68

Table 8.1
Youth's Physical and Mental Health (continued)

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Total respondents	692	756	306	256	219	130	1,069	1,289	2,359
How much did pain interfere with youth's normal work in the past 4 weeks?									
not at all	75.00	64.42	69.28	71.48	71.69	74.62	71.56	68.97	70.16
slightly	15.46	18.78	17.65	21.48	20.55	15.38	17.59	18.23	17.93
moderately	6.07	8.47	7.52	5.08	5.02	5.38	6.83	6.75	6.78
quite a bit	2.75	6.48	3.92	1.95	2.74	4.62	3.18	4.89	4.11
extremely	0.58	1.72	1.63	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.84	1.01	0.93
can't say	0.14	0.13	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.16	0.08
How much of the time during the past 4 weeks has youth felt calm and peaceful?									
all the time	5.92	8.73	7.84	7.42	6.39	6.15	10.10	4.97	7.29
most of the time	47.40	43.25	41.18	46.48	49.77	47.69	46.21	44.76	45.40
a good bit of the time	21.68	17.59	18.95	17.19	18.26	16.15	18.80	19.01	18.91
some of the time	15.03	18.65	18.30	19.53	12.33	13.85	14.59	18.62	16.79
a little of the time	7.37	8.73	10.13	5.86	10.96	15.38	8.14	9.23	8.77
none of the time	1.59	2.51	3.27	1.17	1.83	0.77	1.50	2.48	2.03
can't say	1.01	0.53	0.33	2.34	0.46	0.00	0.65	0.93	0.81
How much of the time during the past 4 weeks did youth have a lot of energy?									
all the time	9.83	11.90	12.09	8.59	12.79	7.69	13.56	8.46	10.81
most of the time	44.65	40.21	42.16	42.97	40.64	45.38	45.93	39.49	42.39
a good bit of the time	22.40	18.52	16.34	23.05	18.26	13.85	17.12	21.64	19.58
some of the time	14.74	18.65	18.95	14.45	15.07	17.69	14.50	18.54	16.70
a little of the time	6.21	8.47	9.15	6.64	9.59	10.77	6.64	9.00	7.93
none of the time	1.16	1.46	0.98	1.95	2.74	4.62	1.50	1.78	1.65
can't say	1.01	0.79	0.33	2.34	0.91	0.00	0.75	1.09	0.93
How much of the time during the past 4 weeks did youth feel down?									
all the time	1.01	1.32	0.65	0.78	0.46	0.77	1.03	0.93	0.97
most of the time	2.60	5.56	5.23	5.08	4.57	7.69	4.30	4.89	4.62
a good bit of the time	3.18	5.95	5.23	3.91	5.02	4.62	4.68	4.65	4.66
some of the time	18.79	18.52	17.97	19.14	15.53	16.15	16.28	19.78	18.19
a little of the time	40.61	34.13	36.60	33.98	34.25	36.92	33.30	39.18	36.50
none of the time	32.66	33.86	33.66	34.77	39.73	33.08	39.76	29.33	34.08
can't say	1.16	0.66	0.65	2.34	0.46	0.77	0.65	1.24	0.97

Table 8.1
Youth's Physical and Mental Health (continued)

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Total respondents	692	756	306	256	219	130	1,069	1,289	2,359
How much did health or emotional problems interfere with youth's social activities?									
all the time	0.58	1.85	0.65	0.78	1.37	0.77	1.12	1.09	1.10
most of the time	2.46	3.31	3.59	3.91	2.28	4.62	2.34	3.80	3.14
a good bit of the time	1.88	4.23	4.58	2.34	5.48	3.85	2.99	3.88	3.48
some of the time	7.95	10.05	12.42	12.89	8.68	8.46	8.79	10.71	9.83
a little of the time	17.77	14.95	16.99	15.63	14.16	20.77	13.94	18.39	16.36
none of the time	68.35	64.81	61.11	62.11	67.12	60.00	70.07	60.82	65.03
can't say	1.01	0.79	0.65	2.34	0.91	1.54	0.75	1.32	1.06
Total respondents	585	553	248	219	184	96	865	1,019	1,885
Is youth limited in the type or amount of work in their job due to health?									
yes	3.76	7.59	5.65	7.76	5.98	5.21	5.43	6.28	5.89
no	96.07	92.22	94.35	91.78	94.02	94.79	94.22	93.72	93.95
Total respondents not currently employed	107	203	58	37	35	34	204	270	474
If youth worked, would they be limited in the type or amount of work due to health?									
yes	13.08	19.70	10.34	16.22	14.29	2.94	15.20	15.19	15.19
no	86.92	79.31	89.66	83.78	82.86	97.06	84.80	83.70	84.18
Total respondents	692	756	306	256	219	130	1,069	1,289	2,359
Has youth ever been told by a health professional that they have asthma?									
yes	25.87	31.22	25.49	27.73	31.05	26.15	27.88	28.55	28.23
no	74.13	68.78	74.51	71.88	68.49	73.85	71.94	71.45	71.68
Has youth ever been told by a health professional that they have ADD/ADHD?									
yes	1.73	5.03	2.29	3.13	5.94	4.62	5.89	1.63	3.56
no	97.98	94.97	97.71	96.88	93.61	95.38	93.92	98.29	96.31
Has youth ever been told by a health professional that they have depression/anxiety?									
yes	15.32	21.30	14.38	14.06	21.00	22.31	11.88	22.89	17.89
no	84.68	78.70	85.62	85.94	79.00	77.69	88.12	77.11	82.11
Does youth regularly smoke cigarettes or any other tobacco products?									
yes	11.42	24.60	18.63	16.02	17.81	26.92	19.74	17.46	18.52
no	88.58	75.13	81.37	83.98	82.19	73.08	80.26	82.39	81.39

Table 8.1
Youth's Physical and Mental Health (continued)

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Total who report both height and weight	686	734	299	254	214	129	1,052	1,263	2,316
Body Mass Index:									
Underweight	5.69	5.31	7.36	5.12	6.54	3.88	3.04	7.92	5.70
Normal weight	68.80	59.40	62.88	66.54	65.89	58.91	61.60	65.95	63.99
Overweight	17.20	23.16	18.73	20.87	19.16	23.26	24.05	17.02	20.21
Obese (Class 1 Obesity)	5.10	7.49	8.70	3.94	3.74	11.63	7.60	5.46	6.43
Obese (Class 2 Obesity)	2.77	3.41	1.34	2.76	3.27	1.55	2.76	2.77	2.76
Morbidly obese	0.44	1.23	1.00	0.79	1.40	0.78	0.95	0.87	0.91

Table 8.2
Youth's Health Behaviours

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
How often does youth participate in physical activity for at least 30 minutes?									
not at all	4.08	8.25	4.27	3.61	4.61	2.38	3.70	6.42	5.31
less than once a week	11.84	15.16	15.17	13.40	16.45	9.52	10.65	15.95	13.77
1-2 times a week	28.35	24.18	29.38	25.26	26.97	33.33	24.11	28.79	26.95
3 times a week	19.22	17.27	20.38	22.16	19.74	20.24	17.16	20.66	19.20
more than 3 times a week	24.47	24.18	20.38	25.26	20.39	26.19	29.29	19.76	23.67
every day	12.04	10.94	10.43	10.31	11.84	8.33	15.09	8.43	11.09
Total respondents	515	521	211	194	152	84	676	997	1,677
Does youth smoke any cigarettes or tobacco products?									
have never smoked	76.65	63.34	64.93	73.06	73.03	67.86	69.97	69.75	69.85
no longer smoke	7.39	10.36	13.74	10.36	9.21	14.29	9.02	10.65	9.97
smoke daily	6.81	16.12	14.69	11.40	12.50	9.52	11.39	12.26	11.88
smoke at least weekly	4.09	4.99	2.84	2.59	1.32	4.76	4.59	3.32	3.82
smoke less often than weekly	5.06	5.18	3.79	2.59	3.95	3.57	5.03	4.02	4.48
Total respondents	514	521	211	193	152	84	676	995	1,675
Number of cigarettes (or equivalent) smoked weekly:									
6 or less	33.77	17.05	20.00	16.13	19.23	26.67	24.64	19.57	21.98
7 to 30	36.36	33.33	24.44	25.81	19.23	46.67	30.43	32.61	31.58
31 to 70	19.48	26.36	42.22	29.03	34.62	13.33	23.19	30.43	27.24
More than 70	10.39	23.26	13.33	29.03	26.92	13.33	21.74	17.39	19.20
Total respondents	77	129	45	31	26	15	138	184	323
Does youth drink alcohol?									
have never drank alcohol	5.83	8.06	11.37	5.67	3.95	1.19	6.36	7.12	6.80
no longer drink alcohol	4.27	4.61	4.27	2.58	4.61	1.19	3.40	4.41	4.05
drink alcohol daily	1.17	1.15	1.90	0.52	1.97	1.19	2.51	0.40	1.25
drink alcohol 5-6 per week	1.55	1.92	1.90	0.52	0.66	1.19	2.37	0.90	1.49
drink alcohol 3-4 per week	6.41	5.18	4.74	13.40	5.26	3.57	9.91	4.01	6.38
drink alcohol 1-2 per week	35.73	25.14	27.96	32.99	25.66	40.48	34.17	27.98	30.47
drink alcohol 2-3 per month	20.58	18.23	21.80	19.59	21.71	23.81	17.90	21.56	20.16
only rarely	24.47	35.70	26.07	24.74	36.18	27.38	23.37	33.60	29.40
Total respondents	515	521	211	194	152	84	676	997	1,677

Table 8.2
Youth's Health Behaviours (continued)

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
How many standard drinks does youth usually have on a day they drink alcohol?									
13 or more standard drinks	4.54	6.17	3.37	2.25	2.88	3.66	8.36	1.70	4.42
11-12 standard drinks	4.10	4.19	4.49	4.49	2.16	7.32	5.74	3.18	4.22
9-10 standard drinks	8.21	10.35	10.11	6.74	7.91	3.66	13.28	5.45	8.63
7-8 standard drinks	12.96	11.67	15.73	13.48	15.11	12.20	14.10	12.26	13.12
5-6 standard drinks	20.09	19.82	22.47	17.98	20.14	26.83	18.20	21.91	20.41
3-4 standard drinks	27.65	23.79	25.28	30.34	27.34	28.05	21.80	29.85	26.51
1-2 standard drinks	22.46	24.01	18.54	24.72	24.46	18.29	18.52	25.65	22.69
Total respondents	463	454	178	178	139	82	610	881	1,494
Does youth drink more than they want to?									
yes	9.72	10.99	13.48	13.48	11.51	6.10	12.46	9.86	10.97
no	90.28	89.01	86.52	86.52	88.49	93.90	87.54	90.14	89.03
Total respondents	463	455	178	178	139	82	610	882	1,495
Places where youth usually drinks:									
Total respondents	463	455	178	178	139	82	610	882	1,495
Youth's home	64.36	63.96	56.74	64.61	59.71	69.51	65.08	62.13	63.21
Relative's home	23.76	26.81	19.66	25.28	22.30	32.93	23.93	25.40	24.75
Friend's home	71.27	69.01	69.10	71.91	70.50	69.51	75.57	66.55	70.23
At parties	76.67	69.45	74.72	74.16	71.94	74.39	75.90	71.54	73.38
In pubs, bars, clubs, etc.	87.26	83.08	84.27	86.52	83.45	86.59	84.59	85.49	85.15
At a restaurant	36.50	29.45	33.15	35.39	35.25	37.80	31.97	35.15	33.78
In a park or on the street	15.55	17.58	11.24	17.98	13.67	14.63	15.41	15.99	15.72
Other places mentioned by respondents:									
Boyfriend's/girlfriend's house	0.00	0.44	0.00	1.12	0.00	0.00	0.33	0.23	0.27
Holiday house	0.22	0.22	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.16	0.11	0.13
Community events	0.22	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.11	0.07
Sporting events or clubs	0.00	0.44	0.56	0.00	2.16	0.00	0.66	0.23	0.40
Beach or river	0.22	1.10	0.00	0.00	0.72	0.00	0.82	0.23	0.47
Movie, theatre, concert	0.22	0.66	0.00	0.00	1.44	1.22	0.33	0.57	0.47
Work	1.08	0.88	0.56	0.00	0.72	0.00	0.98	0.57	0.74
University	0.22	0.44	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.22	0.33	0.23	0.27
Camping	0.22	0.44	0.00	0.56	0.00	0.00	0.49	0.11	0.27

Table 8.2
Youth's Health Behaviours (continued)

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
People youth usually drinks with:									
Parents	34.99	29.89	29.78	37.64	33.09	41.46	31.64	34.47	33.31
Partner	35.21	40.88	38.76	41.01	46.04	45.12	28.85	46.94	39.60
Friends	96.98	94.95	98.31	97.75	96.40	98.78	96.72	96.60	96.65
Workmates	39.74	36.04	39.33	37.08	41.73	40.24	44.10	34.58	38.47
Alone	6.91	9.89	6.18	12.36	7.91	3.66	14.10	4.31	8.29
Family or relatives	0.43	0.22	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.33	0.11	0.20
Total respondents	463	455	178	178	139	82	610	882	1,495
Did youth ever try marijuana?									
never used	65.18	58.35	62.09	57.73	57.24	52.38	55.26	63.99	60.44
used more than one year ago	15.37	20.54	17.06	23.20	19.74	25.00	19.41	18.66	18.97
used in the past year but not past month	11.67	10.75	13.27	13.40	14.47	10.71	13.93	10.73	11.99
used in the past month	7.78	10.36	7.58	5.67	8.55	11.90	11.41	6.62	8.59
Total respondents	514	521	211	194	152	84	675	997	1,676
Did youth ever try ecstasy?									
never used	83.46	78.10	81.04	81.77	84.00	82.14	80.00	82.18	81.28
used more than one year ago	4.67	10.47	7.58	5.73	4.00	10.71	7.16	7.15	7.20
used in the past year but not past month	6.03	6.01	6.16	6.25	7.33	5.95	5.37	6.75	6.18
used in the past month	5.84	5.43	5.21	6.25	4.67	1.19	7.46	3.93	5.34
Total respondents	514	516	211	192	150	84	670	993	1,667
Did youth ever try cocaine?									
never used	91.42	92.08	92.82	92.71	93.38	97.62	91.49	93.15	92.44
used more than one year ago	4.29	4.25	2.87	1.56	3.31	1.19	4.78	2.72	3.54
used in the past year but not past month	2.92	2.90	3.35	4.69	2.65	1.19	2.39	3.42	3.06
used in the past month	1.36	0.77	0.96	1.04	0.66	0.00	1.34	0.70	0.96
Total respondents	513	518	209	192	151	84	670	993	1,667

