

*“Youths and the Pathways they Travel:
The Roles of Human Capital and Eurocentric Appearance”*

Darrick Hamilton
Milano--The New School for Management and Urban Policy
The New School
72 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10011
Office: (212) 229-5400, ext. 1514
Fax: (212) 229-5335
e-mail: hamiltod@newschool.edu

Jason M. Fletcher, PhD
Division of Health Policy and Administration
Department of Epidemiology and Public Health
Yale University
Office:
Fax:
e-mail: Jason.fletcher@yale.edu

Arthur H. Goldsmith
Department of Economics
Washington and Lee University
Lexington, VA 24450
Office: (540) 463-8970
Fax: (540) 463-8639
e-mail: GoldsmithA@wlu.edu

William Darity, Jr.
Sanford Institute of Public Policy
Duke University
Durham, NC 27708
Office: (919) 613-7336
e-mail: wd2@duke.edu

“Youths and the Pathways they Travel: The Roles of
Human Capital and Eurocentric Appearance”

“Adults, older girls, shops, magazines, newspapers, window signs--all the world had agreed that a blue-eyed, yellow-haired, pink-skinned doll was what every girl child treasured. ‘Here’ they said, this is beautiful, and if you are on this day ‘worthy’ you may have it.”

*Each night, without fail, she prayed for blue eyes.
(The Bluest Eye, Toni Morrison, pp. 20-21, and 46)*

I. Introduction

There is an emerging literature that suggests that the path that youths embark upon has important socioeconomic implications for individual life outcomes (Besharov 1999; and Mincy 2006). Human capital accumulation early in life, through either enrollment in school or employment, typically leads to higher wages and other amenities later in life. Thus, Shore (2003), Mincy (2006) and Edelman, Holzer and Offner (2006) argue that the vast early life disconnection or idleness (i.e. neither enrolled in school nor working) of youths (black males in particular) foretells dire consequences for their life outcomes.¹ Edelman, Holzer and Offner (2006) emphasize the role of impoverished schools, broken neighborhoods, and family background in explaining disconnection. However, a possible explanation that the literature has not considered is the influence of cursory characteristics such as appearance in determining the path in which youth embark, and hence young adult human capital accumulation.

There is also a literature (Hamermesh and Biddle 1994; Biddle and Hamermesh 1998, Harper 2000) that theorizes and documents a positive relationship between *beauty* and labor market outcomes. They find that individuals rated as attractive earn significantly higher wages than less attractive individuals, controlling for a wide array of conventional wage determinants, leading them to attribute the gap to preferential

¹ Disconnection may also influence psychological development. Erikson’s (1959) Life Span Development Theory posits that there are eight major stages of human development and that healthy psychological development depends on successful competition of each stage. Youths exiting high school are in the midst of the fifth stage, the *industry stage*. At this point in the life cycle a healthy transition from adolescence to adulthood is contingent upon the attainment of a desirable economic identity which requires a sense of “*knowing where one is going*.” Thus, being disconnected may diminish an individual’s sense of worth and harm psychological well-being (Goldsmith, Veum, and Darity 1996).

treatment.² In this paper, we link the literature on the economic returns to attractiveness with the literature on young adult human capital accumulation. *Eurocentric phenotype*, plays a central role in defining standards of beauty, and governs both status and treatment.³ Thus, we examine if Eurocentric characteristics, influences young adult investments in human capital.

Our theory of how Eurocentric characteristics influences early life paths builds upon the Goldsmith, Hamilton, and Darity (2007) *preference for whiteness* theory, which suggests that favorable treatment in the U.S. is granted to individuals based on proximity to the white *in-group*.⁴ According to Hill (2002) a consensus is building that individuals and institutions grant favorable treatment, opportunities and rewards to African Americans based on how closely their appearance approximates that of Eurocentric standards. We examine if a variety of observable characteristics are associated with an idealized Eurocentric representation of *in-group* membership such as height, weight, eye color, hair color and skin shade. Given this conceptualization of the *in-group*, a variety of cursory characteristics, including skin shade, may lead to favorable treatment and ultimately influence early life outcomes. Based on characteristics available in the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health Survey (Add Health) we examine if having characteristics correlated with Eurocentric norms (the *in-group*) influences young adult human capital investment.

We estimate a multinomial logit model for youths between the ages 18-27 to estimate the relationship between Eurocentric characteristics and whether the respondents are enrolled in school relative to “disconnection” or employed relative to “disconnection”, while controlling for human capital and demographic factors along with school based, neighborhood based and family based characteristics. The convention in

² The employer discrimination based on beauty was more evident in Hamermesh and Biddle (1994) which examined individuals across labor markets in both the U.S. and Canada, and was less evident in Biddle and Hamermesh (1998), which examined individuals graduating from a prestigious U.S. law school.

³ For a literary description of how Eurocentric features influences treatment and status, aside from Toni Morrison’s *Bluest Eye*, see John Dollard’s *Caste and Class in a Southern Town* (1937) especially pages 67-71.

⁴ Following insights from social psychology (Tajfel and Turner, 1986; Campbell, 1965; Fisk and Ruscher, 1993) and anthropology (Sumner, 1906), the theory asserts that social categorization is a fundamental cognitive process leading to “in-groups” and “out-groups,” where “out-groups” are exposed to prejudicial attitudes and biased judgments and “in-group” members receive preferential treatment. In the U.S. context, socialization patterns and the structure of rewards have lead to “whiteness” as a defining attribute of the in-group.

the social science is to capture Eurocentric characteristics with a single bivariate indicator for race. We follow Goldsmith, Hamilton, and Darity (2007) and use a categorical indicator of skin shade, which allows us to capture heterogeneity in the black community with respect to skin shade phenotype proximity to the Eurocentric ideal. However, we improve upon Goldsmith, Hamilton, and Darity (2007) by including additional phenotypical characteristics, such as eye color and hair color, to determine if other Eurocentric correlates play a role in determining the early investment paths for youths.

II. Early Life Paths a Conceptual Framework

Human Capital theory (Becker 1975) asserts that persons consider the expected rate of return to investment activities that enhance skills, such as schooling and gaining work experience, before embarking upon them. The monetary benefits associated with investment paths is expected to be greater for individuals better able to process these investments into labor market returns. The costs of investment, both direct and indirect, will be shaped by ability and opportunity. The conventional assumption is that the rate of return to schooling and acquiring work experience is greater for those youths who are more cognitively talented. In addition, persons extended favorable treatment will be better positioned to translate their human capital investments into higher labor market returns and will face lower costs in acquiring human capital. Thus, Becker's human capital theory may be extended to suggest that individuals closer to the Eurocentric ideal may invest more in human capital as a young adult as a result of both greater benefits and lower costs associated with their better treatment both during the investment process and in the labor market. On the other hand, complacency may set in for those who are privileged, those who appear more Eurocentric, leading to less investment in human capital accumulation.⁵ However, whatever pattern of skill formation activity in-group members establish we take as the baseline for examining the relative behavior of out-group members.

Although youths who are less Eurocentric in appearance can be expected to receive less favorable treatment and privileges, it is unclear if they will ultimately invest

⁵ It is theoretically possible that individual may receive so much preferential treatment that a "corner type" solution, where the marginal utility from additional income is so low that the individual chooses to devote all their time in leisure as opposed to human capital investment.

less than their peers closer to the Eurocentric ideal. Some individuals who face discrimination in the human capital acquisition stage and expect to face discrimination in the labor market stage may take a long-run perspective and engage in behaviors to ultimately overcome the obstacles they face and expect to face.⁶ Consequently, they may adopt a resume building strategy or goal of obtaining more schooling than is typical in the sectors where they plan to work as a way to get a foot in the door.⁷ Similarly, less Eurocentric appearing persons may believe that work is an avenue that will allow them to disprove any adverse stereotypes employers might hold about them promoting a relatively strong desire to work. In addition, once employed they may display an extraordinarily high level of motivation at the worksite, leading to employment stability. Alternatively, those who believe they face discrimination and hence low returns to human capital investments may experience “helplessness” leading them to give up on long-term efforts to acquire skills resulting in disconnection.⁸

A person in the out-group might display reactance in one domain or arena and helplessness in another. For instance, it is possible person who are far from Eurocentric in appearance with strong educational records and reserved personalities may be reactant in schooling and helpless with regard to work--so they are more likely to be in school and less likely to be employed relative to those with Eurocentric appearance who have similar records and personalities.

Clearly, the link between idealized Eurocentric features and locating on an investment path, relative to being disconnected, is theoretically ambiguous. Although this is an empirical question there is no evidence from social scientists on whether there

⁶ Social psychologists (Brehm, 1966) say a person is “*reactant*” when they make great effort to overcome perceived barriers. Given the longstanding history of preferential treatment of individuals with more European features by both whites and blacks it is likely that individuals with less European features know they face additional challenges to being economically and socially successful. Thus, blacks whose appearance places them further from the in-group may be reactant or dedicate unusually high levels of resources to secure entry into an investment path in the period following their high school years. Reactance may also be fostered by a desire to eliminate cognitive dissonance created by a mismatch between perceived labor market skills and outcomes (Goldsmith et al, 2004) or by a desire to uplift a group facing discrimination.

⁷ Evidence consistent with this perspective is offered by Mason (1997) who finds that, after controlling for family background characteristics, blacks acquire more years of schooling than their white counterparts.

⁸ Seligman (1975) in his seminal work postulated that feelings of helplessness arise when a person perceives that valued experiences such as meaningful work, access to quality schooling, and fair treatment are independent of effort and merit. He predicts that learned helplessness leads to depression that saps a person of motivation leading to poorer life outcomes.

is a connection between features of the Eurocentric Ideal and the direction taken by youths in the years that immediately following high school.

A. A Preference for Whiteness

A general feature of society is the tendency for people to be differentiated according to group membership and for there to be “in-groups” and “out-groups.”⁹ Moreover, social and economic privileges may be granted to those in the “in-group” by both members of the in-group and out-group. The preference for whiteness theory (Goldsmith, Hamilton, and Darity 2007) claims that “whiteness” leads to in-group status in the United States. Moreover, a group affiliation effect, which they label the “characterization effect” leads in-group and out-group members, respectively to offer positive treatment to their own group members. Hence, whites are expected to offer preferential treatment to other white members and blacks are expected to do the same for other black members.¹⁰ The theory also describes a second effect, which they label the “status effect”. According to the “status effect”, high status individuals will receive more favorable treatment by members of both the in and out-groups, and that in-group affiliation confers status. The theory asserts that in-group affiliation is associated with a greater status than out-group membership. Thus, according to the “status effect”, both blacks and whites will exhibit preferential treatment towards white individuals. So on net, in-group members treat other in-group members better, while it is ambiguous whether out-group members treat other out-group members better.

The *preference for whiteness* theory also asserts that, given the heterogeneity of blacks (as well as whites), it is an over simplification to classify them as strictly out-group members. Rather, proximity to whiteness governs the degree of in-group status and access to privileges. Although proximity to “whiteness” may encompass many factors, Goldsmith, Hamilton and Darity (2007) emphasized skin shade to measure proximity to “whiteness” as a result of its availability in the data they used. Thus, as skin shade lightens a person is granted more access to the high status in-group, which

⁹ See Tajfel and Turner (1986), Campbell (1965), Fisk and Ruscher (1993) in the social psychology literature and Sumner (1906) in the anthropology literature.

