

NATIONAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE OF LEGAL POLICY  
PUBLICATION NO. 191

Anne Kouvonen

PART-TIME WORK AND DEVIANT BEHAVIOUR  
AMONG FINNISH ADOLESCENTS

Helsinki 2002

Cover design: Kira Maisniemi

ISBN 951-704-278-7 (Print)

ISBN 952-10-0622-6 (PDF)

ISSN 0357-0126

HAKAPAINO OY, HELSINKI 2002

*For Mom and Dad*

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To carry out this inspiring project has been a great opportunity for me. Nevertheless, I would not have succeeded in producing a doctoral dissertation without the help and support of numerous individuals and organisations.

Most of all, I wish to single out three persons. Firstly, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Janne Kivivuori, the supervisor of this work, who did a great job in advising me, devoting a countless number of hours to this project. He gave me encouragement when it was badly needed, and he also co-authored one of the articles of which this dissertation is made up. Secondly, my thanks go to Irja Kandolin, my other supervisor. She has been of great help in the preparation of the articles. Especially through her skilled advice concerning quantitative methods, the quality of this research was greatly improved. Thirdly, Kauko Aromaa deserves special mention and thanks for initiating the idea in 1999, that I should embark on a dissertation. Furthermore, he supported me in my initial stage as a researcher and he also helped me to get funding for my projects.

This work was scientifically reviewed by Salme Ahlström and Sakari Karvonen. I wish to thank them for helping me to develop this work. My thanks also go to editors and reviewers of the journals in which the original papers were published, for their challenging and helpful comments.

Special thanks are due to Tomi Lintonen who co-authored two original papers. From him I learnt a great deal about research methods and about what it takes to prepare articles. His comments and contribution really made this work better.

There are many others, who have helped me in this work. Matti Rimpelä gave me permission to use the SHPS data, and commented on earlier drafts of Papers III and IV. Päivi Honkatukia gave valuable comments concerning the summary article. Eeva-Kaisa Suhonen helped me to collect qualitative data, whereas Eira Mykkänen helped me with the layout of this publication. Vivan Storlund refined my use of the English language in the original papers and in the summary article. Mia Merikoski and Tarja Kröger assisted me on the subject of law and young workers, whereas Terttu Belgasem helped me in library matters. It was Päivi Järviemi, who originally gave me the idea to study adolescent work. Thanks to her I got the possibility to study this subject in two projects financed by the Ministry of Labour in 1999–2000.

Kari Pitkänen gave me advice when I wrote the first original paper. I also wish to thank Tapani Valkonen, Eero Lahelma, Ossi Rahkonen, Pekka

Martikainen and the students of the Population, Health and Living Conditions graduate school for their comments on earlier drafts of my papers.

I am grateful to Tapio Lappi-Seppälä, the director of the National Research Institute of Legal Policy, for giving me the opportunity to work in the premises of the institute, and that this study was published in the series of the institute. The National Research Institute of Legal Policy funded and organised the FSRD data collection together with the Ministry of Education. The Ministry of Social Affairs and Health funded the SHPS data collection. I have received financial support from the Helsinki University Science Foundation, the Population, Health and Living Conditions graduate school, the Alli Paasikivi Foundation and the Ministry of Labour. In addition, I thank all those thousands of adolescents who filled in questionnaires, and whose responses have formed the empirical basis of this dissertation.

Moreover, I wish to extend my thanks outside of academic circles. Therefore, I thank my Grandma Helka Kouvonen, my sisters Merja and Hanna Kouvonen, my cousin Anu Tervo, as well as my dear friend Anu Neuvonen and all other friends for reminding me that there are also other, even more important things in life than just research.

Miikka Merikoski, I appreciate your constant encouragement, tolerance and patient love more than you can imagine.

Last, but not least, I wish to express my greatest gratitude to my parents Ritva and Erkki Kouvonen, who have given me strong emotional support and who have always encouraged me to read, study and get a good education. I dedicate this book to them.

Paltaniemi, June 2002

*Anne Kouvonen*

# CONTENTS

## LIST OF ORIGINAL PUBLICATIONS

1	INTRODUCTION .....	1
2	BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY .....	8
2.1	Adolescent work as a research topic .....	8
2.2	Research about adolescent work in the US: high school kids and the effects of intensive work .....	9
	<i>The question of 'dosage'</i> .....	10
	<i>The question of causality</i> .....	12
2.3	Research about child work in the UK .....	13
2.4	Adolescent work as perceived in criminological theories .....	15
2.5	Pseudomaturity .....	19
2.6	Legislation regulating adolescent work in Finland .....	20
3	STUDY SETTING AND THE AIMS OF THE STUDY .....	22
4	MATERIALS AND METHODS .....	24
4.1	Study population and data collection .....	24
4.2	Operationalization of the main concepts .....	26
	<i>Adolescent work</i> .....	26
	<i>Work intensity</i> .....	27
	<i>Work type</i> .....	28
	<i>Juvenile delinquency</i> .....	29
	<i>Victimization</i> .....	29
	<i>Heavy drinking</i> .....	30
	<i>Drug use</i> .....	30
	<i>Control variables</i> .....	30
4.3	Statistical analysis methods .....	31
5	EMPIRICAL RESULTS .....	33
5.1	Adolescent work in Finland .....	33
5.2	Adolescent work, delinquency and victimization (Papers I and II) .....	36
5.3	Adolescent work, heavy drinking and drug use (Papers III and IV) .....	38

	<i>Heavy drinking</i> .....	38
	<i>Drug use</i> .....	39
6	DISCUSSION .....	41
6.1	Overview of the results .....	41
6.2	Conclusions .....	43
	<i>Balancing the results by introducing qualitative data</i> ....	43
	<i>Selection, socialisation and money</i> .....	46
	<i>Too autonomous too early?</i> .....	49
6.3	Limitations of the study .....	52
6.4	Implications for policy .....	54
6.5	Challenges for future studies .....	55
	REFERENCES .....	57
	TIIVISTELMÄ .....	65
	ABSTRACT .....	66
	ORIGINAL PUBLICATIONS .....	67