Table 8.2
Youth's Health Behaviours (continued)

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Did youth ever try amphetamines/ methamphetamines?									
never used	90.27	84.81	90.05	90.67	90.07	95.24	89.15	88.55	88.82
used more than one year ago	3.50	7.12	3.79	3.11	2.65	3.57	4.16	4.82	4.54
used in the past year but not past month	4.47	5.96	3.79	4.66	6.62	1.19	4.31	5.32	4.90
used in the past month	1.75	2.12	2.37	1.55	0.66	0.00	2.38	1.31	1.73
Total respondents	514	520	211	193	151	84	673	996	1,673
Did youth ever try hallucinogens?									
never used	94.36	88.65	91.43	96.37	94.04	97.62	89.75	94.57	92.58
used more than one year ago	2.33	6.15	4.76	2.07	1.99	1.19	4.75	2.91	3.71
used in the past year but not past month	2.14	3.85	1.43	1.04	3.31	1.19	3.12	2.11	2.51
used in the past month	1.17	1.35	2.38	0.52	0.66	0.00	2.38	0.40	1.20
Total respondents	514	520	210	193	151	84	673	995	1,672
Number of occasions youth used marijuana in their lifetime									
1-2 times	35.56	25.46	32.50	46.34	46.97	30.00	32.89	34.90	34.04
3-19 times	39.44	31.48	37.50	37.80	27.27	47.50	33.55	37.67	35.69
20-49 times	7.22	12.50	3.75	8.54	7.58	7.50	7.97	9.42	8.73
50-149 times	8.89	8.33	6.25	3.66	7.58	5.00	8.97	6.09	7.38
150+ times	8.89	22.22	20.00	3.66	10.61	10.00	16.61	11.91	14.16
Total who ever tried marijuana	180	216	80	82	66	40	301	361	664
Number of occasions youth used ecstasy in their lifetime:									
1-2 times	31.76	29.82	34.21	31.43	28.00	60.00	35.34	29.78	32.37
3-19 times	30.59	37.72	28.95	34.29	40.00	33.33	32.33	35.96	34.29
20-49 times	18.82	11.40	23.68	17.14	16.00	6.67	13.53	17.42	15.71
50-149 times	16.47	14.91	10.53	14.29	4.00	0.00	12.78	13.48	13.14
150+ times	2.35	6.14	2.63	2.86	12.00	0.00	6.02	3.37	4.49
Total who ever tried ecstasy	85	114	38	35	25	15	133	178	312

Table 8.2
Youth's Health Behaviours (continued)

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Number of occasions youth used cocaine in their lifetime:									
1-2 times	54.55	45.00	56.25	42.86	60.00	66.67	61.40	43.48	51.18
3-19 times	31.82	40.00	31.25	50.00	40.00	33.33	29.82	42.03	37.01
20-49 times	9.09	7.50	6.25	7.14	0.00	0.00	3.51	10.14	7.09
50-149 times	4.55	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.90	1.57
150+ times	0.00	7.50	6.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.26	1.45	3.15
Total who ever tried cocaine	44	40	16	14	10	3	57	69	127
Number of occasions youth used amphetamines/ methamphetamines in their lifetime:									
1-2 times	34.69	41.98	30.00	43.75	53.33	25.00	40.54	38.74	39.46
3-19 times	38.78	29.63	40.00	12.50	13.33	50.00	27.03	33.33	30.81
20-49 times	8.16	12.35	15.00	12.50	13.33	25.00	12.16	11.71	11.89
50-149 times	14.29	8.64	5.00	25.00	13.33	0.00	10.81	11.71	11.35
150+ times	4.08	7.41	10.00	6.25	6.67	0.00	9.46	4.50	6.49
Total who ever tried amphetamines	49	81	20	16	15	4	74	111	185
Number of occasions youth used hallucinogens in their lifetime:									
1-2 times	58.62	50.88	61.11	100.00	55.56	100.00	56.52	61.54	58.20
3-19 times	34.48	40.35	22.22	0.00	22.22	0.00	33.33	28.85	31.97
20-49 times	3.45	3.51	11.11	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.35	3.85	4.10
50-149 times	3.45	3.51	5.56	0.00	11.11	0.00	2.90	5.77	4.10
150+ times	0.00	1.75	0.00	0.00	11.11	0.00	2.90	0.00	1.64
Total who ever tried hallucinogens	29	57	18	7	9	2	69	52	122

Table 8.2
Youth's Health Behaviours (continued)

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Age when first tried marijuana									
13 or younger	7.23	16.81	9.87	6.01	7.58	7.50	10.54	10.70	10.61
14	11.11	11.82	12.35	4.82	7.58	10.00	7.89	12.09	10.30
15	13.33	17.73	12.35	9.64	15.15	10.00	12.83	15.38	14.18
16	17.78	20.00	13.58	21.69	16.67	37.50	20.72	18.41	19.55
17	15.00	10.45	16.05	21.69	18.18	10.00	14.47	14.56	14.48
18	13.89	12.73	18.52	21.69	16.67	17.50	16.78	14.56	15.52
19 or older	21.67	10.45	17.28	14.45	18.18	7.50	16.78	14.28	15.38
Total	180	220	81	83	66	40	304	364	670
Age when first tried ecstasy									
15 or younger	11.77	13.05	7.50	2.86	0.00	6.67	5.92	12.28	9.53
16	4.71	14.78	10.00	8.57	8.00	13.33	9.63	10.06	10.16
17	12.94	19.13	5.00	5.71	8.00	26.67	9.63	16.76	13.65
18	28.24	26.09	42.50	34.29	36.00	33.33	32.59	29.61	30.79
19	21.18	19.13	17.50	34.29	32.00	20.00	25.93	19.55	22.22
20 (21)	21.18	7.83	17.50	14.29	16.00	0.00	16.29	11.73	13.65
Total	85	115	40	35	25	15	135	179	315
Age when first tried cocaine									
17 or younger	15.55	34.16	12.50	7.14	20.00	33.33	16.93	23.20	20.93
18	26.67	34.15	25.00	14.29	20.00	33.33	27.12	27.54	27.13
19	28.89	12.20	25.00	14.29	10.00	0.00	25.42	14.49	19.38
20(21)	28.89	19.51	37.50	64.28	50.00	33.33	30.51	34.78	32.56
Total	45	41	16	14	10	3	59	69	129
Age when first tried amphetamines/ methamphetamines									
16 or younger	22.00	26.25	23.80	17.64	26.67	25.00	22.66	24.99	24.05
17	16.00	13.75	0.00	17.65	13.33	0.00	13.33	12.50	12.83
18	34.00	28.75	38.10	11.76	13.33	75.00	30.67	28.57	29.41
19	12.00	15.00	33.33	35.29	40.00	0.00	16.00	22.32	19.79
20 (21)	16.00	13.75	4.76	17.65	6.67	0.00	14.66	11.61	12.83
Total	50	78	21	17	15	4	73	112	185
Age when first tried hallucinogens									
16 or younger	10.35	25.41	22.22	0.00	11.11	0.00	17.40	18.86	18.69
17	6.90	10.17	0.00	14.29	11.11	0.00	8.70	7.55	8.13
18	24.14	15.25	27.78	28.57	0.00	0.00	15.94	22.64	18.70
19	34.48	16.95	27.78	28.57	33.33	0.00	23.19	26.42	24.39
20 (21)	24.14	30.51	22.22	28.58	44.44	100.00	33.33	24.53	29.27
Total	29	58	18	7	9	1	68	53	122

Section 9:
YOUTH'S ATTITUDES AND ASPIRATIONS

Overview of Findings:

One of the strengths of the Youth in Focus (YIF) survey is that it asks young people directly about their opinions on the things that are likely to be important to them, the extent to which they feel in control of their lives, and their goals and expectations about the future. This information – particularly in combination with their mothers' perspectives on similar issues that were collected in the wave 1 survey – make the YIF data ideal for attempting to understand the role that youth's own perspectives on life may have on their life chances. Many researchers have hypothesized that perspectives may be important in understanding why some young people coming from very similar backgrounds often achieve very different outcomes. In short, young people's own perspectives may go some way towards helping us to understand why some of them escape disadvantage and others do not.

There is mounting evidence, for example, that an individual's locus of control is related to his or her labour market outcomes. Locus of control is a psychological concept which reflects the extent which individuals believe they are able to control their future life course. A person whose external locus of control dominates tends to believe that much of what happens is beyond his or her control. Life's outcomes are instead attributed to other forces, like fate or luck, rather than to one's own actions. In contrast, a person with an internal locus of control sees future outcomes as being contingent on his or her own decisions and behaviour. Having an internal locus of control has been associated with higher earnings, more human capital investment, and more rapid career progression (see Cobb-Clark and Tan (2009) for a review).

In this section of the report, we turn to consider the evidence regarding the relationship between socio-economic background and youth's 1) political opinions; 2) perspectives on getting ahead in life; 3) locus of control; and 4) expectations about the future.

Youth's Opinions on Government Policy

Respondents in wave 2 of the YIF survey were asked to nominate up to three policy issues that they felt were important for Australia. Their responses to this question are presented in Table 9.1. Overall, young people were most likely to nominate the environment/pollution/global warming as an important social policy issue with almost one in three (28.3 per cent) picking this as a pressing issue. Other common responses included 1) cost of living/inflation (21.9 per cent); 2) health/public hospitals (16.6 per cent); and 3) the economy/financial crisis (16.2 per cent).

Interestingly, young people growing up in families with a history of intensive income-support (category B) were generally less likely than their peers in non-income-support families (category A) to see any of these as important policy issues. For example, only 23.9 per cent saw the environment/global warming as an issue in comparison to 31.4 per cent of young people in families with no interaction with the income-support system. Overall, 16.7 per cent of 20-year-olds in income-support families failed to nominate any important policy issues in comparison to only 10.1 per cent of youth growing up in families with no history of income support.

There is also evidence that young women are more concerned about social issues (in particular education, health, and the environment), while young men are somewhat more concerned about the state of the economy. For example, young women were almost twice as likely as young men (20.9 vs. 11.4 per cent) to say that health care/public hospitals were an important policy issue for the Australian government. On the other hand, 14.4 per cent of 20-year-old women said that economic issues (e.g., the economy, the financial crisis, the stock

market, or recession) were important in comparison to 18.3 per cent of their male counterparts.

In the first YIF wave, both young people and their parents were asked for their views about the appropriate level of unemployment benefits and the role of the government in supporting the unemployed. These questions were repeated in the wave 2 survey and the results are presented in Table 9.1.

Consistent with their views at age 18 (see Cobb-Clark and Sartbayeva, 2007), 20-year-olds growing up in families with an intensive history of income-support receipt (category B) are more likely than young people in non-income-support families (category A) to believe that unemployment benefits are too low rather than too high. Fully 46.4 per cent of young people in category B believe that benefits levels are too low and cause hardship, in comparison to only 33.4 per cent of youth in category A. Moreover, while young people in income-support families are more evenly split between those who feel it is the government's responsibility to look after the unemployed and those who think it is the responsibility of individuals themselves, young people in families with no interaction with the income-support system are somewhat more likely (56.7 vs. 38.3 per cent) to believe that unemployed individuals should be responsible for providing for themselves.⁷

Young women are more likely than young men to believe that unemployment benefit levels are too low (40.7 vs. 36.4 per cent) and that the government has the responsibility to provide an adequate income for the unemployed (40.3 v. 37.6 per cent).

Finally, the vast majority (73.0 per cent) of young Australians believe that immigrants are generally good for the Australian economy. Support for immigration is on average higher among young people in non-income-support families (category A) and young women.

Youth's Perspectives on Getting Ahead in Life

Beliefs about the importance of education, ambition, family background, or a job in getting ahead in life appear to be somewhat less closely related to an individual's income-support history than are views about unemployment policy (see Table 9.2). Almost all 20-year-olds agree – irrespective of their family background – that having a good education, ambition, and a job are necessary for getting ahead. More than 95 per cent of the young people in both income-support (category B) and non-income-support (category A) families see these three as either extremely or fairly important to getting ahead in life. These results are virtually identical to those based on wave 1 data (see Cobb-Clark and Sartbayeva, 2007).

As in wave 1, young people in families with a history of intensive income-support receipt are less likely to believe that it is extremely or fairly important to have well-educated parents (52.0 vs. 60.8 per cent). Thus, there continues to be differences in the extent to which young people believe that family background is closely linked to future success.

Interestingly, young women are also less likely to believe that parental education is (extremely) important in getting ahead in life.

Youth's Locus of Control

Variation across economic categories in youth's responses to the locus of control questions are reported in Table 9.3. These results indicate that in general young people believe that they have a great deal of control over their lives irrespective of their family background. Almost 95 per cent of 20-year-olds agree or strongly agree with the statement that "What happens to

⁷ See Barón *et al* (2008) for an analysis of the intergenerational link in work-welfare attitudes.

me in the future mostly depends on me". Moreover, 90.7 per cent agree or strongly agree that view that "I can do just about anything I set my mind to".

At the same time, there is evidence that a young person's locus of control may depend on his or her family's income-support history. For example, fully 25.3 per cent of youth in families with a history of intensive income-support receipt (category B) agree or strongly agree with the notion that there is really no way that they can solve some of the problems that they have. In contrast, only 16.9 per cent of young people in non-income-support families (category A) believe the same. Growing up in family with a history of intensive income-support receipt is also associated with an increased likelihood that a young person believes that he or she is sometimes "pushed around in life" and that he or she has little chance of solving his or her problems.⁸

Youth's Expectations about the Future

Finally, we consider young people's expectations regarding their future labour market outcomes (occupation and income) and family formation (marital status, number and timing of children). These results are presented in Table 9.4.

More than half (52.6 per cent) of 20-year-olds growing up in families that have had no interaction with the income-support system (category A) expect to be managers or professionals by the time they are 30. Only 39.9 per cent of youth in income-support families (category B) expect to be employed in a managerial or professional occupation. They are relatively more likely to see themselves employed as associate professionals or clerical, sales, or service workers.