¹⁰ Given the uneven distribution of societal resources the effects, the net effects of this mutual own group preferential treatment may be skewed in the favor of the group with greater resource.

enhances their ability to avoid the constraints and penalties faced by out-group members—those with darker skin shade.¹¹

B. A Preference for Beauty

Hamermesh and Biddle (1994) in their seminal paper offer evidence that greater beauty evokes favorable treatment in the labor market. In addition, researchers in sociology (Hill 2002; Hall 1998; Russell et. al 1992; Conrad, Bond and Cash 1992) and economics (Loury 2006) have found a direct connection between skin shade and notions of beauty with beauty ratings rising as skin shade lightens. Thus, by linking these literatures, one interpretation of the Hamermesh and Biddle (1994) finding is that in-group and out-group are delineated based on beauty and that beauty advances with lighter complexion, leading to economic and social advantages for lighter skinned blacks. Favorable treatment of more attractive persons in the labor market may explain studies showing that lighter skinned African Americans are more likely to work in higher status occupation (Hill 2000), earn higher incomes (Goldsmith, Hamilton, and Darity 2007; Keith and Herring 1991), accumulate more years of schooling (Loury 2006; Hersch 2006), are less likely to be convicted of committing crimes (Price, 2006; Mocan and Tekin, 2006), and are considered more trustworthy (Wilson and Eckel 2007).

C. The Eurocentric Ideal and Privilege

In this paper, we extend the *preference for whiteness* theory by adding additional Eurocentric characteristics, beyond skin shade, to delineate the continuum of in-group and out-group status. We assert that privilege and favorable treatment are granted based on proximity to a Eurocentric ideal; being tall, slender, light-eyed, fair haired, and fair skinned. Given this conceptualization of in-group, a variety of cursory characteristics, not merely skin shade, may lead to in-group identification. Our *Eurocentric Ideal hypothesis* is the byproduct of linking the notion of *preference for beauty* with the theory of *preference for whiteness*. Consistent with this perspective is evidence that height influences wages (Persico, Postlewaite, and Silverman, 2004;

¹¹ Evidence consistent with this perspective is offered by Rangel (2007) using data from the Brazilian 1991 Census of Population. He finds that light skinned children are more likely to receive investments in formal education than their dark-skinned siblings, controlling for observed and unobserved parental characteristics. He attributes this to parents acting strategically based on their expectation that the returns to schooling are smaller for darker skinned children. This same incentive can explain why he also finds that parents are more likely to enroll light skinned children in private school, a higher quality and more expensive form of schooling.

Sargent and Blanchflower 1994, Behrman and Rosenzweig 2001), and that overweight and obese workers face wage penalties (Averett and Korenman 1996), controlling for a wider range of conventional wage determinants. Moreover, this paper will include a variety of phenotypical measures in addition to skin shade to measure proximity to “whiteness”.

Little is known about the connection between the influence of Eurocentric features on the paths taken by youths in the period immediately following their high school years. The aim of this paper is to address this shortcoming in the literature. In the next section we describe our empirical procedures and the data used to conduct our analysis.

III. Data and Methodology

A. Data

The data in this study come from the restricted version of the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health). Add Health is a school-based, longitudinal study of the health-related behaviors of adolescents and their outcomes in young adulthood. Beginning with an in-school questionnaire administered to a nationally representative sample of students in grades 7 through 12 in 1994-95, the study follows up with a series of in-home interviews of students approximately one year and six years later. Other sources of data include questionnaires for parents, siblings, fellow students, and school administrators.¹²

While the full longitudinal sample contains information on over 14,000 individuals, we focus this paper on the 10,900 non-Hispanic white and black respondents available in the dataset. We eliminate 1,000 individuals due to missing data on academic achievement in high school or body-mass index. We eliminate approximately 500 individuals for missing data on interviewer’s characteristics. In addition, we restrict our analysis to persons 18-27 years of age, the period immediately following their high school years, leaving our sample size at 4,837 females and 4,254 males. The male data we analyze contains 3166 whites, and 1088 blacks while our female sample includes 3469 white and 1368 black youths.

¹² See Udry 2003 for full description of the Add Health data set.

Add Health is an ideal data set to explore the link between a respondent's cursory features or characteristics and the life path they are traveling on since information on the respondent's primary activity, such as enrollment in school or working, is collected along with a large set of demographic and phenotypic information. For each of our respondents, we have interviewer-assessed information on race/ethnicity, hair color, eye color, attractiveness, personality, and skin shade as well as the race and gender of the interviewer.¹³ Skin shade is classified among (1) black skin shade (2) dark brown skin shade (3) medium brown skin shade (4) light brown skin shade and (5) white skin shade. We also have information on respondent-rated measures of attractiveness, height, and weight. Thus, we are able to control for Eurocentric appearance.

We are able also to control for important behaviors and outcomes that precede adulthood, including standardized test scores¹⁴, grade point average (GPA), childhood symptoms of ADHD, and religious attendance. GPA in the Add Health is computed by averaging across the most recent grade in four separate domains: English or language arts, mathematics, history or social studies, and science. Grades are self-reported and therefore may contain a bias of subjectivity. Fortunately, researchers have found significant correlations between grades reported by students and those recorded by schools (Dornbusch et al., 1987; Bogenschneider, 1997). A respondent's score on the Add Health Picture Vocabulary Test (AHPVT), an abridged version of the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised (PPVT-R) is also included in an effort to capture achievement in the area of logical reasoning.

¹³ During Interviewer training interviewer's were told "After you leave the respondent's home, your next step in the interview process is to complete the FI observations. These questions are very sensitive. You should never answer them in the respondent's home. It is very important that you complete these questions as soon as possible after leaving the respondent's residence, since they concern the respondent's appearance and demeanor during the interview process."

¹⁴ At the beginning of the interview, respondents were given the Add Health Picture Vocabulary Test (AHPVT), a computerized, abridged version of the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test--Revised. In this test, the interviewer reads a word aloud and the respondent selects the illustration that best fits its meaning. Each word has four simple, black-and-white illustrations arranged in a multiple-choice format. For example, the word "furry" has illustrations of a parrot, dolphin, frog, and cat from which to choose. There are 87 items on the AHPVT, and raw scores have been standardized by age. PPVT-R scores are best thought of as a measure of achievement in the area of logical reasoning should not be interpreted as measures of innate intelligence because of the modest correlation, from .40 to .60, between PPVT-R scores and scores on the Wechsler Full Scale IQS, Stanford-Binet IQS, and McCarthy Scales of Children's Abilities.

Finally, the data contain rich demographic and family background information, including age, family income, parents' education, and family household structure. As we note below, the school-based design of this survey also allows us to control for common environmental factors in our analysis by comparing individuals who attended the same high school.

1. Summary Statistics by Race-Gender Groups

Table 1 reports summary statistics for males and for females, separated by race, for each of the variables used in our analysis. The data are reported in a series of panels corresponding to pathway outcomes, human capital-demographic-family and community characteristics, and phenotype and beauty. The phenotype panel is further broken down by eye and hair color, height, weight, and attractiveness. Variable definitions are presented in Appendix Table 1.

Inspection of columns 1 and 2 in Table 1A reveals that 20 percent of black males youths are disconnected, twice the rate for white males, and the average male in our sample is 22 years of age. Relative to white males youths black males are in families with substantially lower income and a much smaller share of black male youths, only 44 percent, (compared to 74%) live with both parents. They also live in neighborhood with a higher rate of unemployment (1.2 points). White male youths have PVT scores that are 11 points higher and their high school grades are a quarter of a point higher.

Just over half of the white male youths have light colored eyes and virtually all of the rest have brown eyes. In contrast, only 2 percent of the black males have light eyes while 78 percent have brown eyes and 19 percent have black eyes. There are substantial differences in hair color between white and black males as well. Among white males, 22 percent have light hair, 64 percent have brown hair and 12 percent have black hair. No black males have light hair. Eighty five percent of black makes have black hair, 11 percent have brown hair, and 4 percent have a shaved head. Almost a third of the males in our sample are overweight and another 20 percent are obese. Just over 40 percent of the male youths were rated as having above average attractiveness.

Black women are also more likely to be disconnected than white women (18 percent vs. 13 percent). The same pattern of racial differences and similarities noted for males characterizes our female data, and the level of variables for men and women of the

same race are almost the same. For instance, black men and black women have the same PVT score and the racial PVT gap is 9 points for women and 11 points for men, while the racial GPA gap remains at $\frac{1}{4}$ of a point but women's grades are a $\frac{1}{4}$ point higher on average than men's.

The distribution of eye color for women of both races is almost the same as for their male counterparts, except that women's eyes are somewhat lighter. Hair color is lighter for women of both races than for men. Among white women 42% have light hair, which is 20 percent higher than for males, half have brown hair (64% for males) and 6 percent have black hair.

Prior to conducting our logit analysis we examine the unconditional means for the variables used in our analysis by pathway (Table 2), by skin shade (Table 3), and beauty (Table 4). The purpose of the first exercise is to learn if there is a link between the pathways youths travel in the period shortly after their high school years and both human capital and ascriptive features. Inspection of variable means by skin shade provides evidence on how tight the connection is between skin shade and other phenotypical characteristics. Finally, we separate the data into those who are above average in rated beauty and those below that standard to explore if ascriptive characteristics or features associated with the Eurocentric ideal are closely related to interviewer assessed beauty.

2. Summary Statistics by Pathway Outcome

Table 2A reports summary statistics for white males and for black males according to the outcome path they are traveling--work, schooling, or disconnection--for each of the variables used in our analysis (analogous information for women is provided in Table 2B) Inspection of Table 2A reveals the same distinct pattern for white and black males youths. Achievement is lowest for those who are disconnected and greatest for those currently enrolled in school for every measure of educational performance, for both whites and blacks. For instance, PVT scores are about 6 points lower for those who are disconnected relative to those in school and between those in these two outcomes there is half letter gap in grades. Virtually everyone in school is a high school graduate, as are about 80 percent of those working, while only two thirds of the disconnected have a high school degree. In addition, human capital achievement is greater for whites than blacks in every pathway. These unconditional means suggest that

poorer human capital is likely to explain disconnection and why more black male youths are disconnected than white male youths. It is interesting to note that self reported ADHD is much greater among white males than black males. Self-reported ADHD incidence among white males it is about twice as large for those who are disconnected (i.e., 24 percent) compared to those on a skill acquisition path while among black males ADHD is independent of pathway.

A male youths family characteristics, measured by family income, mothers and fathers years of education, and living in a two parent family, all exhibit the same pattern of lowest mean levels for disconnected youths and highest means for youths enrolled in school. The same configuration applies to the local unemployment rate where a white youth resides, and it is almost a full percentage point higher for the disconnected. The only exceptions are that for black youths there is little difference in the local unemployment rate or the likelihood of having a single parent based on the path they are on.