# LIST OF ORIGINAL PUBLICATIONS

This paper is a summary of and an introduction to four original studies that have been published or accepted for publication. Together they form a doctoral dissertation. The studies, which are referred to by Roman numerals in the text, are:

- I Kouvonen A (2001). Part-time Work and Delinquency among Finnish Adolescents. *Young* 9 (4): 30–49.
- II Kouvonen A & Kivivuori J (2001). Part-time Jobs, Delinquency and Victimization among Finnish Adolescents. *Journal of Scandinavian Studies in Criminology and Crime Prevention* 2 (2): 191–212.
- III Kouvonen A & Lintonen T (2002). Adolescent Part-time Work and Heavy Drinking in Finland. *Addiction* 97 (3): 311–318.
- IV Kouvonen A & Lintonen T (2002). Adolescent Work and Drug Experiments. *Journal of Substance Use* 7 (2): 85–92 <<http://www.tandf.co.uk>>

The papers examine the relationship between adolescent part-time work and deviant behaviour. In Papers I-II the association between work intensity (weekly working hours) and delinquency is explored. Papers III–IV examine the relationship between working conditions (intensity and type) and substance use (heavy drinking and the use of drugs).

\*\*\*

The papers are reproduced with the permission of the publishers: Swedish Science Press (I), Taylor & Francis Group (II and IV), Blackwell Science Ltd (III).

# 1 INTRODUCTION

The aim of the present study is to increase our knowledge about adolescent part-time work during the school year, and to examine the association between work and deviant behaviour (delinquency, victimization, heavy drinking and drug use) among Finnish 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> grade lower-level secondary school students. The study comes mainly under sociology, criminology, alcohol studies, and youth studies.

Child or adolescent work has never been an unfamiliar feature in Finland, but the nature of such work and its characteristics underwent decisive changes throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Present adolescent workers in advanced industrialized countries have different social origins and their motivation for working differs from earlier times. Also their jobs are highly different (Greenberger & Steinberg 1986: 3) than that of adolescents for example 100 years ago – or than the jobs of today’s adolescents in the Third World. According to the International Labour Organisation, ILO, (2000) some 250 million children between the age of 5 and 14 are working in developing countries – 120 million full-time and 130 part-time.

In the past, work was an important educational and intergenerational experience for children and adolescents (see Greenberger & Steinberg 1986: 50), originating in economic necessity and absolute poverty. Today, the main motivation for adolescents to work while still attending school is to finance personal needs, mostly leisure consumption<sup>1</sup>. Children and adolescents from more affluent working and middle class families have started to work because they need money to be able to take part in the youth consumer market and culture (Lavalette 1998: 35). Adolescents are often employed in ‘non-standard’ employment relationships and in the hidden economy, and they represent a low paid and vulnerable section of the workforce (Mizen et al. 1999a: 425; see also Rikowski & Neary 1997). Moreover, the very youngest workers typically have poor knowledge about the laws, employment conditions and their rights as employees (Kouvonen 2000b). They may thus be more prone than older workers to be victimized in working life. In addition, adolescents are faced with many kinds of problems in their jobs, such as getting paid for their work and getting necessary guidance for their work tasks (Kouvonen 2000b).

---

<sup>1</sup> However, it has been found that adolescents have also other reasons for working than mere economic ones (Kouvonen 2000a).

In Finland, research on adolescent work goes back far in time – actually to the time before the introduction of compulsory education (1921). As early as 1908, G. R. Snellman studied primary school children's work outside home in the biggest Finnish towns. In spite of this, research on child/adolescent work does not have a good and exhaustive tradition in Finland. As far as I know, it took more than 80 years before this phenomenon would again attract researchers' attention. The lack of interest could be due to the fact that schooling has become almost a full time 'work' for younger children and the main activity of older adolescents. It can be difficult to perceive the significance of adolescent work for society at large, as well as the part such work plays in children's and adolescents' everyday life. This is because adolescent work is often constructed as 'invisible' (Morrow 1994: 142) and it is typically irregular and informal.

It is estimated that adolescent work became more frequent in the 1980s, and that it was quite common in Finland, at least in the area of Helsinki (Siurala 1991: 71). Unfortunately there are no nation-wide surveys from that and earlier periods, and thus we cannot be sure, if there really was an increase. Rahikainen (1996) associates the increase in adolescent labour with the global divide between South and North, and the enrichment of advanced industrial nations. In Western countries, the rate of consumption increased and the volume of adolescents' consumption came to equal or even exceed that of adults. The income of parents no longer covered all expenses and adolescents began to look for their own jobs. As a result of this increase in consumption, new work opportunities opened up to adolescents, for example in the new service sector, such as, in cross-national firms or in the distribution of advertisements. (Rahikainen 1996; Rahikainen 1999). In the late 1980s, students aged 14 to 16 were in Helsinki in a majority among young workers at the check lines of shops, and among coffee shop or shop assistants (Hämäläinen 1990: 23). According to another study (Tallavaara 1990: 52), the most common jobs among adolescents (in Helsinki) younger than 15, were distribution of advertisements, shop assistance and babysitting.

During and after the economic depression in the early part of the 1990s the picture of adolescent work changed. The unemployment rate, especially among young adults, has remained high. Transition to the labour market has complicated, and among young adults, transition to work life does no more mean a simple step to an economically independent life (Laaksonen 2001: 86). Besides, participation in education has changed in many ways: education has lengthened and widened, educational periods and work periods often intermesh, and there exist breaks in educational paths (Komonen 2001:

70). In brief, transition from education to employment tends to take longer and has become more complex, increasingly fragmented, differentiated, and in some respects less predictable. Young people's routes and experiences have become more individualised. (Furlong & Cartmel 1997.)

Partly in consequence of youth unemployment, adolescents attending comprehensive school report difficulties in finding jobs (Kouvonen 2000b: 66). Accordingly, in Finland, the level of adolescent work involvement is lower than in many other industrialized countries. However, as McKechnie et al. (1998: 39) note, it is difficult to accurately assess the extent of child participation in working life. Direct comparisons between countries and studies are problematic, because studies differ for example in how they define 'work', the age of the respondents, and the work status (current/former) (see Hobbs & McKechnie 1998: 10; Pettitt 1998: 4). Young people frequently move in and out of the labour market. Therefore, questions phrased differently may produce very different estimates (Steinberg & Cauffman 1995: 137).