The differences in the occupations young people expect to work in are broadly consistent with their expectations about their future incomes. For example, young people growing up in families with a history of intensive income-support receipt are more likely to see themselves earning less than \$50,000 at age 30 (16.0 vs. 9.1 per cent for category A) and less likely to believe that they will be earning more than \$100,000 (10.6 per cent vs. 21.7 per cent in category A).

Interestingly, more than half of 20-year-old women expect that they will be in a managerial or professional occupation by age 30. Despite this almost one in six (15.8 per cent) believe that they will be earning less than \$50,000 per year. On the other hand, only 38.7 per cent of 20-year-old young men believe that in 10 years time they will be employed as managers or professionals. Nonetheless, fully 29.4 per cent believe that they will be earning more than \$100,000 and only 7.6 per cent believe that they will be earning less than \$50,000.

We turn now to consider young people's expectations about future family formation – in particular marriage and childbearing. Expectations about family formation differ more across gender lines than they do by socio-economic background. In general, young women are more likely to expect that they will marry by age 30 (90.8 vs. 84.3 per cent) and to ever have a child (93.3 vs. 91.4 per cent). Young women also expect to have their first child at a younger age, which is consistent with current fertility patterns.

Expectations about the probability of marrying in the next 10 years are more similar across socio-economic backgrounds. Young people in non-income-support families (category A) are somewhat more likely to expect to marry than are those in income-support families (category B) – 88.7 vs. 86.0 per cent. Approximately, seven per cent of young people irrespective of their family background expect to never have children. Among those who do, 20-year-olds in

⁸ See Barón (2008) for an analysis of the link between the educational outcomes and locus of control of YIF respondents.

income-support families are more likely to expect to have very small (one child) or very large (five or more children) families and to have their first child at a younger age.

Summary

By and large the young people in our sample believe that what happens in the future is largely up to them and they believe that education, ambition, and a job will be very important in getting ahead in life. Despite this, there is also evidence that on some dimensions, the opinions, sense of control, and future expectations of young people is related to the circumstances in which they grow up. Future research should assess the extent to which these different perspectives are 1) related to life outcomes; and 2) play a role in the intergenerational transmission of disadvantage.

Table 9.1
Youth's Opinions on Government Policies

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Total respondents	692	757	308	256	219	130	1,069	1,289	2,362
Important policy issues for Australia (respondents could name up to three issues)									
cost of living/ inflation	22.54	21.40	23.05	19.53	21.92	22.31	21.70	21.96	21.85
high income tax/ high taxes	1.88	2.64	2.27	3.91	1.37	3.08	2.81	2.09	2.41
petrol prices/ petrol taxes	10.55	13.47	10.71	10.55	9.59	13.08	13.00	10.40	11.56
housing affordability/ housing availability/ interest rates	13.15	15.32	16.56	15.23	12.33	16.92	13.75	15.44	14.65
education/ education funding/ cost of education	15.90	11.89	12.01	12.11	13.24	8.46	10.29	15.36	13.04
employment issues/ unemployment/ work choices/ wages	11.85	13.21	13.31	14.45	13.24	10.77	14.78	11.17	12.83
skills shortage/ lack of qualified workers/ labour shortage	0.58	0.26	0.32	0.39	0.00	0.77	0.37	0.39	0.38
welfare system - too generous/ unemployed taking advantage of welfare system	1.45	0.92	0.97	1.56	2.74	2.31	1.59	1.24	1.40
welfare/ student benefits/ carer benefits - not sufficient	5.06	5.28	6.17	2.73	4.57	6.92	4.30	5.74	5.08
environment/ pollution/ climate change/ global warming	31.36	23.91	30.19	27.34	32.42	28.46	26.19	30.18	28.32
water shortage/ drought	10.98	8.72	11.69	8.20	7.31	12.31	9.35	10.16	9.78
foreign policy/ international relations	4.77	4.23	2.27	4.30	5.48	2.31	5.14	3.34	4.15
gay rights/ gay marriage	0.43	0.79	0.65	0.78	0.46	0.77	0.47	0.78	0.64
health/ public hospitals	18.64	15.59	13.96	14.06	19.18	17.69	11.41	20.87	16.55
immigration - too high or too easy/ illegal immigrants	1.45	0.79	0.97	0.78	1.37	0.77	1.12	1.01	1.06
immigration policy - too harsh, too strict treatment of refugees/ asylum seekers	2.02	0.79	0.97	1.17	0.00	2.31	0.84	1.55	1.23
indigenous issues/ reconciliation	3.32	2.91	1.30	2.34	3.20	1.54	2.06	3.26	2.71
public infrastructure/ roads and road safety/ public transport	5.06	4.23	4.87	5.47	6.39	6.15	6.08	4.11	5.00
republic debate	0.14	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.08	0.04
war in Iraq	3.76	3.70	5.19	5.86	4.11	3.85	4.68	3.80	4.19
homelessness/ kids on the street/ drug and alcohol abuse/ crime	5.06	7.00	7.14	6.25	5.94	8.46	5.52	7.06	6.35
economy/ financial crisis/ stockmarket/ recession	17.63	14.00	16.88	16.80	15.07	20.00	18.33	14.43	16.17
none	10.12	16.64	15.26	18.75	15.98	11.54	14.69	14.27	14.44

Table 9.1
Youth's Opinions on Government Policies (continued)

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Total respondents	692	756	306	256	219	130	1,069	1,289	2,359
Opinions on the level of benefits for the unemployed:									
benefits for unemployed are too low and cause hardship	33.38	46.43	37.58	35.94	37.44	32.31	36.39	40.65	38.70
benefits for unemployed are too high and discourage job search	56.65	39.81	50.98	53.13	52.51	60.00	52.48	47.79	49.94
can't say	9.97	13.76	11.44	10.94	10.05	7.69	11.13	11.56	11.36
Who should be responsible for ensuring people have enough to live on?									
mainly the government	38.29	41.14	43.14	31.64	39.27	36.15	37.61	40.34	39.08
mainly a person themselves	56.07	51.59	52.94	59.38	52.05	56.15	56.50	52.37	54.22
can't say	5.64	7.28	3.92	8.98	8.68	7.69	5.89	7.29	6.70
Opinions on the effect of immigrants on the Australian economy:									
immigrants are generally good for the Australian economy	76.45	70.63	78.10	71.09	68.95	67.69	70.53	75.17	73.04
on the whole, immigrants are bad for the Australian economy	17.92	19.44	17.97	23.05	20.55	23.08	21.98	17.46	19.50
can't say	5.64	9.92	3.92	5.86	10.50	9.23	7.48	7.37	7.46

Table 9.2
Youth's Perspectives on Getting Ahead in Life

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Total respondents	692	756	306	256	219	130	1,069	1,289	2,359
To get ahead in life, how important is it to have well-educated parents?									
extremely important	10.69	12.30	9.15	7.42	8.22	10.77	11.97	9.15	10.43
fairly important	50.14	39.68	47.71	45.31	42.92	46.92	46.68	43.83	45.10
not too important	30.35	29.76	28.76	33.98	31.51	23.08	28.16	31.57	30.06
does not matter at all	8.53	17.72	13.40	12.89	17.35	18.46	12.72	14.97	13.95
undesirable, a bad thing	0.29	0.13	0.65	0.39	0.00	0.77	0.28	0.31	0.30
can't say	0.00	0.40	0.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.19	0.16	0.17
To get ahead in life, how important is it for a person to have a good education?									
extremely important	50.14	50.79	49.35	47.27	47.03	46.15	45.00	53.06	49.43
fairly important	44.65	42.86	45.10	46.48	48.86	45.38	47.33	42.67	44.76
not too important	4.05	5.03	5.23	5.08	2.74	6.15	5.33	4.03	4.62
does not matter at all	1.01	0.79	0.33	0.78	1.37	2.31	1.96	0.08	0.93
undesirable, a bad thing	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.39	0.00	0.00	0.09	0.00	0.04
can't say	0.14	0.53	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.28	0.16	0.21
To get ahead in life, how important is it for a person's own ambition?									
extremely important	75.72	73.02	72.88	75.00	71.69	73.08	70.72	76.49	73.89
fairly important	22.83	25.13	26.14	23.44	26.94	26.15	27.13	22.58	24.63
not too important	0.58	1.06	0.65	1.56	0.91	0.00	1.22	0.54	0.85
does not matter at all	0.72	0.13	0.33	0.00	0.46	0.00	0.56	0.16	0.34
undesirable, a bad thing	0.14	0.26	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.09	0.16	0.13
can't say	0.00	0.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.77	0.28	0.08	0.17
To get ahead in life, how important is it for a person to have a job?									
extremely important	62.43	61.24	59.80	66.41	59.36	65.38	63.61	60.67	62.02
fairly important	35.40	34.92	36.27	32.03	38.81	33.08	33.49	36.62	35.18
not too important	1.59	2.91	3.27	1.17	1.37	0.77	2.06	2.17	2.12
does not matter at all	0.29	0.26	0.33	0.39	0.46	0.77	0.47	0.23	0.34
can't say	0.29	0.66	0.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.37	0.31	0.34

Table 9.3
Youth's Locus of Control

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F	Male	Female	Total
Total respondents	515	519	211	194	152	84	675	996	1,675
There is really no way I can solve some of the problems I have									
strongly agree	1.95	4.25	4.27	1.55	3.29	0.00	2.53	3.01	2.93
agree	14.98	21.04	14.69	15.98	15.79	22.62	16.49	18.07	17.39
disagree	52.53	49.81	56.40	52.58	48.03	51.19	50.97	52.21	51.70
strongly disagree	30.54	24.90	24.64	29.90	32.89	26.19	30.01	26.71	27.97
Sometimes I feel that I am being pushed around in life									
strongly agree	1.75	5.59	3.32	4.12	4.61	2.38	3.70	3.71	3.70
agree	28.54	41.23	38.86	28.87	29.61	41.67	33.78	35.04	34.57
disagree	45.83	35.45	39.34	49.48	42.76	36.90	42.07	41.16	41.49
strongly disagree	23.88	17.73	18.48	17.53	23.03	19.05	20.44	20.08	20.24
I can do just about anything I really set my mind to									
strongly agree	36.19	36.29	28.91	27.84	43.42	38.10	36.65	33.97	35.09
agree	54.28	54.44	62.09	63.40	48.68	48.81	54.60	56.38	55.59
disagree	8.56	7.53	8.06	6.19	7.24	13.10	7.72	8.24	8.01
strongly disagree	0.97	1.74	0.95	2.58	0.66	0.00	1.04	1.41	1.32
I often feel helpless in dealing with the problems of life									
strongly agree	2.53	5.02	5.21	6.19	3.31	3.57	3.86	4.42	4.19
agree	17.32	29.92	25.59	23.71	23.84	23.81	21.10	25.83	23.92
disagree	60.89	46.53	53.08	54.64	54.97	55.95	53.49	54.17	53.95
strongly disagree	19.26	18.53	16.11	15.46	17.88	16.67	21.55	15.58	17.94
What happens to me in the future mostly depends on me									
strongly agree	46.99	46.63	46.92	40.72	46.05	40.48	47.85	44.38	45.73
agree	48.54	47.59	50.24	51.03	48.03	50.00	47.41	49.60	48.78
disagree	3.69	5.01	1.42	6.70	5.92	8.33	3.70	5.22	4.60
strongly disagree	0.78	0.77	1.42	1.55	0.00	1.19	1.04	0.80	0.90

Table 9.3
Youth's Locus of Control (continued)

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Total respondents	515	519	211	194	152	84	675	996	1,675
There is little I can do to change many of the important things in my life									
strongly agree	1.17	1.93	0.47	2.58	0.66	0.00	1.19	1.51	1.37
agree	8.54	12.52	11.37	9.28	13.82	15.48	12.30	10.14	11.04
disagree	59.22	58.38	62.56	61.86	55.92	54.76	58.67	59.44	59.16
strongly disagree	31.07	27.17	25.59	26.29	29.61	29.76	27.85	28.92	28.42

Table 9.4
Youth's Expectations about their Future

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Total respondents	692	756	306	256	219	130	1,069	1,289	2,359
Youth's expected occupation in 10 years' time:									
Manager	5.92	6.08	6.21	5.08	7.76	5.38	6.92	5.35	6.06
Professional	46.68	33.86	41.50	37.89	38.81	36.15	31.81	46.08	39.64
Associate professional	7.51	10.32	6.86	9.77	11.87	12.31	9.64	8.92	9.24
Tradesperson	9.10	8.33	9.80	12.50	8.68	7.69	17.40	2.40	9.20
Clerical, sales or services worker	7.08	12.83	8.17	7.42	10.50	8.46	5.05	13.19	9.50
Labourer	0.29	1.32	0.65	1.56	1.83	0.77	1.87	0.23	0.97
Other	16.76	17.46	16.01	15.63	14.16	17.69	19.18	14.43	16.57
Homemaker/housewife/househusband	0.72	1.19	0.98	1.17	0.46	2.31	0.00	1.86	1.02
Can't say	5.49	7.41	9.15	8.59	5.48	8.46	7.39	6.83	7.08
No occupation	0.43	1.19	0.65	0.39	0.46	0.77	0.75	0.70	0.72
Youth's expected annual income in 10 years' time:									
Under \$50,000	9.10	16.01	13.07	10.55	9.13	10.77	7.58	15.83	12.08
\$50,000 to \$59,999	13.73	13.36	14.71	14.84	15.53	16.15	11.69	16.21	14.16
\$60,000 to \$79,999	27.60	20.77	22.22	29.30	26.94	22.31	23.11	25.76	24.54
\$80,000 to \$99,999	16.18	12.17	13.73	15.63	15.53	16.15	16.84	12.41	14.46
\$100,000 or more	22.83	16.01	20.26	19.53	19.63	20.77	29.37	11.40	19.54
Can't say/refused	10.55	21.69	16.01	10.16	13.24	13.85	11.41	18.39	15.22

Table 9.4
Youth's Expectations about their Future (continued)

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Does youth expect to be married/partnered by the time they are 30 years old?									
yes	88.74	85.96	89.00	90.21	88.16	90.48	84.25	90.77	88.11
no	11.26	14.04	11.00	9.79	11.84	9.52	15.75	9.23	11.89
Total respondents	515	520	209	194	152	84	673	997	1,674
How many children does youth expect to have in their lifetime?									
None	7.18	7.10	7.58	10.31	7.89	5.95	8.58	6.72	7.57
1	2.52	6.91	3.32	2.58	1.97	4.76	4.88	3.51	4.05
2	42.72	40.50	38.86	47.42	48.03	45.24	44.97	41.32	42.70
3	30.68	26.49	37.44	27.84	29.61	30.95	27.81	31.19	29.82
4	14.56	13.63	8.06	9.28	10.53	10.71	10.80	13.34	12.28
5 or more	2.32	5.37	4.74	2.59	1.98	2.38	2.96	3.91	3.59
Total respondents	515	521	211	194	152	84	676	997	1,677
Age at which the youth expects to have (or had) their first child:									
Does not expect to have children	8.16	8.25	9.48	11.86	7.89	7.14	10.36	7.42	8.71
Under 20 y.o.	1.16	7.10	4.26	2.58	4.61	8.33	2.22	5.62	4.23
21 to 25 y.o.	17.48	25.14	21.32	20.62	19.74	22.61	14.95	25.38	21.17
26 to 30 y.o.	63.70	51.63	55.93	55.15	57.24	50.00	59.17	55.16	56.72
31 to 35 y.o.	8.93	7.30	8.53	9.79	9.21	11.90	12.30	6.21	8.65
After 36 y.o.	0.57	0.57	0.47	0.00	1.32	0.00	1.04	0.20	0.54
Total respondents	515	521	211	194	152	84	676	997	1,677

Section 10:
YOUTH'S LIFESTYLE AND RISK-TAKING

Overview of Findings:

In this section of the Report we discuss the data on youth's lifestyle and general attitudes to risk-taking. This information was taken from the self-completion questionnaire (SCQ)⁹ of the *Youth in Focus* (YIF) survey, in which the young adults answered questions about recreational activities they regularly participate in, their exercise behaviour and access to transportation. These questions were identical to the ones the then 18-year-olds were asked at wave 1. In addition, a new set of questions was introduced in wave 2 to gauge the young adults' general propensity to engage in risky behaviours.