For white male youths there is little difference in eye color, hair color, height, and weight between those who are disconnected and those on investment pathways. However, beauty ratings for white males follow the pattern noted above with only 30 percent of the disconnected rated as above average in attractiveness while half of those in school and 43 percent of those working are categorized as having above average beauty.

Examination of Table 2B reveals that the same distributional pattern across outcomes holds for women as well as men. Females with the lowest levels of educational achievement, and who come from lower socioeconomic backgrounds, are disproportionately disconnected while those with the most advantageous backgrounds and who achieved most educationally are disproportionately enrolled in school. Those females who are less than average in beauty are more likely to be disconnected but this relation is less pronounced for women. In addition, a higher share of the disconnected, are heavier than normal, compared to the share who are on investment paths, which is the opposite of what we observe for men. Their does not appear to be a connection between eye color, hair color, and height, and the pathway a youth is on for young females, just as for young males.

In summary, there is a clear link between traveling an investment pathway and beauty, human capital, and socioeconomic factors. An interesting question is whether there appears to be a connection between skin shade, a salient phenotypical feature, and pathway--with those with lighter skin shade less likely to be disconnected.

3. Summary Statistics for Skin Shade Groups

Table 3A and 3B, for males and females respectively, present means for all of the variables used in our analysis by skin shade group. Of the 1088 black males in our sample 33 percent (353) are rated as black-skinned, 29 percent (317) were designated as having dark brown skin, 27 percent (294) were placed in the medium brown skin tone category, and 11 (124) were appraised as having light-brown skin. The skin shade distribution for the 1368 black women in our sample is similar to that of the black males, except that a somewhat larger percent of black males is black skinned than for black females. The percent (and number) who had skin that is black, dark brown, medium brown, and light brown respectively is 24 (332), 27 (363), 33 (452), and 16 (221),

Panel A presents information on the outcome distribution for each of the four skin shade groups. For those black males who are not light skinned, the distribution across the outcomes is very similar with about 30 percent in school, almost half working and around 20 percent disconnected. However, the distribution is noticeably different for those with light skin. For this group only 14 percent are disconnected and 44 percent are in school. This suggest a possible link between skin shade and pathway--with those with lighter skin less likely to be disconnected. This raises two questions. First, is skin shade related to the human capital, demographic and family factors that appear related to pathway. Second, are other genotypic factors, such as hair and eye color closely tied to skin shade?

Inspection of Table 3A reveals there is little variation in human capital levels, demographic characteristics and family features across skin shade groups. The lone exception is that family income is 10-20 percent higher for those in the light skin group. We turn now to ascriptive features.

Very few, only 1-2 percent, of black males whose skin is darker than "light" have light colored eyes while 10 percent of those with light skin have light eyes. Brown eyes are common for black males in all skin shade groups. About 80 percent of the dark brown

and light skinned blacks have brown eyes, the share is even higher at 88 percent for those with medium brown skin, and somewhat lower, 67 percent, for those with dark skin. A third of black males with dark skin also have dark eyes, and 20 percent of those with dark brown skin have black eyes, while only 9 percent of those with medium or lighter skin have black eyes.

Virtually no black males have light colored hair, however a strong relation exists between both brown hair and black hair and skin shade. As skin shade lightens the percent of the group with brown hair rises and the percent with black hair falls. Of note is that 93 percent of black-skinned black males have black hair while 72 percent of those with light skin have black hair. In contrast, only 3 percent of the black-skinned males have brown hair while 23 percent of the light skinned males have brown hair.

Similarly, beauty ratings fall as skin shade darkens. Fifty six percent of the light skinned black males are rated as above average in attractiveness and 45 percent of those with medium skin were ranked this way, but only 36-37 percent of those with skin darker than medium brown were rated as above average in beauty.

Inspection of the unconditional means in Table 3B does not reveal a link between skin shade and pathway being travelled for black female youths. For each skin shade group, the distribution across the outcome pathways is nearly the same, whereas black males with light skin were noticeably more likely to be in school and less likely to be disconnected than black males with darker skin.

Black women exhibit the same pattern with respect to eye color and hair color as black males. However, the skin shade--brown hair gradient is more pronounced for women. The share of medium brown (28 percent) and light skinned (45 percent) women with brown hair is twice as large as for men. In addition, only 45 percent of light brown women have black hair while almost $\frac{3}{4}$ of light skin men have black hair. Moreover, 9 percent of light skinned black men have black eyes but only 3 percent of light brown skinned women have black eyes. Finally, like black male youths, beauty ratings rise as skin shade lightens for black female youths, but the gradient is more pronounced. Two thirds of the light skinned black females are rated as above average in attractiveness and 49 percent of those with medium skin were ranked this way, while 42-43 percent of those with skin darker than medium were rated as above average in beauty.

Demographic and family characteristics are unrelated to skin shade, except that family income is larger for lighter skinned women, the same pattern we found for males. Interestingly, PVT scores rose as skin shade lightened for black males, but this is not the case for women.

Given the link between skin shade and a number of ascriptive features, including beauty, a question that arises is whether skin shade and other phenotypical characteristics are so tightly related to attractiveness that they are fully accounted for by beauty ratings.

4. Summary Statistics for Phynotypical Features and Attractiveness

Table 4 presents the share of different sub-samples, constructed based on ascriptive features and outcome pathways, that are rated as above average in attractiveness, both for males and females. There is a clear connection between the Eurocentric ideal and above average attractiveness for males and for females. For both genders, attractiveness ratings are higher for persons who are; whites relative to black, lighter skinned, have lighter eyes and are not obese. In addition, for females, those with lighter hair are rated as more beautiful, and among men shorter individuals are less likely to be rated as more than average attractiveness. However, the relation between Eurocentric features and attractiveness is not nearly strong enough to infer that ascriptive features are simply reflecting beauty ratings.

B. Methodology

Our initial goal is to estimate the effect of a set of explanatory variables, that includes cursory characteristics such as skin shade, on the primary activity or path that youths are traveling in the period following their high school years. Multinomial logit regression is the appropriate estimating technique when the dependent variable is a set of more than two categories that can not be ordered in any meaningful way. We consider three paths, schooling, work, and neither being in school or working which we refer to as disconnection. The first two paths are considered paths to success since they involve the accumulation of skills either through formal study or learning on-the-job. A fundamental assumption of the multinomial logit estimating procedure is that the categories are not *close* substitutes. Although work and schooling entail human capital investment, they are substantially different, and we do not have reason to believe that one

is better than the other for youths. When using multinomial logistic regression, one category of the dependent variable is selected as the reference category, in our case this is being disconnected. The Multinomial logit regression model we estimate is expressed as

$$(1) \quad \Pr(y_i = j) = \frac{\exp(X_i \beta_j)}{1 + \sum_i^j (X_i \beta_j)}$$

and

$$\Pr(y_i = 0) = \frac{1}{1 + \sum_i^j (X_i \beta_j)}$$

where for the i th individual, y_i is the observed path they are traveling and X_i is a vector of explanatory variables. The unknown parameters β_j are estimated by maximum likelihood. The exponential beta coefficients estimated are relative risk ratios that represent the change in the odds of being in the dependent variable category, versus the comparison category, associated with a one unit change on the independent variable or for indicator variables being in a particular group. Estimates that equal 1 suggest that there is no difference in the likelihood of being in a designated category relative to the reference group. Estimates greater (less) than 1 imply that the odds of being in that category are greater (smaller) than being in the comparison category.¹⁵

We estimate reduced-form specifications of equation (1) to determine the effect of phenotype and other factors on the odds of being on an investment path relative to being disconnected. Our primary goal is to determine if Eurocentric appearance, a factor expected to be associated with in-group status, as well as human capital, influences the path a person travels. Thus, the question of how to measure Eurocentric appearance is fundamental to our work. In our view framework the conventional approach of including a bivariate race indicator variable as an independent variable in empirical models implicitly asserts that Eurocentric appearance is effectively captured by a uni-dimensional measure of appearance based on skin tone under the presumption that white corresponds to in-group stature and black corresponds to out-group stature.

¹⁵ For a detailed discussion of the multinomial logit estimating procedure see Greene (1990, pp. 697).

Recent work demonstrating that better life outcomes for blacks in the U.S. are associated with lighter skin shade suggests that the bi-variate measure is a poor mechanism for capturing Eurocentric appearance. Thus, the extent of Eurocentric appearance can be based on skin shade leading to a gradational characterization of in-group--out-group status. In this framework as skin shade lightens the presumption is that Eurocentric appearance and in-group position rise. However, this characterization of Eurocentric appearance is incomplete or less than ideal since a number of other ascriptive characteristics, besides skin color, are also associated with the Eurocentric ideal. Eurocentric appearance can be linked to a constellation of factors aside from skin color. To explore the viability or appropriateness of these alternative means of accounting for Eurocentric appearance, and hence in-group status, we estimate models using each of these three frameworks.

We begin by estimating a specification, *Model A*, that includes a bivariate indicator of race based on interviewer assessment of whether the respondent is black or not, and a set of core or base-line controls as part of the vector X . The base-line model includes controls for human capital, demographic factors, family and neighborhood characteristics expected to influence the primary activity a youth is engaged in. We then estimate *Model B* where the indicator variable for being black is replaced by a set of skin shade indicators, while maintaining the core set of controls, to assess the influence of this primary element of phenotype on the path black youths are traveling.

We stratify the data by gender and estimate all models separately for male and female youths, because a number of studies (Drake and Cayton, 1945; Neal and Wilson 1989 pp. 328) suggest that skin color has a greater impact on the lives of African American women than of African American men, in part because women's valuation of self worth depends more heavily on their perceived physical attractiveness (Collins 2000, pp 89; Jackson 1992 provides a review of this literature).¹⁶ In addition, there is also evidence (Ensminger, Lamkin, and Jacobson 1996) that males are more sensitive to neighborhood effects, which in turn have been linked to school and work outcomes, suggesting that it is unwise to pool males and females in a study of pathways.

¹⁶ There is evidence that that the impact of beauty on criminal behavior is stronger for females (Mocan and Tekin) and that the link between attractiveness and wages is more pronounced for women (Hamermesh and Biddle 1994).

Demographic factors accounted for include age, its square, and marital status. Family and neighborhood characteristics also may influence the primary activities of youths in the period immediately following their high school years. Research (Epstein 1991; Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler, 1995) has consistently found that parents from middle- and high socioeconomic backgrounds are more likely to participate in their children's education than parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds. It is also likely that socially, educationally, and economically advantaged parents foster a higher level of achievement in their children (Conger et al., 1997; McLoyd 1998; Phillips et al., 1998, Portes and MacLeod, 1996). We expect such parents to play an active role in guiding the perspective of their children regarding the path they travel when they are young. We account for these potential pathway determinants by controlling for the respondents family background at the date of the Wave I interview when respondents were 9-18 years of age as well as the local unemployment rate. Family features accounted for include family income, if the respondents was living in a household with both parents, if the family systematically participated in a formal religion, and years of schooling completed by their mother and their father.