In the US, the employment rate of adolescents is especially high: between one half and two thirds of high school juniors have jobs in the formal part-time labour market at any specific time during the school year (Steinberg & Dornbusch 1991: 304). Furthermore, more than 90 % of the adolescents initiate in formal or informal work by the age of 16 (Mihalic & Elliott 1997: 465). American adolescents have both discretionary income with which to consume, and at the same time they are an important source of inexpensive labour (Williams et al. 1996: 200). To work during high school is much less common in Europe and Japan (Mortimer et al. 1994: 304). According to American researchers, the greater frequency of adolescent work in the US is in large part due to four things: the enormous expansion of the service economy after World War II, a widespread belief among American parents that work is beneficial, American youth's strong desire to get money for consumption, and a more complex mixing of school and work. In many European countries, adolescents have less leisure-time (longer school days, more homework, a need to study for examinations that will determine adolescents' future) (Williams et al. 1996: 199; Greenberger & Steinberg 1986: 23).

The extent and nature of adolescent employment is influenced by the structure of, and the opportunities available on the local labour market (Mizen 1992: 8). In the UK and Portugal the employment rates of school children are significantly higher than in other EU countries (Rikowski & Neary 1997: 30). Child labour is a problem in Portugal, where a number of

companies in the footwear, textile, construction and hotel industries exploit child labour. Also Italy has one of the highest rates of child labour in the EU, and obviously there are serious child labour problems (including child prostitution and pornography) in many Eastern European countries ([www.globalmarch.org/cl-around-the-world](http://www.globalmarch.org/cl-around-the-world)).

Studies document that between 20 % and 50 % of the British adolescents under the age of 16 are likely to be in paid employment (Leonard 1998: 80). However, data from the Netherlands and Germany also show similar proportions (Hobbs et al. 1992: 98). Results of British studies further suggest that between two thirds and three quarters of children have some experience of paid work by the time they leave compulsory schooling (Hobbs et al. 1996: 5). According to a Nordic comparative survey (Nordic Council 1999: 158), the number of adolescents aged 13 to 17, who work during the school week from Monday to Friday, amounts to some 60 % in Denmark, 25 % in Iceland, 24 % in Norway, whereas only 7 % in Sweden.

My studies that are summarized here and the Nordic comparative survey (Nordic Council 1999) show, that the employment rate (at the time of the survey or during the present term) of Finnish adolescents is somewhere between 13 % and 18 %, depending on how 'part-time work' is measured and on the age bracket of the adolescents. During the second part of the 1990s, adolescent work became more prevalent among girls (see Paper II, Table 1) (see Keskinen 2001).

There is a certain difference in the kind of jobs that adolescents usually hold in Finland, when compared for example with the UK or the US. In the latter countries, a notable number of adolescents is employed in the service and retail sector<sup>2</sup>. In Finland, a great part of school aged workers have informal jobs, and few adolescents under the age of 16 or 18 work in the service sector, if we exclude distribution of advertisements and cleaning. My earlier qualitative interviews (Kouvonen 2000b) showed that adolescents would like to have these jobs, but employers seem to be reluctant to hire them. This is partly due to the strict restrictions on working hours for adolescents below the official minimum school leaving age, and the rule that adolescents under the age of 18 are not allowed to sell cigarettes and alcohol. Another factor that hampers their possibilities to work, is that there is, at least at the moment, enough late adolescents and (young) adults (the students of

---

<sup>2</sup> Even so, in the UK the labour markets of adolescents below the minimum school leaving age and older students are partly different. For example, many large hotels, retail or catering outlets or chains use a strict age bar in their recruitment (Mizen et al. 1999a: 428).

high schools, vocational schools, colleges and universities, as well as young full-time workers) for service and retail jobs that could be suitable also for younger adolescents. A good example is Finnish fast food restaurants: in the Finnish McDonald's restaurants, the average age of restaurant workers is 21, and in Hesburger restaurants their average age is even higher, approximately 25 (Viikkoliite Nyt 25.1.2002; Autio 1998). It has been noted that the proportion of high school workers is very low (14 %) for example in McDonald's restaurants (Autio 1998). The proportion of lower-level secondary school students working in fast food restaurants must be much below that. Besides, it would appear that even a difference in age of one or two years may condition the position of adolescents on the labour market, as also, whether an adolescent has left compulsory education or not. In other words, major forms and types of employment, working hours and pay rates significantly differ between lower-level secondary school students and older school-going adolescents (see McKechnie et al. 2000: 575). Older working students generally hold more formal jobs (see Steinberg & Cauffman 1995: 139).

In the UK, journalists, politicians and social scientists began to pay attention to adolescent work already in the early 1990s. Likewise, the European Union has dealt with the labour of minors by adopting a directive on the Protection of Young People at Work (1994). According to Bridget Pettitt (1998: 1), child employment was taken to the political agenda in the UK for several reasons. She argues that 'the recent interest has its roots in the increase in international attention to child labour, the children's rights movement and new thinking about the role of children in society'. In contrast, there has not been a comparable discussion in Finland.

In the early 1990s, adolescent work in Helsinki was approached in two surveys (Tallavaara 1990; Hämäläinen 1990), and in 1999 the Nordic Council carried out a comparative survey of child and adolescent work in the Nordic countries (Nordic Council 1999). In 2000, the Ministry of Labour published a pilot study 'Children and young people at work' (Kouvonen 2000b) and a subsequent study of the relationship between adolescent work and problem behaviour (Kouvonen 2001). Furthermore in 2000, Keskinen (2001) studied leisure-time habits, including paid work, among school-going adolescents in Helsinki. According to that study, the employment rate of 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> graders in Helsinki was approximately 20 %.