The information collected about youth's regular activates, exercise behaviour and access to transportation will help in our understanding of 1) the extent to which a healthy lifestyle and regular exercise is correlated with both physical and mental health of young people; 2) young people's social capital and the extent of the social participation of the young adults; and 3) the degree to which access to transportation may affect young people's labour market and educational outcomes.

The set of questions on the youth attitudes to risk-taking can inform future research on the effect of attitudes towards different types of risk on economic behaviour. Research shows that people with higher risk tolerance are not only more likely to be self-employed (Knight, 1921; and Kihlstrom and Laffont, 1979), but are also more likely to be employed full-time, in fixed-term contracts, to change their employer, to receive higher wages and be happier with their work (Pfeifer, 2008). Differences in risk-taking propensity of men and women may help explain gender differences in labour market outcomes, and age risk profile is an important consideration for policy makers.

The YIF self-completion questionnaire asks the young people to evaluate their propensity to take risks on a 10-point scale using a battery of seven questions. The survey asks about overall willingness to take risks as well as specific risks (while driving, in financial matters, in health matters, etc). There is also a hypothetical lottery question that asks respondent to nominate a share of winnings they would be willing to invest in the following scenario:

"Imagine that you had won 100,000 dollars in a lottery. Almost immediately after you collect the winnings, you receive the following financial offer from a reputable bank, the conditions of which are as follows:

There is the chance to double the money within two years.

It is equally possible that you could lose half the amount invested.

You have the opportunity to invest the full amount part of the amount or reject the offer.

What share of your lottery winnings would you be prepared to invest in this financially risky, yet lucrative investment?"

Table 10.1 summarises responses collected in the risk-taking section of the SCQ. Consistent with international evidence, young women tend to be much more risk-averse than young men. For instance, while 41.4 per cent of young men report being either extremely or moderately risk-loving in general, only 32 per cent of young women report the same. The gender differences are of the same magnitude in most questions on specific types of risk. For instance, 42 per cent of young women report being extremely risk-averse while driving, compared to only 28 per cent of young men who report the same; in financial matters, extreme risk aversion is reported by 27 per cent of young women and 19 per cent of young

⁹ Information in this section of the report is drawn exclusively from the self-completion questionnaire. Sample size will vary slightly depending on the item response rate for each question.

men; in leisure and sports the proportion of young men who are extremely risk-loving is twice that of the young women – 20 vs 10 per cent; and while 32 per cent of young women say that they are extremely risk-averse when dealing with own health issues, only 22 per cent of young men report the same. In other areas, like the youth's occupation, the gender differences, while still present, appear smaller, and in the question of risk-taking with faith in other people, they are almost non-existent.

The lottery winnings question also supports the view that young men have higher risk tolerance. While male respondents are more likely to respond that they would invest most of their winnings (16.5 per cent of young men and only 6.7 per cent of young women would invest \$60,000 or more), young women responding to this question are more likely to say that they would either invest \$20,000 or decline the investment offer altogether (78 per cent of young women vs. 66 per cent of young men).

Gender differences in risk-taking are much more pronounced than those associated with income-support history of the young person's family. It can be noted, however, that, compared to the young people who grew up in families with no history of income-support receipt (category A), those youth whose parents had a prolonged history of income support (category B) tend to be more likely to pick the extreme points of the risk-assessment scale, be it extreme risk-aversion or extreme risk-loving, and are less likely to be in the "neither risk-loving nor risk-averse" response categories. In specific risks youth in category B are, on average, more risk-averse: they are 5 to 7 percentage points more likely than the youth in category A to report extreme risk-aversion in questions on risks while driving, in financial matters, in leisure and sports, in occupation, and with faith in other people.

Table 10.2 summarises young people's responses about their usual leisure and recreation activities, as well as club membership and access to transportation. Wave 1 has shown that young people who grew up in families that relied intensively on income support (category B) were less likely to have participated in sports and extra-curricular activities while at school and less often reported being active members of sporting, hobby or community-based clubs at 18 years of age. Consistent with wave 1 findings, at 20 years of age we continue to observe these disparities: youth from heavily income-support-dependent families (category B) are 17 percentage points less likely to participate in clubs compared to the young people from non-income-support-dependent families (category A). Young men are also more likely to be club members than young women (45 vs 35 per cent).

Regarding regular activities of the YIF respondents, differences between gender and income-support categories can be observed for most but not all types of activities. For instance, young people growing up in different economic circumstances provide similar reports on the frequency of watching TV, reading books, visiting family, cooking for pleasure, bushwalking or going to the beach, and participating in some sports (aerobics and swimming, as well as skateboarding and roller-skating, although the latter activity is not prevalent among the 20-year-olds). On the other hand, there are significant differences between categories A and B in the proportions of young people that are frequently going to the movies, concerts, live sporting events, attending a gym or participating in organised sports such as tennis, football etc. Young people in category B are more likely to engage in hobbies, read newspapers or pass their leisure time by going for a walk or car riding or driving for pleasure.

Young women tend to read books and newspapers more often than young men, as well as are more likely to have family or friends visit, go for a walk, go shopping, engage in a hobby, or cook in their spare time. On the other hand, female respondents are much less likely than the young men to participate in any type of sporting activity (less likely to attend a gym or play sports; jogging/power walking is the only exception).

There are no significant gender differences in the young people's reported access to a car or a motorcycle, however, the picture is quite different for young people who grew up in varying economic circumstances. Young adults in category B are almost 10 percentage points less likely to have a car that belongs to them (59 per cent vs 68 per cent for category A), and are almost 5 percentage points less likely to have access to a car or motorcycle belonging to another family member (16 per cent vs 20.4 per cent for category A). In total, more than 24 per cent of youth in category B do not have access to a car, while only 13 per cent of category A youth report the same. The proportion of youth without access to a car is the highest for young people in category B; this may limit their educational, labour market and recreational activities.

Table 10.1
Youth's attitudes to risk

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
<i>Overall willingness of youth to take risks on a scale of 1 to 10</i>									
Extremely risk-loving (9 to 10)	4.68	8.34	4.76	3.12	3.94	3.70	7.01	4.44	5.54
Moderately risk-loving (7 to 8)	29.30	27.32	28.10	34.37	32.90	25.92	33.43	26.60	29.29
Neither (4 to 6)	46.88	44.77	44.76	43.23	42.10	53.09	41.79	47.72	45.39
Moderately risk-averse (2 to 3)	15.04	13.76	16.66	13.55	19.73	14.81	14.18	15.78	15.09
Extremely risk-averse (0 to 1)	4.11	5.81	5.71	5.73	1.32	2.46	3.58	5.46	4.69
Total respondents	512	516	210	192	152	81	670	989	1,663
<i>Youth's willingness to take risks on a scale of 1 to 10: while driving</i>									
Extremely risk-loving (9 to 10)	0.77	1.93	1.91	1.04	1.32	1.19	2.54	0.60	1.38
Moderately risk-loving (7 to 8)	8.94	7.92	9.04	10.37	8.55	8.33	11.63	6.82	8.73
Neither (4 to 6)	25.24	23.55	26.19	24.35	23.69	20.23	28.61	21.26	24.35
Moderately risk-averse (2 to 3)	31.46	25.68	30.00	29.01	30.26	40.48	29.51	29.69	29.55
Extremely risk-averse (0 to 1)	33.59	40.93	32.86	35.24	36.19	29.77	27.72	41.62	36.00
Total respondents	515	518	210	193	152	84	671	997	1,672
<i>in financial matters</i>									
Extremely risk-loving (9 to 10)	0.77	2.12	2.37	1.55	3.94	3.57	3.12	1.10	1.92
Moderately risk-loving (7 to 8)	8.75	8.67	9.01	12.37	5.27	11.90	13.95	5.73	9.02
Neither (4 to 6)	34.25	33.14	32.23	28.36	34.87	20.23	35.76	29.82	32.32
Moderately risk-averse (2 to 3)	35.22	30.06	33.65	30.93	28.95	44.05	28.19	35.94	32.80
Extremely risk-averse (0 to 1)	21.01	26.01	22.75	26.80	26.98	20.23	18.99	27.41	23.96
Total respondents	514	519	211	194	152	84	674	996	1,674

Table 10.1
Youth's attitudes to risk (continued)

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
<i>in leisure and sports</i>									
Extremely risk-loving (9 to 10)	12.65	14.45	14.69	11.34	15.13	15.47	20.30	9.25	13.68
Moderately risk-loving (7 to 8)	30.35	27.36	28.44	29.90	25.00	32.15	34.82	24.42	28.73
Neither (4 to 6)	38.52	33.91	35.07	39.18	41.45	33.33	30.96	40.70	36.74
Moderately risk-averse (2 to 3)	12.25	12.33	12.32	10.83	10.53	11.90	8.14	14.57	11.95
Extremely risk-averse (0 to 1)	6.22	11.94	9.48	8.77	7.89	7.14	5.78	11.06	8.90
Total respondents	514	519	211	194	152	84	675	995	1,674
<i>in youth's occupation</i>									
Extremely risk-loving (9 to 10)	3.89	5.41	4.27	4.13	5.26	7.14	5.49	4.22	4.72
Moderately risk-loving (7 to 8)	14.40	12.54	17.07	19.07	12.50	17.85	17.51	12.66	14.71
Neither (4 to 6)	36.18	34.17	34.60	37.11	38.16	34.52	35.76	35.48	35.57
Moderately risk-averse (2 to 3)	26.85	23.16	21.80	21.13	21.05	21.42	23.59	23.72	23.62
Extremely risk-averse (0 to 1)	18.67	24.71	22.27	18.55	23.02	19.04	17.66	23.92	21.40
Total respondents	514	518	211	194	152	84	674	995	1,673
<i>with own health</i>									
Extremely risk-loving (9 to 10)	3.10	4.61	4.76	4.64	4.61	1.19	5.05	3.21	4.00
Moderately risk-loving (7 to 8)	10.29	10.58	10.00	9.79	6.58	15.47	12.61	8.63	10.21
Neither (4 to 6)	30.68	28.08	27.15	29.90	33.55	32.14	33.54	27.08	29.67
Moderately risk-averse (2 to 3)	26.99	27.11	30.48	29.38	32.90	25.00	27.00	28.89	28.17
Extremely risk-averse (0 to 1)	28.93	29.61	27.62	26.29	22.37	26.20	21.81	32.20	27.94
Total respondents	515	520	210	194	152	84	674	997	1,675

Table 10.1
Youth's attitudes to risk (continued)

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
<i>with faith in other people</i>									
Extremely risk-loving (9 to 10)	6.79	8.88	6.16	8.25	7.90	8.33	7.57	7.73	7.70
Moderately risk-loving (7 to 8)	16.31	15.25	15.17	15.98	13.16	21.43	17.80	14.45	15.77
Neither (4 to 6)	38.64	35.53	40.28	36.08	36.84	41.66	37.99	37.15	37.57
Moderately risk-averse (2 to 3)	22.14	19.31	20.38	22.16	21.05	15.47	19.88	21.18	20.61
Extremely risk-averse (0 to 1)	16.12	21.05	18.00	17.52	21.05	13.09	16.77	19.47	18.34
Total respondents	515	518	211	194	152	84	674	996	1,674
<i>Share of \$100,000 lottery winnings youth would be willing to invest:</i>									
100,000	2.14	1.54	0.95	2.06	0.66	1.19	2.67	0.90	1.61
80,000	1.17	1.73	2.37	2.06	2.63	2.38	2.96	1.00	1.79
60,000	8.74	7.71	4.74	3.09	9.21	8.33	10.96	4.82	7.28
40,000	15.73	14.26	22.27	19.07	12.50	9.52	17.19	14.86	15.88
20,000	29.32	28.71	31.28	27.84	25.66	33.33	25.48	31.53	29.07
Nothing, would decline the offer	42.91	46.05	38.39	45.88	49.34	45.24	40.74	46.89	44.36
Total respondents	515	519	211	194	152	84	675	996	1,675