Finally, all of our models include interviewer fixed effects a set of indicator variables that account for the race-gender background of the interviewer. These controls account for the possibility that gender and race may influence ratings of skin shade, and in subsequent models other cursory or ascriptive characteristics.

Results for the base-line model with a race indicator, Model A, are reported in columns 2 (being in school relative to disconnection) and column 3 (being employed compared to disconnection) in Table 5 for males and for females in Table 7. Our findings for Model B, where skin shade indicators are included in the model, are presented in these tables. Before proceeding to discuss these results it is important to note that there is a body of literature (Case and Katz 1991; Jencks and Mayer 1990; Ginther, , Haveman, and Wolfe 2000) emphasizing the importance of contextual factors, such as neighborhoods and schools on the academic and socio-economic outcomes of youths, especially those who are poor and or non-white. Their findings are consistent with Coleman's (1988) notion of social capital, in that students establish a peer society within their school, and adults do much the same in a community, with which attitudes

related to schooling and achievement become normative expectations. Thus, racial differences in the pathways taken by youths, independent of skin shade, could be the results of differences in school quality and neighborhoods where whites and blacks grew up and attended school.

There is extensive evidence of residential and school segregation based on racial differences (Orfield and Lee, 2005). Moreover, there are tremendous differences in wealth holding between white and black families (Wolff, 1998). The typical black headed household has 7% of the wealth a typical white family possesses. Thus, white students tend to attend wealthier schools, and reside in wealthier communities where jobs are more plentiful. We included measures of family socioeconomic status in our baseline model to control for differences in the school quality and neighborhoods, but these measures are likely to be imperfect. As a result, the estimated coefficients on the skin shade indicators may be capturing the effects of school quality and neighborhood attributes on the pathway a young person is on, biasing our estimates of the magnitude of inter-racial differences in the likelihood of being on an investment path relative to being disconnected.

A desirable feature of the Add Health is that respondents were selected from 120 schools. We take advantage of this feature of the data in Model C by estimating the pathway model with fixed schooling effects which allows us to compare youths who attended the same school. This provides a much better control for school quality and the nature of the neighborhood a youth grew up in, since most students attend school in their neighborhood. Our estimates, of Model C are reported in Tables 5 and 7.

In subsequent estimates, presented in Table 6 for males and Table 8 for females, we introduce additional ascriptive features of a person, beyond their skin shade, under the presumption that Eurocentric appearance and in-group status depends on a myriad of features. Our strategy is to add ascriptive features systematically based on the likelihood of the variable being exogenous to the pathway choice, in an effort to avoid endogeneity bias. First, we add a person's height (Model D), then we add eye and hair color controls (Model E), before including an indicator for having above average beauty (Model F). Given the possible link between skin shade and other measures of Eurocentric appearance, especially beauty and hair color, including these controls may provide

improved estimates of the link between skin shade and the path youths travel. We also estimate a model with controls for weight based on body mass ratings, in these we eliminate the height control since height is taken into account in the body mass index. However, it is possible that pathway influences dietary and exercise patterns leading to simultaneity bias. The results are virtually identical, so we do not report these findings in detail.

IV. Results

A. Males

Youths with greater academic achievement have significantly greater odds of being in school relative to being disconnected and this relation is particularly strong for those with better grades and who have graduated from high school. High school graduates are also much more likely to be working as opposed to disconnected. The challenge of ADHD also significantly influences investment activity. Those who report being inflicted with this condition were 32 % less likely to be enrolled in school and are 40 Percent less likely to be working. Married individuals have lower odds of being in school and higher odds of working, but only the latter effect is estimated with precision. Family background factors are significantly related to schooling, but are unrelated to working. For instance, persons are more likely to be in school, relative to being disconnected, if they are from families with; higher income, a pattern of religious participation, and more educated parents. Finally, youths who reside in communities with higher rates of unemployment exhibit significantly lower odds of being in school (9 percent) and working (6 percent).

The odds of a black males being in school or working, rather than being disconnected, is significantly worse than the odds of being in school relative to disconnection for white male youths. The likelihood of being in school compared to disconnection is 25 percent lower for black males youths. In addition, black males the odds of a male youth working, relative to being disconnected, is 58 percent lower for black males. Thus, the prospect of being disconnected is substantially greater for black male youths than white male youths. An interesting question is if the situation is worse for those black males with darker skin.

Inspection of the findings for Model B reveals that as skin shade lightens the odds of working relative to being disconnected for blacks relative to whites improves, but a significant gap remains. Black males with black skin are 65 percent less likely to be working relative to disconnection than white males, and this gap declines to 56 percent for those with dark brown skin, to 53 percent for those with medium brown skin and the gap is 44 percent for those with light brown skin. However, F-tests reported in Table 5 reveal that the intra-skin shade group differences are not statistically significant.

The odds of being in school relative to being disconnected are 180 percent greater for light skinned black males than for white males and this difference is significant. However, black males with darker skin are less likely to be in school compared to disconnection relative to white males, and for two of the three skin shade groups the gap is significant. Moreover, the magnitude of the gap is substantial, being 38 percent for blacks with black skin or medium brown skin and 19 percent for black who have dark brown skin. The odds of being in school relative to disconnection is significantly better for light skinned black males than for blacks in each of the other skin shade groups.

The pattern of the skin shade findings is unaltered when the model is estimated with school fixed effects. However, when school attended is controlled for, the racial gaps for school or work relative to disconnection that favored whites remain but the magnitude of the differential gets smaller. A striking findings is that now black with light skin are 209 percent more likely to be in school relative to disconnection compared to the school-disconnection situation for white male youths.

Table 6 presents results for males when there is recursive inclusion of additional ascriptive characteristics. Tall persons have significantly greater odds of attending school or working, relative to disconnection, than shorter individuals, and inclusion of the control for being tall has virtually no influence on the effect of skin shade on either attending school or working. The inclusion of eye and hair color (Model E) and then the addition of an indicator attractiveness (Model F) noticeably alters the estimated coefficients on the skin shade indicators in the work relative to disconnection equations, but does not alter the pattern and has little impact on the magnitude of the skin shade variables in the work to disconnection equations. It is still the case that as skin shade darkens for black males the odds of working rather than being disconnected are lower

than for white males. Black male youths with light brown skin are still significantly more likely to be in school compared to disconnection compared to this difference for white male youths after these additional ascriptive controls are controlled for in the estimates. But, now the odds of being in school compared to being disconnected is larger for black males with black skin or dark brown skin than for whites, whereas before it was smaller. However, the only skin shade coefficient that is estimated with precision in the school to disconnection equation is having light brown skin. Thus, the estimated skin shade coefficients in the schooling to disconnection logit suggest that black male youths are more likely to be in school compared to being disconnected than white kids, which is at odds with any notion that black males have an oppositional culture to education.

Male youths with light hair, compared to those with black hair, have a 73 percent larger odds of being in school rather than disconnected while those with brown hair are 12 percent more likely to be in school as opposed to disconnected, but this later effect is insignificant. The gap in the odds for those with light hair relative to those with brown hair is significant. Persons with hair defined as other, most likely a shaved head, are 12 percent less likely than those with black hair to be in school relative to disconnection. and this difference is significant. Males with black eyes have lower odds of being in school, relative to being disconnected, than males with any other eye color. These findings are in line with persons who have a more Eurocentric appearance, lighter hair and lighter eyes, being more inclined toward schooling rather than disconnection. Similarly, persons with light colored eyes and those with brown eyes, compared to those with black eyes, and individuals with light colored hair relative to those with black hair have greater adds of working rather than being disconnected. Although these estimates are statistically insignificant, the difference being having light hair and brown hair is significant.

Finally, persons who are above average in attractiveness are significantly more likely to be in school or working relative to being disconnected. There highly attractive individuals are 78 percent more likely to be in school, and have 51 percent greater odds of working, as opposed to being disconnected.

Bibliography

- Averett, Susan, and Sanders Korenman, 1996. "The Economic Reality of *The Beauty Myth*." *The Journal of Human Resources*, XXXI(2), pp. 304-330.
- Backman, J.G., L.D. Johnston, and P. M. O'Malley, 1993. *Monitoring the Future: Questionnaire Responses from the Nation's High School Seniors, 1992*. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.
- Bahr, S. J., S Maughan, A.C. Marcos, and B Li, 1998. "Family, Religiosity, and the Risk of Adolescent Drug Use." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 60(4), pp. 979—992.
- Bandura, A , 1977. *Social Learning Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Becker, Gary S., 1975. *Human Capital*, 2nd edition. New York: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Behrman, Jere, and mark Rosenzweig, 2001. *The Returns to Increasing Body Weight.* Working Paper. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.
- Besharov 1999
- Biddle, Jeff E., and Daniel S. Hamermesh, 1998. "Beauty, Productivity, and Discrimination: Lawyers' Looks and Lucre," *Journal of Labor Economics*, 16(1), pp. 172-201.
- Bond, Selena, and Thomas F. Cash, 1992. "Black Beauty: Skin Color and Body Images Among African-American College Women." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 22, pp. 874-88.
- Bogensneider, K, 1997. "Parental Involvement in Adolescent Schooling: A Proximal Process with Transcontextual Validity." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 59, pp. 718-733.
- Brehm, Jack W., 1966. *A Theory of Psychological Reactance*. New York: Academic Press.
- Brooks-Gunn, J., and Greg J. Duncan, T. Leventhal, and J. L. Aber, 1997. *Lessons Learned and Future Directions for Research on the Neighborhoods in which Children Live*. In J. brooks-Gunn, G.J. Duncan, and J. L Aber (Eds.), *Neighborhood Poverty*, Volume 1, pp. 279-297. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Brown, Kendrick T., 1998. "Consequences of Skin Tone Bias for African Americans: Resource Attainment and Psychological and Social Functioning." *African American Research Perspectives*, 4(1), pp. 55-60.

Case, Anne, Darren Lubotsky, and Christina Paxson, 2002. Economic Status and Health in Childhood: The Origins of the Gradient," *American Economic Review*, 92(5), pp.1308-1334.

Case, Anne, and Lawrence Katz, 1991. "The Company you Keep: The Effects of Family and Neighborhood on Disadvantaged Youths." Working Paper No. 3705. National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.

Clifford, Margaret M., and Elaine Walster, 1973. "The Effect of Physical Attractiveness on Teacher Expectations." *Sociology of Education*, 46(2), pp. 248-58.

Coleman, James S., 1988. "Social Capital in the creation of human capital." *American Journal of Sociology*, 94(Supplement), pp. 95-120.

Collins, Patricia Hill, 2000. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*, 2nd ed. New York: Routledge.

Crane, J., 1991. "The Epidemic Theory of Ghettos and Neighborhood Effects on Dropping Out and Teenage Childbearing." *American Journal of Sociology*, 96(5), pp. 1226-1259.

Dornbusch, S. M., P. L. Ritter, P. H. Leiderman, D.F. Roberts, and M. J. Fraleigh, 1987. "Adolescent School Performance." *Child Development*, 58, pp. 1233-1257.

Drake, St. Clair, and Horace R. Cayton, 1945. *Black Metropolis: A Study of Negro Life in a Northern City*. New York: Harcourt Brace.