On the whole, information about the extent, forms, nature and correlates of Finnish adolescent work has been scarce. This is the first Finnish study where the correlates of adolescent work are examined and the

phenomenon of adolescent work is systematically described and analysed. The present study explored the association between work during the school year and deviant behaviour. The intention was to go beyond description and simple figures by using more sophisticated statistical analyses and research questions. The overall purpose of this dissertation was to increase our knowledge about part-time work among Finnish girls and boys at the turn of the millennium.

‘An adolescent’ in this study refers to a lower-level secondary school student, 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> graders, most of whom are aged 14 to 16. Karvonen (1997: 21) defines adolescence as ‘a generationally patterned stage of life that is characterised by a gradual transition from childhood dependency to the autonomy typical of adult roles’. Early and late adolescence can roughly be separated at the age when the first symbols of adult status are acquired; especially to leave compulsory education constitutes such a symbol (Karvonen 1997: 21). This study has focused on comprehensive school students in their early or mid adolescence. In the present study, early and mid adolescence are referred to as adolescence.

In the present study focus was placed on lower-level secondary school students for three reasons. First, this group is more homogeneous than older age groups in the sense that they all are in compulsory education, and for them work is in practice always an add-on to the mandatory task of attending school. Second, at these grade levels practically speaking an entire age group of the Finnish population can for the last time be reached in the same institution. Third, the work of comprehensive school students is a fairly unexplored area in Finnish research even though about half of the adolescents have gained some experience of paid work during the term and/or during holidays, by the time they reach the minimum age for leaving school (calculated from the School Health Promotion Survey 2000). In addition, the work histories of young people cover a much longer period of time than has usually been thought (see also Entwisle et al. 2000: 279). Some adolescents begin their working ‘careers’ at a much lower age than the legal minimum age; already at the age of 11, or sometimes even earlier (Kouvonen 2000b: 42; see Hobbs & McKechnie 1998: 11). This illustrates the problem of using fixed start points in transitional analyses: because many young people have already had significant and long experiences of being workers, it can be a misrepresentation to talk about the transition from school to work (Pollock 2000). As Pollock (2000) points out, in a sense ‘there is no such thing as the transition from to school to work’, while at school many adolescents work, on leaving school many do not work. In other words, he sees that the

relationship between education and work is being negotiated while at school, when in further education, as well as while in ‘the world of work’.

In this study, deviant behaviour refers to behaviours where adolescents knowingly break rules or norms defined by some adult authority. Deviant behaviour and problem(atic) behaviour are used mostly as synonymous here, and they include delinquency, heavy drinking and drug use. Drinking and drug are also referred to as ‘substance use’. Furthermore, in the data, delinquency includes the use of illegal drugs, and generally the use of alcohol among minors often include illegal elements.

However, the concept of deviance can be criticised in this context. First, in our culture, the use of alcohol is an essential part in the process of gaining autonomy, and in transition to adult roles. Second, behaviours such as substance use or minor delinquent acts, can be normative for adolescents (e.g. Safron et al. 2001: 428). In Finland, this is very much true especially with heavy drinking: about 60 % of adolescents report at least occasional heavy drinking (Paper III). Yet, an adolescent who uses illegal drugs (Paper IV), drinks heavily at least once a week (Paper III), or commit violent or other serious delinquent acts (Papers I–II) is not following the normative pattern for the majority of her or his peers (see Safron et al. 2001: 428).

Moreover, it can seem peculiar to include victimization in deviant behaviour. In the present study, victimization was examined because of a common criminological finding, that certain types of delinquency and of victimization are associated. For instance, being violent, and being threatened with violence, may reflect the two sides of the same ‘lifestyle’ coin.

\*

This paper summarizes the findings documented in the above-mentioned four original papers. I will begin by describing the context in which the study is set: prior research, central concepts and criminological theories. I will continue by presenting the setting of the study itself and its aims. After this, I will concentrate on material and methods documented in the four original studies. After that the main results of the original papers will be reviewed. A discussion of the results, limitations of the study, implications for policy and suggestions for further research will conclude this summary article.

## 2 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

### 2.1 Adolescent work as a research topic

According to James, Jenks and Prout (1998: 101), in the mainstream sociology of work, writings about children are virtually invisible and the research topic has only quite recently become a focus of interest. Similarly, Morrow (1994: 128) suggests that work activities of older children (aged 11 to 16) have been under-researched and under-theorised within sociology. She argues that in the industrialized West, childhood is often constructed as a period of dependency and non-productivity, and this social construction 'effectively renders children's labour outside school "invisible"' (see also James et al. 1998: 116). Furthermore, Qvortrup (1985: 132) argues that within sociology there has been a tendency to neglect children's activities, and moreover a tendency not to see children as a part of organised society. Likewise, Lucas (1997: 596) notes that it would be misplaced to think that students in full-time education (as well as pensioners), the groups who do not belong to the 'active labour force', are absent from the labour process. In reality, significant proportions of them work.

In this chapter, I will present developments in the field of research about adolescent work, the important questions of working conditions, and of causality, central research problems, as well as prior studies. I will concentrate on American and British studies for one simple reason: they have examined similar research problems as I have done in this study. There will be an emphasis on American research because most of the studies concerned with the association between adolescent work and deviant behaviour come from the US. Furthermore, I was able to find very few Nordic or Finnish studies – or studies from other countries. In Norway, Anne Solberg (1994) has examined child work, and the Nordic Council has made a Nordic comparative survey (1999). Earlier Finnish studies were briefly presented above (Chapter 1).

The fact that prior studies come from fairly different cultures causes some problems. It goes without saying that because of the differences in adolescent employment noted above, as well as other societal and cultural differences, comparing the results of the present study with results from the US and the UK can be problematic. We cannot assume that the results are directly transferable to the Finnish culture (see McKechnie et al. 1996: 195).

American and British research on adolescent work differ from each other at least concerning methods, the concepts they use, the way in which

research problems are formulated and partly they also focus on different age brackets. Methodologically, surveys and sophisticated analysis methods have dominated the scene in the US, whereas in the UK the quantitative studies have been less sophisticated. On the other hand, British researchers have used also qualitative methods. Next I will look at and compare the two ‘traditions’ from these two countries in more detail.