Table 10.2
Youth lifestyle

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
<i>Is the youth respondent an active member of a sporting, hobby or community-based club?</i>									
Yes	47.96	30.52	36.02	42.27	40.79	40.48	44.97	35.41	39.36
No	52.04	69.48	63.98	57.73	59.21	59.52	55.03	64.59	60.64
Total respondents	515	521	211	194	152	84	676	997	1,677
Leisure and recreation activities of youth in the last 6 months									
Total SCQ respondents	515	521	211	194	152	84	676	997	1,677
<i>Watching television or videos</i>									
Never	1.55	0.96	0.47	1.03	1.32	0.00	1.48	0.80	1.07
Sometimes	34.76	37.43	36.02	35.05	36.84	33.33	37.43	34.90	35.90
Often	63.69	61.42	63.51	63.92	61.84	66.67	60.95	64.29	62.97
No answer	0.00	0.19	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.15	0.00	0.06
<i>Going to the movies</i>									
Never	14.17	19.96	17.54	17.53	15.79	17.86	17.31	16.85	17.11
Sometimes	73.01	71.21	70.14	70.10	75.66	64.29	71.01	72.02	71.56
Often	12.82	8.45	12.32	12.37	8.55	15.48	11.24	11.03	11.09
No answer	0.00	0.38	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.38	0.44	0.10	0.24
<i>Going to concerts</i>									
Never	41.94	54.70	51.18	45.88	51.32	40.48	49.26	47.64	48.30
Sometimes	49.32	37.04	41.23	46.91	38.82	50.00	42.75	43.63	43.29
Often	8.54	7.87	7.58	7.22	9.87	7.14	7.40	8.63	8.11
No answer	0.19	0.38	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.38	0.59	0.10	0.30
<i>Going to a pub or club</i>									
Never	14.95	21.69	15.17	15.98	15.13	13.10	14.64	18.86	17.11
Sometimes	45.05	50.67	50.71	50.00	51.32	50.00	47.49	49.85	48.90
Often	39.61	27.26	34.12	34.02	33.55	35.71	37.57	30.99	33.69
No answer	0.39	0.38	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.19	0.30	0.30	0.30
<i>Reading a book</i>									
Never	20.39	21.88	20.85	22.16	25.00	20.24	30.18	15.65	21.53
Sometimes	47.96	46.83	52.13	44.85	42.11	41.67	46.45	47.14	46.93
Often	31.65	31.09	27.01	32.99	32.89	35.71	23.08	37.11	31.37
No answer	0.00	0.19	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.38	0.30	0.10	0.18

Table 10.2
Youth lifestyle (continued)

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Leisure and recreation activities of youth in the last 6 months (continued)									
Total SCQ respondents	515	521	211	194	152	84	676	997	1,677
<i>Reading newspapers</i>									
Never	6.60	6.91	4.74	9.28	11.18	5.95	7.99	6.62	7.16
Sometimes	54.56	50.67	55.92	50.52	47.37	47.62	54.44	50.45	52.06
Often	38.83	42.42	39.34	40.21	41.45	45.24	37.43	42.93	40.73
No answer	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.19	0.15	0.00	0.06
<i>Visiting friends or having friends visit</i>									
Never	1.75	2.88	1.42	1.55	1.97	1.19	1.78	2.21	2.03
Sometimes	30.29	35.70	36.49	32.99	36.84	30.95	35.06	32.70	33.69
Often	67.96	61.23	62.09	65.46	61.18	66.67	63.02	64.99	64.16
No answer	0.00	0.19	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.19	0.15	0.10	0.12
<i>Visiting family or having family visit</i>									
Never	3.88	6.53	4.27	5.15	9.21	5.95	6.07	5.12	5.49
Sometimes	48.74	48.37	46.92	47.94	44.74	51.19	57.40	41.83	48.06
Often	47.18	44.34	48.82	46.91	46.05	41.67	36.24	52.66	46.09
No answer	0.19	0.77	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.19	0.30	0.40	0.36
<i>Car driving/ riding for pleasure</i>									
Never	26.60	23.80	19.91	25.77	21.05	30.95	24.11	24.87	24.51
Sometimes	43.11	38.77	41.23	34.54	37.50	35.71	38.61	40.42	39.65
Often	30.29	37.24	38.86	39.69	40.79	32.14	36.98	34.60	35.66
No answer	0.00	0.19	0.00	0.00	0.66	1.19	0.30	0.10	0.18
<i>Going for a walk</i>									
Never	12.43	11.32	12.32	11.34	10.53	11.90	17.75	7.72	11.75
Sometimes	53.79	51.06	52.61	54.64	53.95	58.33	55.62	51.45	53.13
Often	33.79	37.43	35.07	34.02	35.53	28.57	26.33	40.82	35.00
No answer	0.00	0.19	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.19	0.30	0.00	0.12
<i>Going to the gym</i>									
Never	54.76	59.69	56.87	60.82	59.21	51.19	52.22	60.98	57.48
Sometimes	24.27	22.46	24.64	24.23	24.34	26.19	24.56	23.37	23.85
Often	20.97	17.85	18.48	14.95	16.45	21.43	23.22	15.55	18.60
No answer	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.19	0.00	0.10	0.06

Table 10.2
Youth lifestyle (continued)

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Leisure and recreation activities of youth in the last 6 months (continued)									
Total SCQ respondents	515	521	211	194	152	84	676	997	1,677
<i>Jogging/power walking</i>									
Never	38.64	43.95	46.45	39.18	43.42	39.29	42.90	41.02	41.80
Sometimes	40.00	38.20	35.55	47.94	39.47	42.86	40.98	39.22	39.89
Often	21.36	17.66	17.54	12.89	17.11	15.48	15.68	19.66	18.07
No answer	0.00	0.19	0.47	0.00	0.00	2.38	0.44	0.10	0.24
<i>Aerobics or swimming</i>									
Never	51.84	53.74	55.45	56.70	55.26	52.38	54.44	53.36	53.79
Sometimes	41.55	37.62	36.97	39.18	36.84	38.10	37.57	39.72	38.88
Often	6.60	8.25	7.58	4.12	7.89	8.33	7.69	6.82	7.16
No answer	0.00	0.38	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.19	0.30	0.10	0.18
<i>Skateboarding, roller skating, etc.</i>									
Never	87.18	88.29	90.05	89.69	86.84	86.90	83.14	91.47	88.13
Sometimes	10.68	9.98	7.11	9.28	10.53	7.14	12.87	7.52	9.66
Often	2.14	1.54	2.84	1.03	1.97	2.38	3.40	0.90	1.91
No answer	0.00	0.19	0.00	0.00	0.66	3.57	0.59	0.10	0.30
<i>Bicycling</i>									
Never	61.94	65.64	69.19	70.10	62.50	75.00	57.54	71.21	65.65
Sometimes	29.13	28.41	23.22	23.71	27.63	20.24	30.62	24.37	26.95
Often	8.93	5.76	7.58	6.19	9.21	3.57	11.69	4.21	7.22
No answer	0.00	0.19	0.00	0.00	0.66	1.19	0.15	0.20	0.18
<i>Surfing, sailing, other water sports</i>									
Never	69.71	77.74	77.73	74.74	69.74	69.05	67.31	78.23	73.76
Sometimes	22.52	18.04	18.96	21.65	23.68	17.86	23.82	18.05	20.45
Often	7.77	4.03	3.32	3.61	6.58	10.71	8.58	3.61	5.61
No answer	0.00	0.19	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.38	0.30	0.10	0.18
<i>Snow skiing/snowboarding</i>									
Never	85.44	92.13	89.57	90.72	87.50	94.05	86.54	91.07	89.27
Sometimes	12.43	6.53	9.00	8.76	11.18	2.38	10.50	8.22	9.12
Often	1.94	0.96	1.42	0.52	1.32	1.19	2.51	0.50	1.31
No answer	0.19	0.38	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.38	0.44	0.20	0.30

Table 10.2
Youth lifestyle (continued)

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Leisure and recreation activities of youth in the last 6 months (continued)									
Total SCQ respondents	515	521	211	194	152	84	676	997	1,677
Playing sport (tennis, golf, football, netball, squash, etc.)									
Never	38.45	53.36	46.45	48.97	42.76	47.62	32.25	55.67	46.15
Sometimes	30.87	30.13	31.75	29.90	34.87	23.81	35.65	27.18	30.65
Often	30.49	16.51	21.80	21.13	22.37	26.19	31.80	17.05	23.02
No answer	0.19	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.38	0.30	0.10	0.18
Participating in music, drama, etc.									
Never	65.24	69.67	75.36	71.65	73.68	64.29	70.41	68.71	69.35
Sometimes	24.08	21.31	15.64	19.07	15.13	16.67	18.64	21.56	20.39
Often	10.49	8.83	9.00	9.28	11.18	16.67	10.65	9.53	10.02
No answer	0.19	0.19	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.38	0.30	0.20	0.24
Watching sport on television									
Never	31.46	40.50	31.28	28.87	30.26	32.14	24.11	40.42	33.87
Sometimes	46.60	41.46	49.76	48.97	51.97	45.24	44.38	47.34	46.09
Often	21.75	17.66	18.96	22.16	17.76	22.62	31.07	12.24	19.86
No answer	0.19	0.38	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.44	0.00	0.18
Watching sport live									
Never	48.35	59.69	51.18	49.48	55.26	51.19	45.86	58.07	53.13
Sometimes	40.78	31.67	39.34	40.21	34.21	32.14	38.61	35.31	36.67
Often	10.87	8.06	9.48	10.31	9.87	14.29	15.24	6.22	9.84
No answer	0.00	0.58	0.00	0.00	0.66	2.38	0.30	0.40	0.36
Hobbies (painting, craft, sewing, photography, etc.)									
Never	38.64	31.48	33.18	36.60	41.45	41.67	44.67	29.99	35.90
Sometimes	44.27	45.49	46.92	43.81	42.11	42.86	40.24	47.64	44.66
Often	17.09	22.65	19.91	19.59	16.45	13.10	14.79	22.17	19.20
No answer	0.00	0.38	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.38	0.30	0.20	0.24
Cooking for pleasure									
Never	33.40	32.44	35.55	28.87	36.18	33.33	52.07	20.36	33.09
Sometimes	47.77	46.83	44.55	56.70	50.00	46.43	38.76	54.56	48.24
Often	18.64	20.54	19.91	14.43	13.82	19.05	9.02	24.87	18.49
No answer	0.19	0.19	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.19	0.15	0.20	0.18

Table 10.2
Youth lifestyle (continued)

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
Leisure and recreation activities of youth in the last 6 months (continued)									
Total SCQ respondents	515	521	211	194	152	84	676	997	1,677
<i>Going to the beach, bushwalking</i>									
Never	25.24	27.83	27.96	25.26	25.00	26.19	30.62	23.67	26.42
Sometimes	52.62	52.98	52.13	54.64	52.63	47.62	50.15	54.16	52.65
Often	22.14	18.81	19.91	20.10	22.37	23.81	18.79	22.07	20.69
No answer	0.00	0.38	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.38	0.44	0.10	0.24
<i>Playing board games, computer games or cards</i>									
Never	20.97	17.85	20.85	16.49	21.71	21.43	11.39	25.08	19.56
Sometimes	53.98	53.93	52.61	55.15	52.63	45.24	49.70	55.97	53.37
Often	25.05	28.02	26.54	28.35	25.66	32.14	38.76	18.86	26.95
No answer	0.00	0.19	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.19	0.15	0.10	0.12
<i>Shopping</i>									
Never	8.93	8.64	6.16	8.25	9.21	10.71	17.31	2.51	8.53
Sometimes	55.53	51.82	56.40	55.67	52.63	47.62	62.72	47.74	53.85
Often	35.34	39.35	37.44	36.08	38.16	40.48	19.53	49.75	37.45
No answer	0.19	0.19	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.19	0.44	0.00	0.18
<i>Additional activities respondents have engaged in often during the last 6 months</i>									
Total SCQ respondents	515	521	211	194	152	84	676	997	1,677
None	81.94	81.19	80.09	79.90	85.53	79.76	82.84	80.64	81.45
Dancing	2.72	1.73	3.32	2.06	3.29	3.57	0.59	3.81	2.50
Outings with friends/ family/ groups	0.97	0.58	0.47	0.52	0.66	0.00	0.15	1.00	0.66
Horse riding, equestrian activities	1.55	0.38	0.95	1.55	0.00	0.00	0.30	1.20	0.89
Listening to music/ CDs	0.39	0.38	0.95	1.03	2.63	1.19	1.18	0.50	0.78
Gardening	0.19	0.77	1.90	0.00	0.00	2.38	0.30	0.90	0.66
Eating out, going to restaurants	1.17	1.34	1.90	1.03	0.66	0.00	0.59	1.60	1.19
Fishing, spear fishing	0.78	1.15	0.47	1.03	0.66	1.19	1.48	0.50	0.89

Table 10.2
Youth lifestyle (continued)

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
<i>Additional activities respondents have engaged in often during the last 6 months (continued)</i>									
Total SCQ respondents	515	521	211	194	152	84	676	997	1,677
Studying	0.19	0.00	0.95	1.55	0.00	0.00	0.15	0.50	0.36
Having sex	0.39	0.38	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.19	0.44	0.20	0.30
Writing stories/ poems/ articles/ songs	0.97	0.96	0.95	0.00	1.32	2.38	0.44	1.30	0.95
Playing with pets/ walking dogs	0.78	0.58	1.90	0.52	0.66	1.19	0.30	1.20	0.83
Private parties/ barbeques	0.58	0.19	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.15	0.30	0.24
Motorbike riding/ racing; motor cross; dirt bike racing	0.58	0.96	1.42	1.55	0.66	1.19	1.92	0.30	0.95
Night clubbing	0.39	0.38	0.00	1.55	0.00	1.19	0.44	0.50	0.48
Camping; rock climbing; trekking	1.36	1.34	0.47	1.03	0.66	0.00	1.18	0.90	1.07
Volunteer work	0.19	0.19	0.00	0.52	0.00	1.19	0.00	0.40	0.24
On-line charring; blogging; surfing the net	1.75	2.50	2.84	1.55	0.00	3.57	1.18	2.41	2.03
Working on car/ motorbike	0.58	0.58	0.47	0.00	0.66	0.00	1.04	0.10	0.48
Drinking with family/ friends	0.78	0.00	0.00	0.52	0.00	1.19	0.59	0.20	0.36
Martial arts/ karate/ wrestling/ tae kwondo/ boxing	0.19	1.34	0.00	1.55	0.66	2.38	1.63	0.30	0.83
Indoor sports - table tennis/ ten pin bowling	0.00	0.58	0.00	0.00	0.66	1.19	0.30	0.30	0.30
Travelling/ road trips	1.17	0.96	1.42	0.52	1.32	0.00	1.18	0.90	1.01
Youth/ church groups; going to church; Bible study	0.39	0.58	0.47	0.52	1.32	1.19	0.30	0.80	0.60
Daydreaming, sleeping	0.58	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.66	0.00	0.00	0.40	0.24
Hunting, shooting	0.39	0.19	0.00	0.52	0.00	0.00	0.44	0.10	0.24