Edelman, Peter, Harry J. Holzer, and Paul Offner, 2006. *Reconnecting Disadvantaged Young Men*. Urban Institute: Washington, D.C.

Ensminger, M.E., R.P. Lamkin, and N Jacobson, 1996. "School Leaving: A Longitudinal Perspective Including Neighborhood Effects." *Child Development*, 67(5), pp. 2400-2416.

Epstein, J. L., 1991. "Paths to Partnership: What we Can Learn from Federal, State, District, and School Initiatives." *Phi Delta Kappan*, 72(5), pp. 344-349.

Erikson, E., H., 1959. "Identity and the Life Cycle." *Psychological Issues*, 1, pp. 50-100.

Evans, T.D., F. T. Cullen, V.S. Burton Jr., R.G. Dunaway, G. L. Payne, and S.R. Kethineni, 1996. "Religion, Social Bonds, and Delinquency." *Deviant Behavior*, 17(1), pp. 43-70.

Ferguson, Ronald F., "Teachers' Perceptions and Expectations and the Black-White test Score Gap." In: Jencks, C. and Phillips, M. (Eds.), *The Black-White Test Score Gap*. Brookings Institution Press, Washington, DC, pp. 273-317.

Freeman, Richard B., 1986. "Who Escapes? The Relation of Church going and other Background Factors to the Socioeconomic Performance of Black Male Youths from Inner-City Tracts." In R.B. Freeman and H. J. Holzer (Eds.), *The Black*

Ginther, Donna, Haveman, Robert, and Barbara Wolfe, 2000. "Neighborhood Attributes as Determinants of Children's Outcomes." *Journal of Human Resources*, 35(4), pp. 603-642.

Goldsmith, Arthur H., Hamilton, Darrick, and William Darity, Jr., 2006. "Does a Foot-in-the-Door Matter? White-Nonwhite Differences in the Wage Return to Tenure and Prior Workplace Experience." *Southern Economics Journal*, 73(2), pp. 267-306.

Goldsmith, Arthur H., Veum, Jonathan R. and William Darity, Jr., 1996. "The Psychological Impact of Unemployment and Joblessness," *Journal of SocioEconomics*, 25(3), pp. 333-358.

Greene, William H., 1990. *Econometric Analysis*. New York: MacMillan Publishing.

Hall, Ronald E., 1992. "Bias Among African Americans Regarding Skin Color: Implications for Social Work Practice." *Research on Social Work Practice*, 2, pp. 479-86.

Hamermesh, Daniel S., and Jeff E. Biddle, 1994. "Beauty and the Labor Market." *American Economic Review*, 84(5), pp. 1174-1194.

Harper, Barry, 2000. "Beauty, Stature and the Labour Market: A British Cohort Study." *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 62(S1), pp. 771-800.

Hatfield, Elaine, and Susan Sprecher, 1986. *Mirror, Mirror ...: The Importance of Looks in Everyday Life*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Hersch, Joni, 2006. "Skin Tone Effects Among African-Americans: Perceptions and Reality." *American Economic Review*, 96(May), pp. 251-255.

Hill, Mark El, 2002a. "Skin Color and the perception of Attractiveness among African Americans: Does Gender Make a Difference?" *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 65(1), pp. 77-91.

Hill, Mark E., 2002b. "Skin Color and Intelligence in African Americans: A Reanalysis of Lynn's Data." *Population and Environment*, 24(2), pp. 209-214.

Hoover-Dempsey, K. V., and H. M. Sandler, 1995. "Parental Involvement in Children's Education: Why Does it Make a Difference?" *Teachers College Record*, 97(2), pp. 310-331.

Jackson, Linda A., 1992. *Physical Appearance and Gender: Sociobiological and Sociocultural Perspectives*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Jackson, Linda A., John E. Hunter, and Carole N. Hodge, 1995. "Physical Attractiveness and Intellectual Competence: A Meta-Analytic Review." *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 58(2), pp. 108-22.

Jaynes, J.D., and R. M. Williams Jr., 1989. *A Common Destiny: Blacks in American Society*. National Academy Press, Washington, D.C.

Jencks, Christopher, and Susan E. Mayer, 1990. The Social Consequences of Growing Up in a Poor Neighborhood. In Laurence .E. Lynn, and Michael G. H. McGeary (Eds.), *Inner-City Poverty in the United States* (pp. 111-186). Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

Kollins, Scott H, F. Joseph McClernon, and Bernard Fuemmeler. "Association Between Smoking and Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder Symptoms in a Population-Based Sample of Young Adults." *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 2005; 62:1142-1147

Lerner, Richard, Mary Delaney, Laura Hess, Jasna Jovanovic, and Alexander von Eye, 1990. "Early Adolescent Physical Attractiveness and Academic Competence." *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 10(1), pp. 4-20.

Loury, Linda Datcher, 2006. "*Schooling, Skin Tone, and Attractiveness: Beauty Makes Skin Seem Deep*." Working Paper, Department of Economics, Tufts University.

Maddox, Keith B., and Stephanie A. Gray, 2002. "Cognitive Representations of Black Americans: Re-exploring the Role of Skin Tone." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28(2), pp. 250-259.

McLoyd, **V.C.**, 1998. "Socioeconomic Disadvantage and Child Development." *American Psychologist*, 53, pp. 185-204.

Mincy, Ronald B., 2006. *Black Males Left Behind*. Washington D. C.: Urban Institute.

Mobius, Markus M., and Tanya S. Rosenblat, 2005. "Why Beauty Matters." *American Economic Review*, 96(1), pp. 222-235.

Neal, Angela M., and Midge L. Wilson, 1989. "The Role of Skin Color and Features in the Black Community: Implications for Black Women and Therapy." *Clinical Psychology Review*, 9, pp. 323-33.

- Orfield, Gary and Chungmei Lee, 2005. "Why Segregation Matters: Poverty and Educational Inequality." The Civil Rights Project at Harvard University, pp. 1-47.
- Persico, Nicola, Andrew Postlewaite, and Dan Silverman, 2004. "The Effect of Adolescent Experience on Labor Market Outcomes: The Case of Height," *The Journal of Political Economy*, 112(5), pp. 1019-1053.
- Portes, A., and D. MacLeod, 1996. "Educational Progress of Children of Immigrants: The Role of Class, Ethnicity, and School Context." *Sociology of Education*, 69, pp. 255-275.
- Rangel, Marcos A., 2007. "Is Parental Love Colorblind? Allocation of Resources within Mixed-Race Families," Working Paper, Harris School of Public Policy.
- Register, Charles, A., and David R. Williams, 1990. "Wage Effects of Obesity among Young Workers." *Social Science Quarterly*, 71(3), pp. 130-41.
- Ryabov, Igor, and Jennifer Van Hook, 2007. "School Segregation and Academic Achievement and Hispanic Children." *Social Science Research*, 36, pp. 767-788.
- Russell, Kathy, Midge Wilson, and Ronald Hall, 1992. *The Color Complex: The Politics of Skin Color among African Americans*. **CITY**: Anchor Books.
- Sargent, James D., and David G. Blanchflower, 1994. "Obesity and Stature in Adolescence and Earning in Young Adulthood: Analysis of a British Birth Cohort." *Archives Pediatric and Adolescent Medicine*, 148(July), pp. 681-87.
- Seltzer, Richard, and Robert C. Smith, 1991. "Color Differences in the Afro-American Community and the Differences They Make." *Journal of Black Studies*, 21, pp. 279-86.
- Shore, Rima, 2003. "Reducing the Number of Disconnected Youth." Kids Count Indicator Brief, Annie E. Casey Foundation.
- Wilson, Rick, L., and Catherine C. Eckel, 2006. Judging a Book by its Cover: Beauty and Expectations in the Trust Game." *Political Science Quarterly*, XX(XX), pp. XX-XX.
- Wilson, Rick K. and Catherine C. Eckel, "Initiating Trust: The Conditional Effects of Skin Shade on Trust Among Strangers." Working Paper, Department of Political Science Rice University, 2007.
- Wolff, Edward N., 1998. "Recent Trends in the Size Distribution of Household Wealth." *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 12(3), pp. 131-150.

Appendix Table 1*Definition of Variables: Data Source, National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health)*

Variables	Variable Definitions	Variables	Variable Definitions
Jobless	1 if respondent is neither working nor enrolled in school, 0 otherwise	Skin Light Brown	1 if interviewer judges a respondent's skin shade to be light brown, 0 otherwise
Enrolled in School	1 if respondent is enrolled in school full-time or part-time (regardless of hours worked), 0 otherwise	Eyes Light	1 if interviewer judges the respondent's eye color as "hazel", "blue", or "green", 0 otherwise
Working	1 if respondent reports working 10+ hours a week and is not enrolled in school, 0 otherwise	Eyes Brown	1 if interviewer judges the respondent's eye color as "brown", 0 otherwise
Black	1 if respondent self reports being Black, 0 otherwise	Eyes Black	1 if interviewer judges the respondent's eye color as "black", 0 otherwise
White	1 if respondent self reporting being White (non-Hispanic), 0 otherwise	Eyes Other	1 if interviewer judges the respondent's eye color as not being "hazel", "blue", "green", "brown" or "black", 0 otherwise
Skin Black	1 if interviewer judges a respondent's skin shade to be black, 0 otherwise	Light Hair	1 if interviewer judges the respondent's hair color as "blonde", or "red", 0 otherwise
Skin Dark Brown	1 if interviewer judges a respondent's skin shade to be dark brown, 0 otherwise	Brown Hair	1 if interviewer judges the respondent's hair color as "brown", 0 otherwise
Skin Medium Brown	1 if interviewer judges a respondent's skin shade to be medium brown, 0 otherwise	Black Hair	1 if interviewer judges the respondent's hair color as "black", 0 otherwise

Appendix Table 1 (Continued)

Definition of Variables: Data Source, National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health)

Variables	Variable Definitions	Variables	Variable Definitions
Other Hair	1 if interviewer judges the respondent's hair color as not "blonde", "red", "brown", or "black" 0 otherwise	ADHD	1 if respondent's ADHD score was above the cutoffs suggested in Kollins et al. 2005, 0 otherwise
Height	Height in feet	Age	Respondent's age in years
Overweight	1 if respondent's BMI is .85--.94 of age/gender group mean, 0 otherwise	Married	1 if respondent is married, 0 otherwise
Obese	1 if respondent's BMI is >.94 of age/gender group mean, 0 otherwise	Family Income	Family income of respondent's family in wave 1 divided by 10,000
Attractive	1 if the interviewer judges the respondent to be "attractive" or "very attractive", 0 if "about average", "unattractive", or "very unattractive"	Religious Attendance	1 if respondent attends religious services at least once a month, 0 otherwise
PVT Score	Respondent's raw score on the Peabody Vocabulary Test	Mothers Years of Schooling	Years of schooling completed by the respondent's mother
H.S. GPA	Self-reported, average of most recent grades in math, science, English, and history	Fathers Years of Schooling	Years of schooling completed by the respondent's father
H.S. Diploma	1 if respondent has a high school diploma, 0 otherwise	Both Parents	1 if respondent is living in a married household in wave 1, 0 otherwise
		Unemployment Rate	1990 rate of unemployment in the county where the respondent resides in wave 1?