## 2.2 Research about adolescent work in the US: high school kids and the effects of intensive work

In the US, researchers usually talk about ‘adolescent’ or ‘teenage’ work, whereas in the UK the term ‘child work’ is commonly used. This probably reflects the fact that the US studies have mostly been concerned with high school students, whereas British studies cover students below official school leaving age (16 years). Hobbs et al. (1996: 7) note that ‘the end of compulsory schooling marks a suitable spot at which to end the study of “child” employment, as opposed to “youth” or “adult” employment’. The present study focuses on students in compulsory education. However, because the subject of correlates and possible effects of adolescent work is almost unexplored in Europe, a considerable number of references and many concepts have consequently been adopted from American research. The term ‘adolescent work’ is thus most frequently used in the present study, except in those cases where reference is made to British research. Another reason for choosing the term ‘adolescent’ is that 14–16-year-old students prefer to be called adolescents, not children (see Honkatukia 1999).

According to McKechnie et al. (1996: 193), research on child employment in Britain has been relatively rare, whereas the study of child employment has attained academic legitimacy in the US. The debate about whether work is good or bad for adolescents – the effects of employment – started in the US more than two decades ago. Before the early eighties, the scientific study of the effects of adolescent employment was quite rare because of the wide conviction that working is inherently good for adolescents (Steinberg & Cauffman 1995: 141). (Of the assumed benefits of work, see Paper I.)

During the early 1980s, Ellen Greenberger and Laurence Steinberg published a series of reports based on a large-scale systematic investigation on the subject. Based on their studies, these researchers suggested that the benefits of work to adolescent development, to education, socialisation and

subsequent employment have been overstated (Steinberg & Cauffman 1995: 142; Steinberg 1982: 183). Subsequent to these reports, a number of empirical studies have been conducted in the US. Studies of the same kind have been carried out also in Canada (Tanner & Krahn 1991). Moreover, some researchers in the UK have recently taken up the argument about 'costs and benefits' (Heptinstall 1998: 93), but generally speaking research about the costs and benefits of adolescent work in Britain and the rest of Western Europe is almost non-existent (Hobbs et al. 1992: 101).

Entwisle and colleagues (2000: 280–281) have divided the American research tradition of adolescent work into four major phases. In the first phase (prior to 1970), investigators paid almost no attention to students' paid work. In the second phase, research was based on national samples that were made possible by improved technology, and researchers emphasised the positive consequences of teenage work. The third phase began in the early 1980s, when attention moved to the possible negative effects of adolescent work on schoolwork, on adolescence development, and on the more frequent deviant behaviour among adolescent workers. Finally, in the 1990s, research entered its present, fourth phase. In brief, now the major issue is, whether work really has negative effects, or whether these effects, attributed to working, are instead due to pre-employment differences. Furthermore, Steinberg and Cauffman (1995: 143) argue that by the end of the 1980s, it became clear that the question whether adolescent work is good or bad, is too simplistic. Instead researchers began to ask in which conditions working is beneficial, harmful, or inconsequential. Work intensity, which is usually measured as the number of weekly work hours, has proved to be one of the most important conditions and variables in the studies of adolescent work (Steinberg & Cauffman 1995).

### *The question of 'dosage'*

Consequently, there is an emerging consensus among researchers that the possible negative effects are related to work intensity, that is, to weekly work hours, not to the question whether the student works or not (e.g. Cullen et al. 1997: 125; Steinberg et al. 1993: 172; Steinberg & Dornbusch 1991). Benefits seem to be attained from a relatively small involvement in working life (Hobbs et al. 1996: 16); it has been suggested that benefits can be gained and costs avoided by limiting the weekly working time during the school year to 10 hours or less (Steinberg & Cauffman 1995: 162). Moreover, no work at all is not necessarily better than 1–5 hours of work per week (Bachman &

Schulenberg 1993: 231). Studies have indicated that there are some advantages of at least moderate employment to adolescents' socialisation and development, such as increased autonomy and improved social skills, at least in some kinds of jobs (e.g. Mortimer et al. 1992a; Steinberg et al. 1982; Steinberg et al. 1981; Greenberger et al. 1981: 702), as well as better future economic attainment (Ruhm 1997) and adult employability (Mihalic & Elliott 1997). However, a growing body of research has suggested that intensive work during the school year has immediate undesirable correlates. It has been shown that there is an association between work / long working hours and higher rates of substance use and/or delinquency (e.g. Safron et al. 2001; Mortimer & Johnson 1998; Mihalic & Elliott 1997; Ploeger 1997; Mortimer et al. 1992b; Steinberg & Dornbusch 1991; Tanner & Krahn 1991), victimization (Bachman & Schulenberg 1993), psychological and somatic symptoms (Steinberg et al. 1993) and depressed mood (Shanahan et al. 1991). There are also studies of deviant behaviour at the workplace (Wright & Cullen 2000; Ruggiero et al. 1982). As to school performance, there is no agreement on whether working improves or worsens it (see Mortimer & Johnson 1998: 432; Ruhm 1997: 738; Steinberg & Cauffman 1995: 146).

Furthermore, there are other negative things, which might be associated with intensive work. For example, 'time trade-off perspective' indicates that 'time spent in one activity (i.e., work) leads to less time allocated to other supposedly more developmentally beneficial activities' (Safron et al. 2001: 426). In other words, working may steal time from other valuable activities, such as hobbies, voluntary work, periodical exercising, and getting enough sleep (Bachman & Schulenberg 1993: 228). In their study, Safron and colleagues (2001) found that intensive work was associated with more time spent on unstructured social activities with peers (such as dating and riding for fun), but to less time spent engaged in sport, health behaviours and school-related activities. Moreover, social time use and health behaviours partially mediated the relationship between work intensity and substance use.

In addition, adolescent work may have negative long-term effects, such as more frequent alcohol and cannabis use in adulthood (Mihalic & Elliott 1997: 483). Finally, it is worth noting that no studies have suggested that intensive part-time work in adolescence is correlated with positive psychological or behavioural outcomes (Steinberg & Cauffman 1995: 161–162).