Table 10.2
Youth lifestyle (continued)

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F			
<i>Additional activities respondents have engaged in often during the last 6 months (continued)</i>									
Total SCQ respondents	515	521	211	194	152	84	676	997	1,677
Playing musical instrument; singing	0.19	0.96	0.95	1.03	0.66	1.19	1.18	0.40	0.72
Going out for coffee	0.58	0.19	0.47	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.50	0.30
Seeing my boyfriend/girlfriend	0.00	0.38	0.47	0.52	0.00	0.00	0.15	0.30	0.24
<i>Youth's access to a car or a motorcycle</i>									
Total SCQ respondents	515	521	211	194	152	84	676	997	1,677
Own car	68.16	58.93	66.35	69.07	69.74	78.57	65.68	65.90	65.83
Own motorcycle	2.91	3.26	3.32	4.64	1.97	3.57	6.66	0.90	3.22
Car/ motorcycle provided by employer	0.58	0.38	0.95	1.03	0.66	0.00	0.89	0.40	0.60
Car/ motorcycle belonging to another family member	20.39	15.93	18.48	13.92	15.13	11.90	17.90	16.65	17.11
Car/ motorcycle belonging to partner/ boyfriend/ girlfriend	0.58	1.54	1.42	1.55	0.00	2.38	0.74	1.40	1.13
Car/ motorcycle belonging to a friend	0.19	0.77	0.47	0.52	0.00	0.00	0.59	0.30	0.42
Car/ motorcycle belonging to a family friend	0.00	0.38	0.00	0.52	0.00	0.00	0.15	0.20	0.18
Car/ motorcycle belonging to other	0.19	0.19	0.00	0.52	0.66	0.00	0.15	0.30	0.24
No, but has a driver license	4.66	6.33	6.16	6.70	8.55	5.95	5.47	6.42	6.02
No, and does not have a driver license	8.54	17.85	8.06	8.76	7.24	4.76	10.80	11.23	11.09

Section 11:
IMPORTANT EVENTS IN YOUTH'S LIFE

Overview of Findings:

Existing research documents a consistent relationship between individual's socio-economic status and their vulnerability to undesirable life events. Not only people from lower socioeconomic backgrounds are more likely to experience negative events, they are also more strongly affected by such events (McLeod and Kessler, 1990). Researchers attribute this higher vulnerability to two types of resources: financial and nonfinancial. The latter include such broader coping resources as support of social networks and personal character traits.

In the first wave of the Youth in Focus survey, the youth respondents were asked about negative events that happened to them while they grew up. They were asked whether they experienced a death of a close friend or a family member, financial crisis, or alcohol or drug problems in their household. The young people also reported whether they themselves had ever had a drug or an alcohol problem, ran away from home, got into trouble with the police or attended juvenile court due to offending, have been hanging out with a bad crowd, got pregnant themselves or got someone else pregnant, were seriously injured or assaulted, or treated for a mental or an emotional issue. The results of wave 1 data analysis have shown that youth from income-support-dependent families were much more likely to have experienced these events, although the subsequent research (Cobb-Clark *et al*, 2008) has shown that this higher propensity to experience negative life events could not be directly attributed to the income-support receipt but rather to the general low socio-economic circumstances of the youth's family, their parent's propensity for risk-taking and parental investments in children.

In the second wave of the Youth in Focus survey, we have collected information on a wider range of life events, both positive and negative, that may have happened to young people between 18 and 20 years of age. We also asked the YIF respondents to assess to what extent these events affected their life. The summary of young people's responses is presented in Table 11.1. In the Table, we first report the proportions of young people who did not experience a particular event, and then summarise the impact of the event for those young people who have experienced it.

The analysis in this section will focus on differences between genders, as well as between categories A and B of income-support stratification. We confine our analysis to these two categories since the total numbers of young people responding to the SCQ is smaller than the overall number of respondents, and these two categories have the largest numbers of respondents.

Overall, we find that the majority of the youth respondents did not experience any particular event we asked about in the two years before the wave 2 interview. A few notable exceptions are getting a new job, changed work situation, outstanding personal achievement, and breaking up or relationship problems with girlfriend or boyfriend, which the majority of the YIF respondents have experienced some time during the past two years.

Consistent with the wave 1 results, we find that young people in category B are more likely to have experienced a range of undesirable life events, such as trouble with the police, being arrested or put in jail, being a victim of crime, being treated for mental or emotional issue, having alcohol or drug abuse problems, and major financial loss, compared to the young adults in the non-income-support-dependent families. Category B youth are also more likely to have married or got engaged, to have had an abortion (youth or their spouse), and to have been separated from their spouse or partner. Young women are much less likely than the young men to have got in trouble with the police or have been arrested, or have experienced either a major financial gain or loss.

Regarding the effect of events in young people's life on those youth that experienced them, unsurprisingly, young women are less likely than young men to say that any particular event had no impact on their life, and are more likely to pick extreme responses (either "extremely positive impact" or "extremely negative impact") when assessing the extent to which a given event had affected them.

There is no clear trend in the extent to which positive and negative life events affect young people from different income-support categories. Marriage and engagement are more likely to have no impact on the life of young people in category B relative to those in category A, who, in turn, are the ones more

likely to say that their life was significantly happier because of these events. Similarly, respondents in category B are more likely to say that their life was unaffected by such events as trouble with the police or being arrested or put in jail than respondents who grew up in non-income-support-dependent families (category A). However, since the numbers of youth that have experienced these events is quite small, we cannot draw conclusions about differences in vulnerability to significant life events across economic categories. Rather, the information collected on various events and their impact on a young person's life should be used in a more detailed research to see how different circumstances have shaped a young person's life and their relationship with other outcomes, characteristics and personality traits of young people.

Table 11.1
Youth's life events

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total			
	A	B	C	D	E	F						
<i>Events which occurred since youth turned 18 and their impact on youth's life</i>												
<i>Marriage or setting up household with a partner</i>												
Total respondents	513	519	209	194	151	84	672	994	1,670			
Did not happen	86.94	74.76	77.03	80.41	78.81	66.67	86.01	75.05	79.40			
<i>Impact of event on those youth who experienced it:</i>												
Extremely positive	49.23	45.80	66.65	47.37	56.25	46.44	41.46	54.03	50.58			
Somewhat positive	35.83	25.20	12.49	42.11	18.74	10.71	26.59	25.41	25.58			
No impact	4.44	15.25	14.58	0.00	12.51	14.28	15.94	8.86	11.07			
Somewhat negative	7.43	11.45	4.18	7.91	6.23	24.99	13.80	8.46	9.90			
Extremely negative	2.99	2.30	2.09	2.65	6.23	3.57	2.14	3.21	2.91			
<i>Engagement</i>												
Total respondents	513	517	209	194	151	84	670	994	1,668			
Did not happen	92.59	84.53	85.17	90.72	90.07	83.33	90.90	86.52	88.25			
<i>Impact of event on those youth who experienced it:</i>												
Extremely positive	52.63	42.53	58.06	50.00	53.37	35.69	31.21	55.19	48.00			
Somewhat positive	15.79	21.27	16.12	33.30	26.69	14.28	29.56	16.39	20.43			
No impact	15.79	22.50	12.88	5.60	20.04	28.55	26.26	14.91	18.38			
Somewhat negative	15.79	8.73	6.47	5.60	0.00	14.28	8.24	9.72	9.19			
Extremely negative	0.00	4.98	6.47	5.60	0.00	7.14	4.95	3.71	4.09			
<i>Breaking up with boyfriend/girlfriend</i>												
Total respondents	513	518	210	194	151	84	672	994	1,670			
Did not happen	46.20	41.51	48.10	40.72	41.72	45.24	45.54	42.66	43.89			
<i>Impact of event on those youth who experienced it:</i>												
Extremely positive	4.70	10.89	6.42	5.21	9.09	8.69	4.92	9.30	7.57			
Somewhat positive	19.57	18.81	13.76	12.18	13.64	13.04	19.41	15.26	16.86			
No impact	10.87	11.56	16.51	19.13	15.91	15.21	18.31	10.36	13.44			
Somewhat negative	49.28	41.25	48.63	48.70	45.45	50.00	42.62	48.43	46.21			
Extremely negative	15.58	17.49	14.68	14.78	15.91	13.04	14.76	16.67	15.90			
<i>Reconciliation (making up) with boyfriend/girlfriend</i>												
Total respondents	512	521	210	194	151	84	672	996	1,672			
Did not happen	70.70	64.49	66.19	68.04	64.90	67.86	67.56	67.07	67.22			
<i>Impact of event on those youth who experienced it:</i>												
Extremely positive	20.65	22.16	25.35	27.41	32.08	18.51	16.06	28.36	23.55			
Somewhat positive	43.99	39.99	35.20	30.63	32.08	40.76	44.48	34.77	38.68			
No impact	15.32	18.92	14.08	11.30	20.74	18.51	22.01	13.12	16.60			
Somewhat negative	14.68	12.42	18.31	29.04	13.22	14.81	13.32	17.67	15.86			
Extremely negative	5.32	6.48	7.04	1.63	1.88	7.41	4.13	6.10	5.28			

Table 11.1
Youth's life events (continued)

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total			
	A	B	C	D	E	F						
Events which occurred since youth turned 18 and their impact on youth's life												
Separation from spouse/ partner (due to work, travel, etc.)												
Total respondents	513	521	210	193	151	83	672	995	1,671			
Did not happen	82.85	76.78	80.48	86.01	75.5	78.31	82.44	78.59	80.13			
Impact of event on those youth who experienced it:												
Extremely positive	2.27	5.77	0.00	0.00	2.69	5.53	1.71	4.20	3.32			
Somewhat positive	14.75	13.22	7.33	11.08	10.82	5.53	9.34	13.59	12.03			
No impact	15.92	29.76	26.84	14.80	27.02	33.33	28.82	21.58	24.41			
Somewhat negative	51.14	38.85	53.69	55.54	51.35	38.87	47.44	46.47	46.70			
Extremely negative	15.92	12.40	12.19	18.51	8.12	16.64	12.70	14.11	13.54			
Relationship problems with boyfriend/girlfriend												
Total respondents	512	520	210	194	152	84	674	994	1,672			
Did not happen	43.36	36.15	39.05	32.47	38.16	42.86	43.62	35.41	38.82			
Impact of event on those youth who experienced it:												
Extremely positive	1.73	5.42	1.56	0.00	2.13	0.00	2.38	2.80	2.63			
Somewhat positive	12.41	13.25	10.94	13.74	12.76	12.50	11.58	13.24	12.72			
No impact	11.03	13.55	14.85	14.50	10.64	16.66	17.63	10.28	12.99			
Somewhat negative	63.10	52.70	58.59	58.02	62.77	58.33	53.42	61.22	58.27			
Extremely negative	11.72	15.07	14.06	13.74	11.71	12.50	15.01	12.46	13.39			
Youth or youth's spouse/ partner got pregnant												
Total respondents	513	520	210	193	151	84	671	996	1,671			
Did not happen	94.35	84.04	89.05	91.19	87.42	78.57	90.01	87.85	88.69			
Impact of event on those youth who experienced it:												
Extremely positive	17.17	37.34	43.47	23.50	31.56	44.42	17.92	42.96	33.86			
Somewhat positive	10.27	16.85	17.35	29.40	21.07	22.21	25.33	13.25	17.95			
No impact	24.07	13.28	21.74	0.00	26.31	11.11	19.42	14.07	15.92			
Somewhat negative	13.81	14.47	13.06	23.50	10.49	16.66	17.92	13.25	14.85			
Extremely negative	34.51	18.05	4.38	23.50	10.49	5.55	19.42	16.54	17.42			
Youth or youth's partner/ spouse had an abortion												
Total respondents	513	520	210	194	151	83	672	995	1,671			
Did not happen	95.52	88.27	93.81	93.81	90.73	89.16	91.37	92.56	92.1			
Impact of event on those youth who experienced it:												
Extremely positive	8.71	6.56	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.21	4.03	4.56			
Somewhat positive	0.00	9.80	7.75	25.04	14.24	11.07	12.05	8.06	9.87			
No impact	34.82	22.93	46.20	8.40	21.47	22.23	29.32	22.98	25.70			
Somewhat negative	17.41	24.55	23.10	33.28	28.59	55.54	32.79	21.64	26.46			
Extremely negative	39.06	36.06	23.10	33.28	35.71	11.07	20.74	43.28	33.29			

Table 11.1
Youth's life events (continued)

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total			
	A	B	C	D	E	F						
<i>Events which occurred since youth turned 18 and their impact on youth's life</i>												
<i>Trouble with the police</i>												
Total respondents	513	520	210	194	151	84	672	996	1,672			
Did not happen	84.8	77.88	80	79.38	78.81	75	70.24	87.15	80.38			
<i>Impact of event on those youth who experienced it:</i>												
Extremely positive	1.25	3.48	0.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	2.99	0.78	2.14			
Somewhat positive	17.96	11.30	7.15	14.99	18.74	9.52	14.01	12.53	13.40			
No impact	20.53	33.91	35.70	24.98	31.24	38.08	31.01	28.09	29.87			
Somewhat negative	48.75	39.10	42.85	47.48	40.63	28.56	39.52	46.85	42.35			
Extremely negative	11.51	12.16	14.30	7.52	9.39	23.80	12.50	11.75	12.18			
<i>Youth arrested/ attended court due to offending/ put in jail</i>												
Total respondents	513	520	209	194	151	83	670	996	1,670			
Did not happen	94.35	89.62	92.34	93.81	88.08	87.95	86.72	94.98	91.68			
<i>Impact of event on those youth who experienced it:</i>												
Somewhat positive	6.90	11.08	6.27	0.00	16.69	9.96	10.09	7.97	9.38			
No impact	17.17	35.16	24.93	8.40	33.31	9.96	24.70	28.09	25.96			
Somewhat negative	37.88	20.42	31.20	58.32	16.69	40.00	32.61	23.90	29.57			
Extremely negative	37.88	33.33	37.47	33.28	33.31	40.00	32.61	40.04	35.22			
<i>Significant financial improvement (not related to work)</i>												
Total respondents	513	521	210	194	151	84	673	996	1,673			
Did not happen	82.65	79.46	80	85.57	86.09	79.76	76.82	85.34	81.83			
<i>Impact of event on those youth who experienced it:</i>												
Extremely positive	32.56	25.22	23.80	28.55	28.54	41.16	23.73	33.56	28.62			
Somewhat positive	49.45	42.99	57.15	50.03	47.59	23.52	48.71	44.54	46.73			
No impact	14.58	16.80	11.90	14.28	19.05	11.76	18.59	11.66	15.13			
Somewhat negative	1.10	6.52	4.75	3.60	4.74	17.64	3.84	6.14	4.95			
Extremely negative	2.25	8.42	2.40	3.60	0.00	5.88	5.13	4.09	4.62			
<i>Major financial loss (not related to work)</i>												
Total respondents	513	520	209	193	151	84	672	994	1,670			
Did not happen	91.81	85.19	84.69	92.75	90.07	79.76	84.97	90.44	88.2			
<i>Impact of event on those youth who experienced it:</i>												
Extremely positive impact	0.00	1.28	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.05	0.51			
Somewhat positive	4.76	5.20	3.14	14.34	0.00	17.64	5.92	6.28	6.10			
No impact	7.08	11.68	18.75	0.00	33.33	11.76	13.84	11.61	12.71			
Somewhat negative	59.46	54.56	56.24	57.24	33.33	47.04	50.50	56.80	53.81			
Extremely negative	28.57	27.28	21.88	28.55	33.33	23.52	29.67	24.16	26.86			