Table 1*Summary Statistics for Variables used in Econometric Analysis: Males and Females by Race*

Variables	Males		Females	
	White	Black	White	Black
	(n=3166)	(n=1088)	(n=3469)	(n=1368)
Panel A: Life Outcomes				
Disconnected	0.10 (0.29)	0.20 (0.40)	0.13 (0.34)	0.18 (0.39)
Working	0.57 (0.49)	0.48 (0.50)	0.46 (0.50)	0.40 (0.49)
School	0.33 (0.47)	0.32 (0.47)	0.41 (0.49)	0.42 (0.49)
Panel B: Human Capital and Demographic Characteristics				
PVT	106.36 (11.62)	95.00 (14.35)	104.82 (11.85)	95.06 (13.58)
H.S. GPA	2.77 (0.78)	2.49 (0.69)	2.99 (0.75)	2.73 (0.68)
H.S. Diploma	0.84 (0.37)	0.80 (0.40)	0.87 (0.33)	0.86 (0.34)
ADHD	0.14 (0.34)	0.07 (0.26)	0.07 (0.26)	0.05 (0.22)
Age	21.92 (1.70)	21.95 (1.79)	21.73 (1.75)	21.78 (1.69)
Married	0.15 (0.36)	0.10 (0.30)	0.22 (0.42)	0.10 (0.30)
Family Income	5.04 (3.58)	3.78 (2.90)	5.18 (4.75)	3.79 (3.36)
Mothers Years of Schooling	13.53 (2.00)	13.61 (2.05)	13.42 (1.98)	13.40 (2.07)
Fathers Years of Schooling	13.67 (2.18)	13.40 (1.91)	13.51 (2.16)	13.32 (1.99)
Both Parents	0.74 (0.44)	0.44 (0.50)	0.71 (0.45)	0.41 (0.49)
Unemployment Rate Locally	6.36 (2.35)	7.56 (2.07)	6.36 (2.35)	7.59 (2.07)

Table 1 (Continued)*Summary Statistics for Variables used in Econometric Analysis: Males and Females by Race*

Variables	Males		Females	
	White (n=3166)	Black (n=1088)	White (n=3469)	Black (n=1368)
Panel C: Phenotype and Beauty				
Height	5.87 (0.24)	5.85 (0.25)	5.38 (0.22)	5.38 (0.24)
Eye Color				
Light Eyes	0.54 (0.50)	0.02 (0.14)	0.60 (0.49)	0.04 (0.18)
Brown Eyes	0.41 (0.49)	0.78 (0.42)	0.36 (0.48)	0.81 (0.39)
Black Eyes	0.01 (0.10)	0.19 (0.39)	0.01 (0.07)	0.15 (0.36)
Hair Color				
Light Hair	0.22 (0.41)	0.00 (0.04)	0.42 (0.49)	0.02 (0.15)
Brown Hair	0.64 (0.48)	0.11 (0.31)	0.50 (0.50)	0.22 (0.42)
Black Hair	0.12 (0.33)	0.85 (0.36)	0.06 (0.24)	0.74 (0.43)
Attractive	0.44 (0.50)	0.41 (0.49)	0.56 (0.50)	0.48 (0.49)
Weight				
Overweight	0.32 (0.47)	0.29 (0.46)	0.22 (0.42)	0.26 (0.44)
Obese	0.20 (0.40)	0.22 (0.41)	0.21 (0.41)	0.31 (0.46)

Notes

Data Source: *Data Source, National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health)*.

Unweighted means are reported, with their standard errors in parentheses. Some categories do not sum to 1 because outcomes such as “hair other” are left out of the table.

Table 2A*Summary Statistics for Variables used in Econometric Analysis, by Outcome Pathway: Males*

Variable	White Males (n=3166)			Black Males (n=1088)		
	Dis- Connect (n=304)	School (n=1066)	Work (n=1796)	Dis- Connect (n=214)	School (n=346)	Work (n=528)

Panel A: Human Capital and Demographic Characteristics

PVT	103.68 (12.58)	109.96 (11.12)	104.68 (11.24)	91.91 (12.58)	98.35 (14.12)	94.01 (14.76)
H.S. GPA	2.53 (0.78)	3.12 (0.68)	2.59 (0.77)	2.33 (0.66)	2.67 (0.70)	2.43 (0.67)
H.S. Diploma	0.65 (0.48)	0.97 (0.17)	0.80 (0.40)	0.63 (0.48)	0.93 (0.25)	0.78 (0.42)
ADHD	0.24 (0.43)	0.11 (0.31)	0.13 (0.34)	0.08 (0.28)	0.08 (0.26)	0.06 (0.24)
Age	21.78 (1.73)	21.27 (1.63)	22.32 (1.62)	21.82 (1.74)	21.31 (1.73)	22.43 (1.71)
Married	0.13 (0.33)	0.06 (0.24)	0.20 (0.40)	0.07 (0.26)	0.05 (0.22)	0.14 (0.35)

Panel B: Family and Community Characteristics

Family Income	4.50 (4.41)	5.97 (3.89)	4.58 (3.09)	2.97 (1.94)	4.34 (3.39)	3.73 (2.79)
Mothers Years of Schooling	13.06 (1.84)	14.19 (2.00)	13.21 (1.92)	13.00 (1.85)	14.27 (2.00)	13.42 (2.05)
Fathers Years of Schooling	13.23 (2.31)	14.47 (2.07)	13.27 (2.08)	12.97 (1.71)	13.88 (1.98)	13.25 (1.88)
Both Parents	0.65 (0.47)	0.81 (0.40)	0.71 (0.45)	0.50 (0.50)	0.50 (0.50)	0.43 (0.49)
Local Unemployment Rate	6.88 (2.60)	6.00 (2.00)	6.47 (2.47)	7.69 (2.20)	7.71 (2.20)	7.42 (1.91)

Table 2A*Summary Statistics for Variables used in Econometric Analysis, by Outcome Pathway: Males*

Variable	White Males (n=3166)			Black Males (n=1088)		
	Dis- Connect (n=304)	School (n=1066)	Work (n=1796)	Dis- Connect (n=214)	School (n=346)	Work (n=528)
Panel C: Phenotype and Beauty						
Skin Shade						
Skin Black	Darrick, I	Am thinking	Of getting	0.39 (0.49)	0.31 (0.46)	0.31 (0.46)
Skin Dark Brown	Rid of these	Four rows		0.29 (0.45)	0.29 (0.46)	0.29 (0.45)
Skin Medium Brown				0.25 (0.44)	0.24 (0.43)	0.30 (0.45)
Skin Light Brown				0.07 (0.26)	0.16 (0.34)	0.10 (0.29)
Eye Color						
Light Eyes	0.49 (0.50)	0.55 (0.50)	0.55 (0.50)	0.02 (0.14)	0.03 (0.17)	0.02 (0.13)
Brown Eyes	0.45 (0.50)	0.41 (0.49)	0.41 (0.49)	0.77 (0.42)	0.77 (0.42)	0.78 (0.41)
Black Eyes	0.02 (0.14)	0.01 (0.10)	0.01 (0.09)	0.20 (0.40)	0.19 (0.39)	0.19 (0.39)
Hair Color						
Light Hair	0.16 (0.37)	0.23 (0.42)	0.22 (0.41)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.06)
Brown Hair	0.67 (0.47)	0.64 (0.48)	0.63 (0.48)	0.09 (0.29)	0.12 (0.32)	0.11 (0.31)
Black Hair	0.13 (0.33)	0.11 (0.32)	0.13 (0.33)	0.87 (0.33)	0.84 (0.37)	0.84 (0.36)
Other Hair	0.04 (0.19)	0.02 (0.13)	0.03 (0.16)	0.04 (0.19)	0.05 (0.21)	0.05 (0.21)
Height	5.86 (0.25)	5.88 (0.24)	5.86 (0.24)	5.81 (0.26)	5.85 (0.24)	5.86 (0.26)
Weight						
Overweight	0.29 (0.45)	0.35 (0.48)	0.31 (0.46)	0.27 (0.44)	0.33 (0.47)	0.28 (0.45)
Obese	0.22 (0.41)	0.18 (0.38)	0.21 (0.41)	0.19 (0.39)	0.18 (0.39)	0.26 (0.44)
Attractive	0.30 (0.46)	0.50 (0.50)	0.43 (0.49)	0.35 (0.48)	0.45 (0.49)	0.41 (0.49)

Notes

Data Source: *Data Source, National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health).*

Unweighted means are reported, with their standard errors in parentheses. Some categories do not sum to 1 because outcomes such as “hair other” are left out of the table.

Table 2B*Summary Statistics for Variables used in Econometric Analysis, by Outcome Pathway: Females*

Variable	White Females (n=3469)			Black Females (n=1368)		
	Dis- Connect (n=455)	School (n=1408)	Work (n=1606)	Dis- Connect (n=249)	School (n=577)	Work (n=542)
	Panel A: Human Capital and Demographic Characteristics					
PVT	99.50 (11.85)	107.75 (11.48)	103.76 (11.47)	90.84 (12.11)	98.33 (13.32)	93.51 (13.71)
H.S. GPA	2.59 (0.77)	3.28 (0.65)	2.86 (0.74)	2.56 (0.66)	2.93 (0.66)	2.60 (0.67)
H.S. Diploma	0.68 (0.47)	0.96 (0.20)	0.85 (0.36)	0.72 (0.45)	0.94 (0.23)	0.84 (0.36)
ADHD	0.11 (0.31)	0.06 (0.24)	0.07 (0.25)	0.05 (0.22)	0.05 (0.21)	0.05 (0.23)
Age	21.91 (1.72)	21.09 (1.67)	22.24 (1.64)	21.87 (1.68)	21.32 (1.64)	22.23 (1.63)
Married	0.43 (0.50)	0.10 (0.30)	0.28 (0.45)	0.10 (0.30)	0.08 (0.27)	0.13 (0.33)
Panel B: Family and Community Characteristics						
Family Income	4.32 (2.98)	5.81 (4.59)	4.86 (5.20)	3.47 (3.86)	4.03 (3.09)	3.67 (3.38)
Mothers Years of Schooling	12.85 (1.82)	13.99 (1.99)	13.09 (1.89)	12.90 (1.96)	13.90 (2.00)	13.10 (2.08)
Fathers Years of Schooling	12.80 (1.94)	14.14 (2.10)	13.17 (2.12)	12.99 (1.82)	13.61 (2.11)	13.17 (1.90)
Both Parents	0.64 (0.48)	0.77 (0.42)	0.69 (0.46)	0.35 (0.48)	0.48 (0.50)	0.37 (0.48)
Local Unemployment Rate	7.12 (2.72)	6.20 (2.17)	6.28 (2.35)	7.80 (2.13)	7.63 (2.11)	7.46 (2.00)

Table 2B*Summary Statistics for Variables used in Econometric Analysis, by Outcome Pathway: Females*