In general, the tone of the American researchers' commentaries has been quite negative and it is argued that it may sometimes be overdrawn

(Mortimer et al. 1994: 323). Mortimer and Johnson (1998) showed that adolescent work could be protective in some conditions and risky in others. Moreover, Ruhm (1997: 770) sees that light or moderate work provides important benefits and thus should be encouraged.

While there has been extensive discussion about work intensity, perhaps too little attention has been given to the quality of youth work (see Stern et al. 1990: 265). It is possible that some kinds of jobs increase, for example, responsibility, while other jobs and working environments may have negative effects. If more hours are done in some specific kinds of jobs, work hours may at least partly be only an intermediate factor. One feature of work quality, the type of job held, has not often been under consideration. According to McNeal (1997: 210), ‘distinctions among industries are meaningful constructs and can be seen as a general proxy for work environment, the degree of supervision, amount of structure in the workplace, peer-adult environments, and variations in income’.

### ***The question of causality***

In addition to the conditions of employment, researchers have directed their attention to the question of causality. There is some controversy among researchers, whether the negative correlates of extensive working are really caused by the work itself: are the relationships simply spurious, due to selection processes, truly attributable to the influence of intensive working, or is there some combination of the processes at work (Mortimer et al. 1996: 1245; Steinberg & Cauffman 1995: 144; Steinberg et al. 1993: 171). While the present study cannot solve this problem, I nevertheless agree with Marsh (1991: 185), who argues that this is the most important methodological issue for researchers in this field.

Taking a job is – arguably – a self-selected, voluntary activity, and at least in cross-sectional data it is impossible to determine whether intensive work is a cause of something. Some investigators (e.g. Entwisle et al. 2000: 293) have argued that young people who work long hours are, for example, more inclined to use drugs and alcohol and to commit delinquent acts even before they entered the labour force. Differences between groups could thus reflect pre-employment differences in orientation (Gottfredson 1985: 430). Furthermore, both intensive work and the negative correlates can reflect ‘third variables’, and intensive part-time work could be more a symptom rather than the cause of various correlates (Bachman & Schulenberg 1993: 232). Similarly, it is possible that even if intensive workers and other

adolescents have pre-employment differences, intensive part-time work further exacerbates problems (see Mihalic & Elliott 1997: 493; Steinberg et al. 1993: 178). In addition, employers could have selected some specific kinds of adolescents for more intensive work (Mortimer et al. 1992b: 76).

On the other hand, there are longitudinal studies (Steinberg et al. 1993; Steinberg et al. 1982), which have indicated that some of the negative correlates of adolescent employment may indeed be consequences of intensive work.

According to Steinberg & Cauffman (1995: 144–145), researchers have addressed the problem of selection at least in three ways. First, the researcher may statistically control for background characteristics, and examine whether differences between workers and non-workers persist after controlling. In the present study, this method was used. Second, a longitudinal design may be used. Third, among non-workers, those who are seeking employment can be differentiated from those who do not want to have a job. Unfortunately, in the absence of randomised experimental designs, there is no satisfactory way to solve the problem of selection vs. socialisation effects (Steinberg & Cauffman 1995: 145). Accordingly, researchers argue that the issue has not been fully addressed (e.g. Bachman & Schulenberg 1993: 221). Indeed, there may never be any adequate answer to this problem (Marsh 1991: 185).

To conclude, as Jerald G. Bachman and John Schulenberg (1993: 221) note, the discussion about the costs and benefits of adolescent work is likely to continue. They argue that there are at least three critical issues concerning the relationship between work intensity and its correlates: the trade-off between costs and benefits, the shape (i.e., linear/non-linear) of the relationships, and the question of the causal direction underlying the correlations.

## 2.3 Research about child work in the UK

Research on child/adolescent work – at least quantitative research – is not so widespread in the UK as in the US. As Phillip Mizen, Angela Bolton and Christopher Pole (1999a: 425) point out:

‘On the one hand, debate has been constrained by a ‘numbers game’, in which survey after survey broadly approximates one another’s findings, while on the other, attention has been limited to a narrow

administrative focus usually pointing to the ineffectiveness of the existing regulatory framework.’

These writers conclude that the analysis of child work in Britain has failed to progress very far (see Hobbs et al. 1992: 104), and future research – in Britain or elsewhere in the Western world – needs to ask broader questions about the relationship between child work and the changing organisation of childhood (Mizen et al. 1999a: 434).

On the other hand, all British child work researchers do not share the above criticism. McKechnie et al. (2000: 574) argue that the statement of Mizen’s group ‘is potentially misleading as it fails to acknowledge the context in which this research was taking place’. They note that at the beginning of the 1990s the British government held a position that child employment was not a problem in the country. As a consequence, researchers’ priorities were to describe the nature and extent of child employment and to relate that information to the legislative framework.

Moreover, British scholars have noted limitations in the way things have been examined and conceptualised in American research. Mizen and co-workers (1999a: 424) argue that because American researchers position adolescent work as an aspect of child development, they fail to recognise the possible connections between children’s employment and the social forces organising their lives. Instead, Mizen and colleagues consider work as a rational response of many school children to the conditions of childhood, the changing distribution of family income and the commodification of children’s leisure-time. They argue that paid work offers a potential emancipating force for poor children. Furthermore, they indicate that in the American tradition ‘questions of work’s significance to the immediate are marginalized in favour of an assessment of the costs and benefits of working to children’s transitions into the well-adjusted workers of tomorrow’. (Mizen et al. 2000.)

In brief, British research on child work is heterogeneous both in regard to methods and research problems. As an illustration, here are some examples of questions that have been examined: child labour in a historical, legislative and policy context (Lavalette 1998); children’s contributions to family budgets (Middleton et al. 1998; Leonard 1998); the extent (Hobbs et al. 1996) and significance of child work (Mizen 1992); working children: the health and safety issue (McKechnie et al. 1998; Heptinstall 1998); adolescents’ perceptions of the role of part-time work (McKechnie et al. 1996); work, labour and economic life in late childhood (Mizen et al. 1999b).