Table 11.1
Youth's life events (continued)

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total			
	A	B	C	D	E	F						
Events which occurred since youth turned 18 and their impact on youth's life												
Foreclosure on mortgage or loan												
Total respondents	513	519	210	194	151	84	671	996	1,671			
Did not happen	97.08	94.22	94.29	95.88	95.36	91.67	94.04	96.08	95.27			
Impact of event on those youth who experienced it:												
Extremely positive	6.51	13.32	0.00	25.00	0.00	14.29	14.93	5.10	10.15			
Somewhat positive	6.51	13.32	8.41	25.00	14.22	14.29	12.58	12.76	12.68			
No impact	53.42	36.68	50.09	12.62	42.89	14.29	39.93	35.97	38.05			
Somewhat negative	19.86	20.07	33.27	12.62	0.00	28.57	17.45	22.96	20.30			
Extremely negative	13.36	16.61	8.41	25.00	42.89	28.57	14.93	22.96	19.03			
Borrowing more than \$10,000 (buying home, business, etc.)												
Total respondents	513	520	210	194	152	84	673	996	1,673			
Did not happen	87.72	85.19	81.9	85.57	80.92	75	83.51	85.54	84.7			
Impact of event on those youth who experienced it:												
Extremely positive	30.13	19.45	23.70	21.41	20.70	33.32	17.10	29.18	24.25			
Somewhat positive	30.13	16.88	28.95	46.43	27.57	28.56	35.11	21.51	27.32			
No impact	28.58	32.48	23.70	21.41	27.57	4.76	25.23	27.11	26.14			
Somewhat negative	11.07	18.16	15.80	10.74	13.78	23.80	15.34	15.28	15.23			
Extremely negative	0.00	12.96	7.90	0.00	10.32	9.52	7.22	6.92	7.06			
Borrowing less than \$10,000 (buying car, getting school loan, etc)												
Total respondents	512	519	209	192	151	83	672	990	1,666			
Did not happen	83.59	75.34	75.6	76.56	80.79	65.06	75.74	79.49	78.03			
Impact of event on those youth who experienced it:												
Extremely positive	13.10	17.19	11.76	13.35	27.59	17.23	14.72	16.72	15.84			
Somewhat positive	33.33	32.04	29.43	44.45	17.23	31.02	30.05	33.98	32.23			
No impact	38.09	20.32	33.32	28.88	20.67	24.13	30.05	25.60	27.58			
Somewhat negative	10.73	23.44	19.59	11.09	27.59	17.23	19.62	17.26	18.30			
Extremely negative	4.75	7.02	5.90	2.22	6.87	10.33	5.52	6.39	6.01			
New job												
Total respondents	512	520	207	194	152	84	672	993	1,669			
Did not happen	22.46	25.00	24.64	20.62	18.42	26.19	23.51	22.86	23.13			
Impact of event on those youth who experienced it:												
Extremely positive	46.35	49.23	45.51	46.75	41.93	43.54	45.13	47.78	46.61			
Somewhat positive	44.58	40.00	41.67	43.51	45.16	41.93	42.02	42.82	42.63			
No impact	5.79	6.16	5.12	3.25	6.45	8.06	7.58	4.43	5.68			
Somewhat negative	3.02	4.11	7.05	5.85	5.65	4.84	4.47	4.56	4.53			
Extremely negative	0.26	0.51	0.64	0.66	0.81	1.61	0.78	0.39	0.55			

Table 11.1
Youth's life events (continued)

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total			
	A	B	C	D	E	F						
<i>Events which occurred since youth turned 18 and their impact on youth's life</i>												
<i>Changed work situation (responsibility, working conditions, hours, etc)</i>												
Total respondents	513	521	210	194	151	83	673	995	1,672			
Did not happen	26.12	34.93	31.43	24.74	24.5	24.1	32.99	26.53	29.13			
<i>Impact of event on those youth who experienced it:</i>												
Extremely positive	31.93	29.49	31.94	26.71	24.56	25.40	25.06	32.29	29.53			
Somewhat positive	44.59	46.90	44.45	40.41	50.00	53.97	45.46	45.83	45.75			
No impact	11.34	11.20	8.33	15.76	9.64	6.35	15.52	8.34	11.05			
Somewhat negative	11.34	9.44	14.58	16.44	13.15	12.70	11.76	12.32	12.06			
Extremely negative	0.79	2.95	0.70	0.69	2.64	1.58	2.22	1.22	1.61			
<i>Trouble with employer (danger of losing job, fired, suspended, demoted, etc)</i>												
Total respondents	513	521	210	194	151	84	673	996	1,673			
Did not happen	75.44	71.4	75.71	66.49	76.16	66.67	69.99	74.8	72.8			
<i>Impact of event on those youth who experienced it:</i>												
Extremely positive	0.77	0.66	5.89	3.07	2.77	0.00	1.50	1.98	1.76			
Somewhat positive	9.53	15.42	5.89	7.70	5.54	3.57	11.90	8.77	10.11			
No impact	15.88	18.11	21.57	18.47	22.23	17.85	22.29	15.16	18.24			
Somewhat negative	57.94	49.65	56.85	52.31	52.77	50.02	49.52	56.19	53.38			
Extremely negative	15.88	16.12	9.80	18.47	16.65	28.56	14.86	17.94	16.47			
<i>Change in spouse/partner's work (loss of job, beginning new job, etc)</i>												
Total respondents	513	519	209	194	152	84	672	995	1,671			
Did not happen	82.46	73.22	78.47	80.93	76.97	70.24	82.74	74.57	77.8			
<i>Impact of event on those youth who experienced it:</i>												
Extremely positive	22.23	15.83	20.02	18.93	11.42	19.99	10.37	21.35	18.06			
Somewhat positive	20.01	20.13	22.20	24.33	31.44	19.99	23.29	21.35	21.85			
No impact	22.23	17.25	20.02	16.20	28.57	12.00	26.71	16.20	19.41			
Somewhat negative	32.21	33.83	28.89	35.13	20.02	35.99	30.19	32.40	31.80			
Extremely negative	3.31	12.96	8.87	5.40	8.55	12.00	9.50	8.69	8.87			
<i>Trouble with in-laws</i>												
Total respondents	512	519	210	194	151	84	672	994	1,670			
Did not happen	91.6	84.78	88.1	90.72	89.4	80.95	88.99	87.73	88.2			
<i>Impact of event on those youth who experienced it:</i>												
Somewhat positive	4.64	5.06	0.00	11.10	6.23	12.49	9.45	3.26	5.59			
No impact	27.86	18.99	36.05	16.70	37.45	31.23	28.43	23.80	25.34			
Somewhat negative	58.10	58.21	47.98	55.50	31.23	43.73	50.05	54.93	53.31			
Extremely negative	9.29	17.74	15.97	16.70	25.00	12.49	12.17	18.01	15.76			

Table 11.1
Youth's life events (continued)

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total			
	A	B	C	D	E	F						
<i>Events which occurred since youth turned 18 and their impact on youth's life</i>												
<i>Major change in closeness of family members (increased or decreased closeness)</i>												
Total respondents	512	518	210	194	152	84	670	996	1,670			
Did not happen	67.19	55.02	58.1	60.82	60.53	52.38	65.67	56.63	60.18			
<i>Impact of event on those youth who experienced it:</i>												
Extremely positive	17.25	9.45	9.09	13.14	13.33	14.99	7.84	14.83	12.48			
Somewhat positive	19.66	18.45	15.92	15.80	15.00	17.49	18.26	17.36	17.75			
No impact	10.12	13.29	15.92	10.52	16.67	12.49	17.39	10.42	12.78			
Somewhat negative	43.46	41.64	45.47	42.09	40.01	50.00	42.62	43.30	43.02			
Extremely negative	9.54	17.16	13.63	18.43	15.00	5.00	13.92	14.11	13.99			
<i>Death of a spouse/partner</i>												
Total respondents	512	516	210	194	151	84	671	992	1,667			
Did not happen	97.27	93.6	93.81	96.91	94.7	94.05	94.34	95.87	95.26			
<i>Impact of event on those youth who experienced it:</i>												
Somewhat positive	7.33	18.13	0.00	0.00	12.45	0.00	13.25	7.26	10.13			
No impact	14.29	18.13	30.69	0.00	37.55	0.00	21.02	17.19	18.99			
Somewhat negative	21.61	18.13	23.10	0.00	0.00	60.00	15.72	22.03	18.99			
Extremely negative	57.14	45.47	46.20	100.00	50.00	40.00	50.00	53.75	51.90			
<i>Death of a close friend or family member</i>												
Total respondents	513	519	210	194	152	83	673	994	1,671			
Did not happen	63.55	55.11	60.48	69.59	59.87	59.04	60.77	60.56	60.68			
<i>Impact of event on those youth who experienced it:</i>												
Extremely positive	1.07	3.43	2.40	5.10	0.00	0.00	3.03	1.77	2.29			
Somewhat positive	6.42	5.15	1.21	6.77	4.91	5.88	5.68	4.84	5.16			
No impact	10.15	10.74	8.43	8.48	11.49	8.81	11.75	8.92	10.05			
Somewhat negative	57.23	45.49	63.87	32.19	39.35	58.84	47.72	51.52	50.08			
Extremely negative	25.13	35.20	24.09	47.45	44.26	26.46	31.81	32.91	32.43			
<i>Major personal illness or injury</i>												
Total respondents	513	518	210	194	152	84	673	994	1,671			
Did not happen	77.78	72.78	70.00	73.71	76.97	83.33	71.47	77.36	74.99			
<i>Impact of event on those youth who experienced it:</i>												
Extremely positive	0.86	2.13	0.00	0.00	5.73	0.00	1.05	1.77	1.44			
Somewhat positive	3.51	6.39	7.93	7.84	2.87	0.00	4.70	6.23	5.52			
No impact	13.14	15.61	12.70	7.84	17.15	7.14	18.23	9.32	13.39			
Somewhat negative	59.68	46.80	52.37	49.03	51.41	57.11	47.91	56.01	52.18			
Extremely negative	22.82	29.10	27.00	35.30	22.84	35.69	28.11	26.68	27.51			

Table 11.1
Youth's life events (continued)

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total			
	A	B	C	D	E	F						
<i>Events which occurred since youth turned 18 and their impact on youth's life</i>												
<i>Someone close to youth had a serious injury or illness</i>												
Total respondents	513	521	209	194	151	84	672	996	1,672			
Did not happen	64.13	62.96	63.64	59.28	60.93	59.52	62.65	62.75	62.62			
<i>Impact of event on those youth who experienced it:</i>												
Extremely positive	1.09	3.10	3.96	1.28	1.69	0.00	1.61	2.42	2.09			
Somewhat positive	5.44	7.26	5.25	5.06	6.78	2.94	4.79	6.47	5.91			
No impact	11.40	9.31	10.53	8.87	13.57	8.82	16.73	6.20	10.41			
Somewhat negative	64.12	53.89	60.53	70.90	59.33	61.76	61.37	60.64	60.81			
Extremely negative	17.93	26.43	19.75	13.92	18.63	26.46	15.53	24.27	20.81			
<i>Major change in eating habits (much more or less intake, change in diet, etc)</i>												
Total respondents	513	519	210	193	152	84	672	995	1,671			
Did not happen	51.07	41.62	48.10	48.19	50.66	45.24	50.00	45.23	47.10			
<i>Impact of event on those youth who experienced it:</i>												
Extremely positive	15.94	13.86	13.76	11.00	9.34	8.69	11.90	14.31	13.46			
Somewhat positive	30.68	28.06	31.19	28.01	29.33	36.96	30.96	28.99	29.75			
No impact	15.53	17.81	11.00	15.00	17.33	15.21	18.76	14.13	15.84			
Somewhat negative	33.07	29.70	33.95	38.00	37.33	36.96	31.54	34.12	33.14			
Extremely negative	4.78	10.57	10.10	8.01	6.67	2.17	6.84	8.44	7.81			
<i>Change of residence</i>												
Total respondents	513	518	210	192	151	84	671	993	1,668			
Did not happen	59.65	45.95	48.57	55.21	51.66	51.19	54.10	51.16	52.34			
<i>Impact of event on those youth who experienced it:</i>												
Extremely positive	30.93	30.36	31.48	32.55	24.66	31.71	24.68	33.82	30.44			
Somewhat positive	39.60	35.00	30.55	33.71	43.84	34.15	35.08	37.12	36.24			
No impact	18.36	17.85	19.44	23.26	23.29	12.19	25.32	15.05	18.99			
Somewhat negative	7.73	13.58	13.88	4.64	6.85	21.94	11.05	10.93	10.95			
Extremely negative	3.37	3.22	4.63	5.80	1.37	0.00	3.90	3.09	3.40			
<i>Leaving home for the first time</i>												
Total respondents	512	520	210	194	151	84	672	995	1,671			
Did not happen	62.30	56.73	59.52	62.37	62.91	63.10	62.65	58.69	60.32			
<i>Impact of event on those youth who experienced it:</i>												
Extremely positive	41.96	37.79	38.81	41.08	39.28	35.50	35.07	42.10	39.52			
Somewhat positive	37.29	33.33	31.77	36.99	33.92	29.02	35.45	34.06	34.53			
No impact	11.41	15.99	9.41	9.59	16.07	6.45	18.34	9.25	12.68			
Somewhat negative	8.30	8.44	14.11	8.21	7.14	22.57	7.18	11.18	9.65			
Extremely negative	1.03	4.44	5.88	4.12	3.56	6.45	3.99	3.41	3.63			