Variable	White Females (n=3469)			Black Females (n=1368)		
	Dis- Connect (n=455)	School (n=1408)	Work (n=1606)	Dis- Connect (n=249)	School (n=577)	Work (n=542)
	Panel C: Phenotype and Beauty					
Skin Shade						
Skin Black				0.29 (0.45)	0.24 (0.42)	0.22 (0.41)
Skin Dark Brown				0.24 (0.42)	0.26 (0.44)	0.28 (0.46)
Skin Medium Brown				0.33 (0.47)	0.34 (0.47)	0.32 (0.46)
Skin Light Brown				0.14 (0.34)	0.16 (0.33)	0.18 (0.36)
Eye Color						
Light Eyes	0.64 (0.48)	0.60 (0.49)	0.60 (0.49)	0.04 (0.20)	0.02 (0.15)	0.04 (0.21)
Brown Eyes	0.34 (0.47)	0.36 (0.48)	0.36 (0.48)	0.80 (0.40)	0.81 (0.39)	0.81 (0.40)
Black Eyes	0.00 (0.00)	0.01 (0.08)	0.01 (0.08)	0.16 (0.37)	0.15 (0.36)	0.15 (0.36)
Hair Color						
Light Hair	0.40 (0.49)	0.43 (0.50)	0.42 (0.49)	0.02 (0.13)	0.02 (0.14)	0.03 (0.16)
Brown Hair	0.55 (0.50)	0.49 (0.50)	0.50 (0.50)	0.20 (0.40)	0.23 (0.42)	0.22 (0.42)
Black Hair	0.05 (0.21)	0.06 (0.24)	0.07 (0.25)	0.77 (0.42)	0.73 (0.44)	0.73 (0.44)
Other Hair	0.01 (0.09)	0.02 (0.12)	0.01 (0.10)	0.02 (0.14)	0.01 (0.12)	0.02 (0.13)
Height	5.34 (0.20)	5.40 (0.22)	5.37 (0.23)	5.37 (0.25)	5.37 (0.25)	5.39 (0.23)
Weight						
Overweight	0.28 (0.45)	0.21 (0.40)	0.22 (0.41)	0.25 (0.43)	0.28 (0.45)	0.26 (0.44)
Obese	0.27 (0.44)	0.16 (0.36)	0.25 (0.43)	0.39 (0.49)	0.27 (0.44)	0.32 (0.47)
Attractive	0.45 (0.50)	0.54 (0.50)	0.53 (0.50)	0.42 (0.49)	0.54 (0.50)	0.46 (0.50)

Notes

Data Source: *Data Source, National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health).*

Unweighted means are reported, with their standard errors in parentheses. Some categories do not sum to 1 because outcomes such as “hair other” are left out of the table.

Table 3A*Summary Statistics by Skin Shade for Black Males for Variables used in Econometric Analysis*

Variables	Race		Skin Shade if Black			
	White (n=3166)	Black (n=1088)	Black (n=353)	Dark Brown (n=317)	Medium Brown (n=294)	Light Brown (n=124)
Panel A: Life Outcomes						
Disconnected	0.10 (0.29)	0.20 (0.40)	0.24 (0.43)	0.19 (0.39)	0.18 (0.39)	0.14 (0.35)
Working	0.57 (0.49)	0.48 (0.50)	0.46 (0.50)	0.49 (0.50)	0.54 (0.50)	0.44 (0.50)
School	0.33 (0.47)	0.32 (0.47)	0.30 (0.46)	0.32 (0.47)	0.28 (0.45)	0.44 (0.50)
Panel B: Human Capital and Demographic Characteristics						
PVT	106.36 (11.62)	95.00 (14.35)	94.18 (14.30)	94.31 (14.66)	96.51 (14.04)	95.34 (14.28)
H.S. GPA	2.77 (0.78)	2.49 (0.69)	2.49 (0.71)	2.50 (0.64)	2.49 (0.69)	2.46 (0.78)
H.S. Diploma	0.84 (0.37)	0.80 (0.40)	0.76 (0.43)	0.80 (0.40)	0.82 (0.38)	0.81 (0.40)
ADHD	0.14 (0.34)	0.07 (0.26)	0.09 (0.29)	0.07 (0.26)	0.06 (0.23)	0.06 (0.23)
Age	21.92 (1.70)	21.95 (1.79)	21.87 (1.74)	21.83 (1.76)	22.14 (1.85)	22.01 (1.84)
Married	0.15 (0.36)	0.10 (0.30)	0.09 (0.29)	0.12 (0.33)	0.08 (0.26)	0.11 (0.32)
Family Income	5.04 (3.58)	3.78 (2.90)	3.66 (2.86)	3.55 (2.17)	3.91 (3.81)	4.32 (2.25)
Mothers Years of Schooling	13.53 (2.00)	13.61 (2.05)	13.53 (2.07)	13.59 (2.19)	13.66 (1.89)	13.76 (2.01)
Fathers Years of Schooling	13.67 (2.18)	13.40 (1.91)	13.29 (1.94)	13.38 (1.94)	13.62 (1.90)	13.23 (1.72)
Both Parents	0.74 (0.44)	0.44 (0.50)	0.45 (0.50)	0.41 (0.49)	0.44 (0.50)	0.43 (0.50)
Unemployment Rate Locally	6.36 (2.35)	7.56 (2.07)	7.33 (1.94)	7.75 (2.08)	7.70 (2.17)	7.50 (2.06)

Table 3A (Continued)*Summary Statistics by Skin Shade for Black Males for Variables used in Econometric Analysis*

Variables	Race		Skin Shade if Black			
	White (n=3166)	Black (n=1088)	Black (n=353)	Dark Brown (n=317)	Medium Brown (n=294)	Light Brown (n=124)
Panel C: Phenotype and Beauty						
Height	5.87 (0.24)	5.85 (0.25)	5.84 (0.25)	5.86 (0.26)	5.84 (0.25)	5.84 (0.27)
Eye Color						
Light Eyes	0.54 (0.50)	0.02 (0.14)	0.01 (0.08)	0.02 (0.13)	0.01 (0.10)	0.10 (0.30)
Brown Eyes	0.41 (0.49)	0.78 (0.42)	0.67 (0.47)	0.79 (0.41)	0.87 (0.33)	0.80 (0.40)
Black Eyes	0.01 (0.10)	0.19 (0.39)	0.32 (0.47)	0.19 (0.39)	0.10 (0.29)	0.09 (0.29)
Hair Color						
Light Hair	0.22 (0.41)	0.00 (0.04)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.01 (0.08)	0.00 (0.00)
Brown Hair	0.64 (0.48)	0.11 (0.31)	0.03 (0.17)	0.12 (0.32)	0.14 (0.35)	0.23 (0.42)
Black Hair	0.12 (0.33)	0.85 (0.36)	0.93 (0.25)	0.84 (0.37)	0.80 (0.40)	0.72 (0.45)
Attractive	0.44 (0.50)	0.41 (0.49)	0.37 (0.48)	0.36 (0.48)	0.45 (0.50)	0.56 (0.50)
Weight						
Overweight	0.32 (0.47)	0.29 (0.46)	0.28 (0.45)	0.28 (0.45)	0.34 (0.47)	0.23 (0.43)
Obese	0.20 (0.40)	0.22 (0.41)	0.24 (0.43)	0.25 (0.43)	0.19 (0.39)	0.19 (0.39)

Notes

Data Source: *Data Source, National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health).*

Unweighted means are reported, with their standard errors in parentheses. Some categories do not sum to 1 because outcomes such as “hair other” are left out of the table.

Table 3B*Summary Statistics by Skin Shade for Black Females for Variables used in Econometric Analysis*

Variables	Race		Skin Shade if Black			
	White (n=3469)	Black (n=1368)	Black (n=332)	Dark Brown (n=363)	Medium Brown (n=452)	Light Brown (n=221)
Panel A: Life Outcomes						
Disconnected	0.13 (0.34)	0.18 (0.39)	0.22 (0.41)	0.16 (0.37)	0.18 (0.39)	0.16 (0.37)
Working	0.46 (0.50)	0.40 (0.49)	0.36 (0.48)	0.42 (0.49)	0.39 (0.49)	0.43 (0.50)
School	0.41 (0.49)	0.42 (0.49)	0.42 (0.49)	0.42 (0.49)	0.43 (0.50)	0.41 (0.49)
Panel B: Human Capital and Demographic Characteristics						
PVT	104.82 (11.85)	95.06 (13.58)	93.46 (13.67)	93.93 (13.69)	95.46 (13.49)	98.48 (13.00)
H.S. GPA	2.99 (0.75)	2.73 (0.68)	2.73 (0.67)	2.72 (0.67)	2.73 (0.69)	2.77 (0.68)
H.S. Diploma	0.87 (0.33)	0.86 (0.34)	0.83 (0.39)	0.88 (0.32)	0.87 (0.34)	0.88 (0.33)
ADHD	0.07 (0.26)	0.05 (0.22)	0.06 (0.24)	0.05 (0.20)	0.05 (0.21)	0.04 (0.20)
Age	21.73 (1.75)	21.78 (1.69)	21.72 (1.74)	21.84 (1.72)	21.82 (1.72)	21.72 (1.54)
Married	0.22 (0.42)	0.10 (0.30)	0.08 (0.27)	0.12 (0.32)	0.10 (0.30)	0.11 (0.31)
Family Income	5.18 (4.75)	3.79 (3.36)	3.47 (2.10)	3.61 (3.19)	3.83 (2.95)	4.47 (5.34)
Mothers Years of Schooling	13.42 (1.98)	13.40 (2.07)	13.12 (1.89)	13.30 (2.07)	13.55 (2.07)	13.65 (2.28)
Fathers Years of Schooling	13.51 (2.16)	13.32 (1.99)	13.13 (1.90)	13.22 (2.11)	13.42 (1.97)	13.57 (1.91)
Both Parents	0.71 (0.45)	0.41 (0.49)	0.40 (0.49)	0.40 (0.49)	0.41 (0.49)	0.45 (0.50)
Unemployment Rate Locally	6.36 (2.35)	7.59 (2.07)	7.30 (1.90)	7.89 (2.20)	7.59 (2.04)	7.55 (2.11)

Table 3B (Continued)*Summary Statistics by Skin Shade for Black Females for Variables used in Econometric Analysis*

Variables	Race		Skin Shade if Black			
	White (n=3469)	Black (n=1368)	Black (n=332)	Dark Brown (n=363)	Medium Brown (n=452)	Light Brown (n=221)
Panel C: Phenotype and Beauty						
Height	5.38 (0.22)	5.38 (0.24)	5.37 (0.24)	5.39 (0.25)	5.38 (0.23)	5.38 (0.26)
Eye Color						
Light Eyes	0.60 (0.49)	0.04 (0.18)	0.02 (0.14)	0.02 (0.13)	0.01 (0.12)	0.13 (0.33)
Brown Eyes	0.36 (0.48)	0.81 (0.39)	0.69 (0.47)	0.80 (0.40)	0.90 (0.31)	0.82 (0.35)
Black Eyes	0.01 (0.07)	0.15 (0.36)	0.29 (0.46)	0.18 (0.39)	0.09 (0.29)	0.03 (0.13)
Hair Color						
Light Hair	0.42 (0.49)	0.02 (0.15)	0.02 (0.12)	0.01 (0.09)	0.02 (0.13)	0.07 (0.27)
Brown Hair	0.50 (0.50)	0.22 (0.42)	0.09 (0.28)	0.13 (0.34)	0.28 (0.45)	0.45 (0.50)
Black Hair	0.06 (0.24)	0.74 (0.43)	0.88 (0.32)	0.85 (0.36)	0.69 (0.46)	0.45 (0.50)
Attractive	0.56 (0.50)	0.48 (0.49)	0.43 (0.50)	0.42 (0.49)	0.49 (0.50)	0.65 (0.48)
Weight						
Overweight	0.22 (0.42)	0.26 (0.44)	0.28 (0.45)	0.25 (0.43)	0.27 (0.44)	0.26 (0.44)
Obese	0.21 (0.41)	0.31 (0.46)	0.34 (0.48)	0.36 (0.48)	0.30 (0.46)	0.22 (0.40)

Notes

Data Source: *Data Source, National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health)*.