## 2.4 Adolescent work as perceived in criminological theories

In some American studies concerning the relationship between adolescent work and deviant behaviour (delinquency and substance use) (e.g. Ploeger 1997; Cullen et al. 1997), a criminological theoretical frame has been utilized. However, in spite of repeatedly found correlations between adolescent work intensity and deviant behaviour, the domain of work in adolescents' life has, until recently, been largely ignored by criminologists. Consequently, theory in this area seems to be relatively underdeveloped (Williams et al. 1996: 196, 200). The relationship between adolescent work and deviant behaviour has rarely been systematically studied, compared with the attention paid to the effects of other social contexts such as peer group, family and school. This might be partly due to the assumption, that unlike other contexts, 'going to work' is not integral to adolescence. (Williams et al 1996: 196.) However, especially in late adolescence work becomes a significant socialisation setting (Mihalic & Elliott 1997: 464). Furthermore, as Cullen et al. (1997: 128) note, the 'neglect of the institution of work is a potentially important omission: the effects of employment appear to rival if not surpass the effects of family and school factors'. Besides, it is reasonable to locate adolescent problem behaviours in context, and not to study them merely as isolated phenomena (see Steinberg & Avenevoli 1998).

Following some earlier American studies, I wanted to apply criminological theories to my subject, and in a Finnish context, by investigating the relationship between adolescent work and deviant behaviour. Originally, I began to study the relationship between adolescent work and deviant behaviour because earlier studies pointed at this as a fruitful research subject. I wanted to find out if the relationship between work and deviant behaviour is similar in Finland.

As a consequence, common criminological variables reflecting criminological theories were used as controllers in the analysis models (see especially Paper II). In this section, focus is placed on how various criminological theoretical perspectives link adolescent work to either more or less involvement in deviant behaviour. I will briefly present some important theories; in the original articles they have been presented somewhat more extensively, and more theories are presented there, such as labelling and subculture theories. Furthermore, I want to point out that the following selection of criminological theories is not exhaustive. In this summary, focus is placed on: (1) opportunity structure theories, (2) strain theories, (3) control

theories, (4) learning theories, and (5) the general theory of crime. There are implicit and ambiguous assumptions in these theories about the nature of deviant behaviour. Besides, when used to explain the relationship between work and deviant behaviour, these models appear to be relatively simplistic. Nevertheless, it is of course inherent in theoretical work that theories somehow simplify the social world.

### *1. Opportunity structure theories*

It is sometimes assumed that having a job reduces participation in deviant behaviour. For example, if adolescents spend much of their time at work, they are too busy to commit delinquent acts, or use alcohol or drugs. This kind of thinking implies that delinquent acts are committed solely 'on the streets', in public spaces. However, a notable part of juvenile delinquency takes place in schools, homes etc. Similarly, work itself may also offer opportunities for some delinquent acts. For example, the employment or occupation theory of Clinard and Quinney (1973) suggests that working adolescents commit more property offences because they have on-the-work-access to money and goods.

Reference to opportunity structure is one dimension of the more general routine activity theory, which posits that crime takes place when motivated offenders, suitable targets and the absence of capable guardians converge in time and space (Cohen & Felson 1979; Clarke 1980). The predictions of the routine activity theory concerning adolescent work are ambiguous: work provides opportunities for crimes and other deviant behaviour or even potential victims (suitable targets) for crime, but it can as well put the adolescent under the surveillance of 'capable guardians'.

### *2. Strain theories*

The classical formulation of strain theory is Robert Merton's (1968) anomie theory. According to Merton, strain, and hence delinquency, results if culture proscribes certain goals (such as economic success), but the social structure does not provide some people with legitimate means of attaining those goals. Work is a legitimate means of fulfilling cultural goals. Therefore, this theory would seem to predict that adolescents who work commit less delinquent acts than adolescents who do not work.

Similarly, Robert Agnew's (1992; 2001) general strain theory suggests that strain is produced by the blockage of desired goals. Moreover, Agnew notes that strain can be produced by the inability to escape noxious stimuli and by the withdrawal of positive stimuli. Strain refers to relationships in which others are not treating the individual as he or she

would like to be treated (Agnew 1992: 48). Stressors or strains increase the likelihood of negative emotions, such as frustration and anger (Agnew 2001: 319). However, Agnew (2001: 351) further argues that certain common types of strain – such as failure to achieve educational and occupational success – will not be related or will be only weakly related to crime, whereas other types will be more strongly associated with crime. These strains include e.g. negative school experiences, parental rejection, harsh parental discipline and peer abuse.

While intensive work may give adolescents material success and resources, at the same time it may expose them to other forms of strain or stress, which adolescents may try to ease by substance use (Williams et al. 1996: 204; Greenberger & Steinberg 1986: 134). Harassment or other victimization by employers, colleagues or customers can also be a source of strain. In a similar way, a conflict between work and school may create pressures for school-related deviance (Greenberger & Steinberg 1986: 131). Moreover, Heiser (2000) argues that ‘jobs of today do not reduce strain, because they are unstable and do not offer long-range prosperity’.

### *3. Control theories*

According to ‘the social bond theory’, the dominant version of traditional control theory, weak bonds to conventional institutions promote weak social control and deviant behaviour (Mihalic & Elliott 1997: 465; Williams et al. 1996: 202; Hirschi 1969). Work is expected to reduce juvenile delinquency and substance use by involving adolescents in conventional economic activity and ‘good’ social contacts. On the other hand, Hirschi (1983) has argued that work may actually loosen the ties to socialising institutions such as the family or the school. He suggests that when adolescents work, and have enough money of their own, they become less dependent upon their parents who thereby no longer have the material means to punish them. In consequence, the system of parental control is weakening and adolescents become too autonomous too early. Decreasing dependence on the family results in increasing dependence on other young people. However, they cannot take the place of parents as socialising agents. It has been suggested that the opportunity to use substances is higher in unsupervised occasions since there is no authority figure present to maintain social control (see Safran et al. 2001: 428–429).