Table 11.1
Youth's life events (continued)

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total			
	A	B	C	D	E	F						
<i>Events which occurred since youth turned 18 and their impact on youth's life</i>												
<i>Outstanding personal achievement</i>												
Total respondents	512	521	210	194	152	84	674	995	1,673			
Did not happen	41.99	42.23	43.81	47.42	33.55	40.48	42.88	41.61	42.08			
<i>Impact of event on those youth who experienced it:</i>												
Extremely positive	48.82	50.84	43.23	39.22	49.50	52.00	40.00	53.37	47.98			
Somewhat positive	45.79	36.89	51.70	48.04	39.61	36.00	48.56	38.89	42.83			
No impact	3.71	9.97	3.38	12.74	8.91	4.00	9.87	5.34	7.11			
Somewhat negative	0.67	1.00	0.85	0.00	0.99	6.00	0.79	1.20	1.04			
Extremely negative	1.02	1.33	0.85	0.00	0.99	2.00	0.79	1.20	1.04			
<i>Increased social or church activities</i>												
Total respondents	513	519	210	193	150	84	670	995	1,669			
Did not happen	47.56	50.87	49.05	51.81	54.00	52.38	51.79	48.84	50.09			
<i>Impact of event on those youth who experienced it:</i>												
Extremely positive	42.37	37.25	33.64	30.11	37.67	27.51	33.75	39.29	37.21			
Somewhat positive	47.96	44.31	57.94	53.77	47.83	60.00	50.16	48.92	49.35			
No impact	7.44	14.90	7.48	11.83	14.50	2.50	13.63	8.64	10.56			
Somewhat negative	1.85	1.95	0.00	4.30	0.00	7.50	0.93	2.76	2.04			
Extremely negative	0.36	1.57	0.94	0.00	0.00	2.50	1.56	0.39	0.84			
<i>Decreased social or church activities</i>												
Total respondents	513	520	210	194	151	84	672	996	1,672			
Did not happen	73.29	71.54	72.38	77.32	72.19	79.76	72.02	74.30	73.33			
<i>Impact of event on those youth who experienced it:</i>												
Extremely positive	5.09	3.37	3.44	4.54	2.37	5.88	5.33	3.11	4.05			
Somewhat positive	12.39	5.41	3.44	2.29	9.53	17.64	8.51	7.43	7.84			
No impact	27.74	36.47	29.33	31.83	40.49	29.40	30.84	33.97	32.51			
Somewhat negative	45.26	42.59	50.00	50.00	35.71	47.04	43.60	45.33	44.62			
Extremely negative	9.47	12.16	13.79	11.38	11.90	0.00	11.69	10.16	10.99			
<i>Youth had an alcohol problem</i>												
Total respondents	513	519	210	194	151	84	672	995	1,671			
Did not happen	92.2	88.63	91.9	92.78	92.05	89.29	87.05	93.57	90.96			
<i>Impact of event on those youth who experienced it:</i>												
Extremely positive	2.44	1.67	0.00	7.20	0.00	0.00	2.32	1.56	1.99			
Somewhat positive	2.44	6.77	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.63	1.56	3.32			
No impact	25.00	21.99	41.11	7.20	25.03	11.11	20.69	26.59	23.12			
Somewhat negative	42.44	45.73	52.96	71.33	49.94	55.56	52.90	43.70	49.00			
Extremely negative	27.44	23.75	5.93	14.27	25.03	33.33	19.54	26.59	22.46			

Table 11.1
Youth's life events (continued)

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total			
	A	B	C	D	E	F						
<i>Events which occurred since youth turned 18 and their impact on youth's life</i>												
<i>Youth had a drug abuse problem</i>												
Total respondents	513	520	210	194	151	84	672	996	1,672			
Did not happen	94.54	88.46	90.48	94.85	91.39	89.29	89.58	93.07	91.63			
<i>Impact of event on those youth who experienced it:</i>												
Extremely positive	7.14	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.44	1.44	1.43			
Somewhat positive	3.48	11.70	5.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.54	4.33	6.45			
No impact	28.57	23.31	25.00	10.10	38.44	11.11	28.60	20.35	24.25			
Somewhat negative	32.05	40.03	50.00	70.10	15.33	66.67	41.46	40.55	41.46			
Extremely negative	28.57	24.96	19.96	20.00	46.11	22.22	19.96	33.33	26.40			
<i>Victim of crime (assault, robbery, etc)</i>												
Total respondents	515	520	210	194	151	84	674	996	1,674			
Did not happen	89.13	80.96	83.81	84.02	79.47	79.76	82.2	85.34	83.99			
<i>Impact of event on those youth who experienced it:</i>												
Extremely positive	0.00	0.00	2.96	0.00	6.43	0.00	0.84	1.36	1.12			
Somewhat positive	3.59	6.04	0.00	3.25	6.43	0.00	5.84	2.73	4.12			
No impact	23.18	18.17	17.67	9.70	25.82	17.64	24.16	15.08	19.05			
Somewhat negative	42.87	40.39	52.93	54.82	38.72	47.04	49.16	40.38	44.41			
Extremely negative	30.36	35.35	26.50	32.23	22.60	35.28	20.00	40.38	31.36			
<i>Treated for mental or emotional issue</i>												
Total respondents	515	519	211	194	151	83	674	995	1,673			
Did not happen	86.02	78.81	83.41	86.08	82.78	81.93	85.76	81.11	82.96			
<i>Impact of event on those youth who experienced it:</i>												
Extremely positive	9.73	9.11	8.56	18.53	19.22	6.64	15.66	8.52	10.86			
Somewhat positive	30.54	31.81	28.57	25.93	30.78	26.67	23.95	33.51	30.16			
No impact	18.03	21.80	25.74	14.80	11.56	13.34	25.00	15.99	19.31			
Somewhat negative	23.61	20.91	17.12	25.93	19.22	40.01	22.89	22.34	22.48			
Extremely negative	18.03	16.38	20.01	14.80	19.22	13.34	12.50	19.69	17.19			
<i>Someone close to youth had an alcohol problem</i>												
Total respondents	515	520	211	194	151	84	674	997	1,675			
Did not happen	87.96	75.19	81.04	84.54	84.77	77.38	82.79	81.44	81.91			
<i>Impact of event on those youth who experienced it:</i>												
Extremely positive	1.58	4.64	2.48	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.43	2.16	2.65			
Somewhat positive	6.48	4.64	2.48	3.36	0.00	0.00	5.17	3.23	3.98			
No impact	14.53	15.52	14.98	10.03	13.07	5.26	18.13	11.37	13.88			
Somewhat negative	62.87	50.38	50.00	63.32	60.87	63.17	53.46	57.27	55.78			
Extremely negative	14.53	24.79	30.01	23.35	26.07	31.56	19.81	25.92	23.77			

Table 11.1
Youth's life events (continued)

	Stratification category						Male	Female	Total			
	A	B	C	D	E	F						
<i>Events which occurred since youth turned 18 and their impact on youth's life</i>												
<i>Someone close to youth had a drug abuse problem</i>												
Total respondents	515	520	211	194	151	84	674	997	1,675			
Did not happen	86.8	74.42	83.41	84.02	80.13	82.14	79.97	82.35	81.37			
<i>Impact of event on those youth who experienced it:</i>												
Extremely positive	1.44	1.49	2.83	3.25	3.32	0.00	2.25	1.70	1.93			
Somewhat positive	8.86	6.02	0.00	3.25	3.32	0.00	8.14	2.83	5.15			
No impact	13.26	15.05	17.12	12.89	19.98	13.33	19.27	11.95	15.08			
Somewhat negative	57.35	49.61	51.42	51.63	53.35	53.30	51.87	52.86	52.23			
Extremely negative	19.09	27.83	28.57	29.04	19.98	33.31	18.52	30.71	25.66			

REFERENCES

ABS, 2005. *Australian Social Trends, Population, People in their 20s: Then and Now*, Catalogue No. 4102.0, Australian Bureau of Statistics, Canberra.

ABS, 2008. *Australian Social Trends: Risk Taking by Young People*, Catalogue No. 4102.0, Australian Bureau of Statistics, Canberra.

Barón, Juan D., 2008. "Exploring the factors associated with youths' educational outcomes: the role of locus of control and parental socio-economic background", pp 121-75 in the Australian National University PhD thesis "*Contemporary social policy: an analysis of economic and social disadvantage in Australia and Colombia*".

Barón, Juan D., Deborah A. Cobb-Clark, and Nisvan Erkal, 2008. "*Cultural Transmission of work-welfare attitudes and the intergenerational correlation in welfare attitudes*", Youth in Focus Discussion Paper no. 5.

Borjas, George, 1992. "Ethnic Capital and Intergenerational Mobility", *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 107, pp. 123- 150.

Case, Anne, Angela Fertig, and Christina Paxson, 2003. "*From Cradle to Grave? The Lasting Impact of Childhood Health and Circumstance*", NBER Working Paper No. W9788, June. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=418290>

Cobb-Clark, Deborah A., 2007. "*Leaving Home: What Economics Has to Say about the Living Arrangements of Young Australians*", unpublished working paper.

Cobb-Clark, Deborah A., Chris Ryan, and Anastasia Sartbayeva, 2008. "*Taking Chances: the Effect of Growing up on Welfare on the Risky Behavior of Young People*", working paper.

Cobb-Clark, Deborah A., and Anastasia Sartbayeva, 2007. "*The relationship between income-support history characteristics and outcomes of Australian youth*", Youth in Focus Discussion Paper no. 2.

Cobb-Clark, Deborah A., and Michelle Tan, 2009. "*Noncognitive Skills, Occupational Attainment, and Relative Wages*", IZA Discussion Paper no. 4289, July 2009.

Cohen, Yinon, and Andrea Tyree, 1986. "Escape from Poverty: Determinants of Intergenerational Mobility of Sons and Daughters of the Poor", *Social Science Quarterly*, 67, pp. 803-183.

Currie, Janet, and Mark Stabile, 2002. "*Socioeconomic Status and Health: Why is the Relationship Stronger for Older Children?*", NBER Working Paper 9098, August.

d'Addio, Anna C., 2007. "*Intergenerational Transmission of Disadvantage: Mobility or Immobility across Generations? A Review of the Evidence for OECD Countries*", OECD Social, Employment and Migration Working Papers No. 52.

Dearden, Lorraine, Stephen Machin, and Howard Reed, 1997. "Intergenerational Mobility in Britain", *Economic Journal*, 107(440), pp. 47-66.

Dechter, Aimee, and Pamela J. Smock. 1994. "*The Fading Breadwinner Role and the Economic Implications for Young Couples*," Discussion Paper no. 1051-94, Institute for Research on Poverty, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Gruber, Jonathan (ed), 2001. *Risky Behavior Among Youths: An Economic Analysis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hartley, Robyn, 1993. "Young Adults Living at Home", *Family Matters*, No. 36, December, pp. 35 – 37.

Haveman, Robert, Gary Sandefur, Barbara Wolfe, and Andrea Voyer, 2001. "Inequality of Family and Community Characteristics in Relation to Children's Attainments: A Review of Trends in Levels and Inequality in Characteristics and Attainments and Estimated Relationships between Them", University of Wisconsin, unpublished working paper.

Haveman, Robert and Barbara Wolfe, 1995. "The Determinants of Children's Attainments: A Review of Methods and Findings", *Journal of Economic Literature*, Vol. 33(4), December, pp. 1829-1878.

Israel, Mark, and Michael Seeborg, 1998. "The Impact of Youth Characteristics and Experiences on Transitions Out of Poverty", *Journal of Socio-Economics*, Vol. 27 (6), pp. 753-776.

Klepinger, Daniel, Shelly Lundberg, and Robert Plotnick, 1997. "How Does Adolescent Fertility Affect the Human Capital and Wages of Young Women?", Discussion Paper no. 1145-97, September 1997, Institute for Research on Poverty.

Knight, Frank H., 1921. *Risk, uncertainty, and profit*. Houghton Mifflin, New York.

Kihlstrom, Richard E., and Jean-Jacques Laffont, 1979. "A general equilibrium entrepreneurial theory of firm formation based on risk aversion", *Journal of Political Economy*, 87(4), pp. 719–48.

McCoull, Frances, and Jocelyn Pech, 2000. "Trans-generational income support dependence in Australia: early evidence" in P Saunders (ed) *Reforming the Australian welfare state*, Australian Institute of Family Studies, Melbourne, pp. 91-111.

McLeod, Jane D., and Ronald C. Kessler, 1990. "Socioeconomic status differences in vulnerability to undesirable life events", *Journal of Health and Social Behaviour*, 31(June), pp. 162-72.

Nicholson, Jan, Julie-Anne Carroll, Alison Brodie, Elizabeth Waters, and Graham Vimpani, 2004. "Child and Youth Health Inequalities in Australia: The Status of the Australian Research 2003", Paper prepared for the Health Inequalities Research Collaboration, Children, Youth and Families Network, October.

Pech, Jocelyn, and Frances McCoull, 1998. "Transgenerational poverty and income support dependence in Australia: work in progress", *Social Security Journal*, 1998/2, pp. 167-182.

-----, 2000. "Transgenerational welfare dependence: myths and realities", *Australian Social Policy*, (1), pp. 43-68.

Pfeifer, Christian, 2008. "A Note on Risk Aversion and Labour Market Outcomes: further evidence from German survey data", IZA Discussion Paper No. 3523, May 2008.

Ryan, Chris, and Anastasia Sartbayeva, 2008. "Young Australians and Social Inclusion", SPRS Report 2008.

Schneider, Judy, 1999. "The Increasing Financial Dependency of Young People on Their Parents", SPRC Discussion Paper No. 96, February.

Weston, Ruth, David Stanton, Lixia Qu, and Grace Soriano, 2001. "Australian Families in Transition", *Family Matters*, No. 60, Spring/Summer, pp. 12-23.

Whittington, Leslie A., and H. Elizabeth Peters, 1996. "Economic Incentives for Financial and Residential Independence", *Demography*, Vol. 33(1), February, pp. 82-97.