Unweighted means are reported, with their standard errors in parentheses. Some categories do not sum to 1 because outcomes such as “hair other” are left out of the table.

Table 4

Percent of Ascriptive based Sub-Sample Rated as Above Average in Attractiveness: Males and Females

Subsample (n= Male; Female)	Above Average Attractiveness	
	Males	Females
White (n= 3166; 3469)	44	56
Black (n= 1088; 1368)	41	48
Skin Black (n= 348; 319)	37	43
Skin Dark Brown (n= 313; 357)	36	42
Skin Medium Brown (n= 280; 434)	45	49
Skin Light Brown (n= 109; 188)	53	66
Height Short (n= 714; 1088)	36	55
Height Medium (n=2509; 2080)	44	53
Height Tall (n=1031; 1669)	46	53
Eyes Light (n= 1747; 2138)	46	58
Eyes Brown (n= 2150; 2343)	42	52
Eyes Black (n= 241; 228)	37	41
Hair Light (n= 687; 1496)	41	58
Hair Brown (n= 2134; 2051)	44	53
Hair Black (n= 1308; 1227)	42	48
Overweight (n= 1342; 1131)	50	52
Obese (n= 877; 1170)	31	31
Disconnected (n= 518; 704)	32	44
School (n= 1412; 1985)	49	60
Working (n= 2324; 2148)	42	51

Notes: Cells indicate percent of a group rated as above average in Attractiveness Ratings do not sum to 100 % for hair color and eye color because the categories of “other” are excluded from this table.

Table 5

Logit Estimates of the Determinants of Being in School Relative to Disconnection or Being Employed Relative to Disconnection for Males

Variables	Model A Bivariate Race		Model B Skin Shade		Model C Skin Shade (School Fixed Effects)	
	Schooling (n=4254)	Working (n=4254)	Schooling (n=4254)	Working (n=4254)	Schooling (n=4254)	Working (n=4254)
Black	0.746** (0.108)	0.419** (0.054)				
Skin Black			0.624** (0.121)	0.349*** (0.059)	0.720 (0.170)	0.423*** (0.088)
Skin Dark Brown			0.812 (0.169)	0.441*** (0.081)	0.878 (0.220)	0.568** (0.124)
Skin Medium Brown			0.613** (0.136)	0.469*** (0.090)	0.582** (0.154)	0.545*** (0.125)
Skin Light Brown			1.809* (0.600)	0.556* (0.172)	2.089* (0.774)	0.718 (0.246)
PVT	1.015*** (0.005)	1.001 (0.004)	1.015*** (0.005)	1.001 (0.004)	1.016*** (0.005)	1.001 (0.005)
H.S. GPA	1.672*** (0.138)	0.976 (0.071)	1.674*** (0.138)	0.978 (0.071)	1.863*** (0.167)	1.022 (0.081)
H.S. Diploma	6.864*** (1.205)	1.748*** (0.207)	6.865*** (1.209)	1.742*** (0.205)	8.06*** (1.505)	1.812*** (0.231)
ADHD	0.679** (0.112)	0.597*** (0.084)	0.684** (0.113)	0.599*** (0.084)	0.716* (0.126)	0.599*** (0.089)
Age	1.511 (1.173)	2.319 (1.590)	1.535 (1.194)	2.395 (1.652)	0.861 (0.752)	1.579 (1.222)
Age Squared	0.986 (0.018)	0.985 (0.015)	0.986 (0.018)	0.984 (0.015)	0.999 (0.020)	0.993 (0.017)
Married	0.781 (0.152)	1.646*** (0.263)	0.764 (0.149)	1.639*** (0.263)	0.784 (0.161)	1.679*** (0.281)
Family Income	1.051** (0.023)	1.008 (0.021)	1.048** (0.023)	1.006 (0.021)	1.039* (0.022)	1.000 (0.020)
Religious Attendance	1.011*** (0.003)	1.003 (0.003)	1.011*** (0.003)	1.003 (0.003)	1.012*** (0.003)	1.003 (0.003)

Table 5 (Continued)

Logit Estimates of the Determinants of Being in School Relative to Disconnection or Being Employed Relative to Disconnection for Males

Variables	Model A Bivariate Race		Model B Skin Shade		Model C Skin Shade (School Fixed Effects)	
	Schooling (n= 4254)	Working (n=4254)	Schooling (n=4254)	Working (n=4254)	Schooling (n=4254)	Working (n=4254)
Mothers Years of Schooling	1.122*** (0.037)	1.043 (0.031)	1.119*** (0.037)	1.043 (0.031)	1.111*** (0.039)	1.052 (0.033)
Fathers Years of Schooling	1.084** (0.034)	0.970 (0.028)	1.088** (0.034)	0.971 (0.028)	1.059* (0.036)	0.960 (0.029)
Both Parents	1.197 (0.162)	1.203 (0.144)	1.202 (0.162)	1.209 (0.145)	1.210 (0.174)	1.179 (0.147)
Unemployment Rate	0.909*** (0.022)	0.943*** (0.020)	0.909*** (0.023)	0.942*** (0.020)	0.956 (0.095)	1.042 (0.087)
R Squared	F tests for Significant Wage Differences Between Skin-shade Groups					
Black vs Dark Brown			[0.276]	[0.268]	[0.446]	[0.192]
Black vs Medium Brown			[0.946]	[0.177]	[0.433]	[0.281]
Black vs Light Brown			[0.003]***	[0.154]	[0.005]***	[0.131]
Dark Brown vs Medium Brown			[0.281]	[0.785]	[0.137]	[0.868]
Dark Brown vs Light Brown			[0.025]**	[0.484]	[0.023]**	[0.505]
Medium Brown vs Light Brown			[0.003]***	[0.610]	[0.001]***	[0.433]
Joint Test			[0.014]**	[0.373]	[0.008]***	[0.370]

Notes: Coefficient estimates (log odds relative to disconnection) are reported and standard errors are shown in parentheses. All estimated equations include interviewer fixed effects. Joint test null is each skin-shade has same effect as its adjacent group. P-values for F-statistics are shown in square brackets. *, **, *** indicates significance at the 1, 5, and 10 percent levels.

Table 6

Logit Estimates of the Determinants of Being in School Relative to Disconnection or Being Employed Relative to Disconnection for Males: Evaluating the Influence of Eurocentric Appearance Factors

Variables	Model D Height		Model E Eye and Hair Color		Model F Appearance	
	Schooling (n=4254)	Working (n=4254)	Schooling (n=4254)	Working (n=4254)	Schooling (n=4254)	Working (n=4254)
Skin Black	0.728 (0.172)	0.426*** (0.088)	1.028 (0.297)	0.474*** (0.118)	1.022 (0.297)	0.455*** (0.117)
Skin Dark Brown	0.880 (0.221)	0.569** (0.125)	1.185 (0.341)	0.641* (0.159)	1.161 (0.335)	0.598* (0.151)
Skin Medium Brown	0.586** (0.155)	0.547*** (0.125)	0.766 (0.226)	0.579** (0.148)	0.721 (0.213)	0.562** (0.145)
Skin Light Brown	2.076** (0.768)	0.712 (0.244)	2.664** (1.034)	0.760 (0.281)	2.460** (0.957)	0.722 (0.259)
Height	1.497* (0.364)	1.447* (0.315)	1.454 (0.354)	1.423 (0.311)	1.380 (0.337)	1.383 (0.302)
Eyes Light			1.539 (0.445)	1.190 (0.302)	1.471 (0.428)	1.131 (0.289)
Eyes Brown			1.283 (0.317)	1.072 (0.230)	1.269 (0.315)	1.052 (0.226)
Eyes Other			1.387 (0.648)	0.974 (0.403)	1.373 (0.645)	0.963 (0.400)
Hair Light			1.655* (0.429)	1.367 (0.319)	1.731** (0.451)	1.388 (0.328)
Hair Brown			1.108 (0.209)	0.935 (0.155)	1.123 (0.213)	0.923 (0.156)
Hair Other			0.894 (0.318)	0.964 (0.295)	0.884 (0.315)	0.953 (0.293)
Attractive					1.783*** (0.226)	1.506*** (0.174)
Overweight						
Obese						

Table 6 (Continued)

Logit Estimates of the Determinants of Being in School Relative to Disconnection or Being Employed Relative to Disconnection for Males

Variables	Model D Height		Model E Eye and Hair Color		Model F Appearance	
	Schooling (n=4254)	Working (n=4254)	Schooling (n=4254)	Working (n=4254)	Schooling (n=4254)	Working (n=4254)
	F tests for Significant Differences Between Skin-shade Groups					
Black vs Dark Brown	[0.466]	[0.198]	[0.586]	[0.204]	[0.627]	[0.231]
Black vs Medium Brown	[0.425]	[0.289]	[0.297]	[0.296]	[0.217]	[0.386]
Black vs Light Brown	[0.006]***	[0.141]	[0.013]**	[0.148]	[0.023]**	[0.196]
Dark Brown vs Medium Brown	[0.142]	[0.870]	[0.118]	[0.883]	[0.088]*	[0.796]
Dark Brown vs Light Brown	[0.024]**	[0.525]	[0.035]**	[0.525]	[0.051]*	[0.596]
Medium Brown vs Light Brown	[0.001]***	[0.452]	[0.001]***	[0.458]	[0.001]***	[0.476]
Joint Test	[0.009]***	[0.390]	[0.013]**	[0.413]	[0.014]**	[0.502]
	F tests for Significant Differences Between Eye and Hair Color Groups					
Eyes Light vs Eyes Brown			[0.246]	[0.467]	Did not	run these
Hair Light vs Hair Brown			[0.047]**	[0.041]**		
R Squared						

Notes: Coefficient estimates (log odds relative to disconnection) are reported and standard errors are shown in parentheses. All estimated equations include interviewer fixed effects. Column titles indicated what has been added to the model. Eurocentric Ideal includes all ascriptive factors. P-values for F-statistics are shown in square brackets. *, **, *** indicates significance at the 1, 5, and 10 percent levels.