There are some problems in Hirschi’s notions. First, the relationship between parents and children is described solely in economic terms. It is supposed that parental control can function only by economic means, through

pocket money. Second, even if an adolescent had economic autonomy, this does not necessarily mean that she or he would start to commit delinquent acts, to drink weekly or to use illegal drugs. Third, it is an essential part of adolescence that an individual becomes autonomous and independent of their parents bit by bit. In a way, the challenge is to find a reasonable balance between adolescent's efforts to autonomy, and parental control.

In addition, problem behaviour may be incited by the lack of other than parental adult authority: deviant behaviour can also occur because adolescent work is often done in the absence of adult supervision.

#### *4. Learning theories*

In learning theories, it is suggested that deviant behaviour is learned in interaction with other people. Differential association theory may regard some workplaces as places where adolescents are exposed to an overabundance of associations with criminal behavioural patterns and verbalisations, in comparison with associations with anti-criminal ones. Criminal behavioural patterns can be learnt also from persons who are not criminals, similarly anti-criminal behaviour patterns can be learnt from criminals. (Sutherland & Cressey 1978: 80–85.) At many workplaces, adolescents have contacts with older work mates, who can act as role models for more adult-like habits, such as drinking. Furthermore, they can procure alcohol and drugs for adolescent workers. Similarly, there may be delinquent age-mates that encourage a working adolescent to commit delinquent acts or to use substances with them. The differential reinforcement or social learning theory of Akers (Burgess & Akers, 1968: 146) argues that 'criminal behaviour is learned both in non-social situations that are reinforcing or discriminative and through that social interaction in which the behavior of other persons is reinforcing or discriminative for criminal behavior'. Interactional theory (Thornberry 1987: 863) views delinquency as resulting from freedom followed by a weakening of a person's bonds to conventional society, and from an interactional setting where delinquent behaviour is learned and reinforced. Control, learning and delinquency variables are seen as interrelated, exercising mutual effects on one another.

However, from the point of view of learning theories, work as such is neutral in the criminological and substance use sense, unless we know what kind of people adolescents meet there, and what kind of people they would otherwise interact with.

### 5. *The general theory of crime*

In their general, cross-cultural theory of crime and delinquency, Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) define crime as ‘the short-sighted pursuit of self-interest’, and criminality as ‘the relative absence of the self-control required to produce concern for the long-term consequences of one’s acts’. Crimes and equivalent ‘pleasures’, such as smoking and drinking correlate, because ‘they share features that satisfy the tendencies of criminality, providing immediate, easy and short-term pleasure’. In addition, Gottfredson and Hirschi note that work in adolescence does not diminish delinquency.

In line with their theory and similar hypotheses presented elsewhere, one can draw the conclusion that intensively working adolescents and juvenile delinquents share characteristics: like delinquency, casual and often low-skilled unstable adolescent work may be a manifestation of the underlying tendency to pursue short-term immediate pleasures (through money). In contrast, education is a long-sighted activity that brings reward only after a long time.

In sum, many criminological theories can be used to argue either that work is associated with an increased or a decreased likelihood of deviant behaviour, or alternatively both ways. Theories concerning the relationship between work and deviant behaviour should be further developed. In addition, every theory should specify with which age group it is concerned and/or how the mechanisms function within different age groups (e.g. children, early adolescents, late adolescents, young adults, middle aged). Applying a developmental or life-course perspective (Sampson & Laub 1993), Williams and co-workers (1996: 195) argue that the effect of working may vary according to a person’s stage in life: working may be criminogenic at some ages, but crime reducing at other ages.

## 2.5 Pseudomaturity

From a psychological and psychosocial point of view, it has been argued that intensive work may be a reflection or consequence of the precocious transition to adult roles rather than an independent cause of deviant or problem behaviour. Intensive part-time work may be a part or a component of a youth lifestyle, which could be called ‘pseudomaturity’ or ‘precocious development’. (Bachman & Schulenberg 1993: 232; Mortimer et al. 1996.) Thus, part of the correlation between intensive work and deviant behaviour may stem from pre-existing individual differences that are manifest prior to

entrance into working life (Wright & Cullen 2000: 871–872). To some extent, such a phenomenon may reflect the differential timing of biological maturity in adolescents that probably has socially mediated effects on behaviour. Even so, ‘pseudomaturity’ is also a lifestyle phenomenon that cannot be wholly reduced to variations in biological development.

The idea of pseudomaturity differs from the theories of crime and delinquency, which emphasise the additional and continuing independent effect of work hours on deviant behaviour (McMorris & Uggen 2000: 277). In pseudomaturity, young individuals engage in adult-like behaviour before they have the requisite views and responsibilities (Bachman & Schulenberg 1993: 232). In other words, pseudomaturity involves the attainment of adult roles too early and too quickly, without the development of sufficient psychological maturity. For example, when working teenagers spend their earnings on themselves, mostly on ‘luxury items’, this does not prepare them for the responsible money management required in adulthood. (Greenberger & Steinberg 1986: 171, 174, 177.)

Working adolescents may start to think of themselves as adults, given the adult-like responsibilities on the job and a growing degree of economic autonomy (Mortimer & Johnson 1998: 431). These adolescents aim at acquiring the adulthood symbols, or perhaps only superficial signs of adulthood – such as dating, smoking, heavy drinking and intensive work – earlier than their age-mates on average. As Greenberger and Steinberg (1986: 5) note, a heavy engagement in work may actually interfere with the time-consuming and important process of achieving real maturity, which requires the development of complex cognitive structures. Moreover, intensive work assumes the function of a means as wages and ‘premature affluence’ permit adolescents freely to engage in ‘adultoid’ behaviours that otherwise might be unavailable or constrained (Greenberger & Steinberg 1986: 178).

## 2.6 Legislation regulating adolescent work in Finland

In the Finnish act regulating the work of adolescents (998/1993), there are rules concerning, among others, safety and health at work, the kind of work that may be performed and the daily working hours that are permitted for young people under the minimum age for leaving school (16) and for young people under 18 years. These rules aim at protecting adolescents, but on the other hand it can be argued that they, at the same time, constrain adolescents’

possibilities to get jobs on the formal labour market, driving them thereby to seek jobs in the hidden economy, where they are totally out of reach of legislative protection.

***What the current Finnish law says?***

- A 14-year old child, or a child who reaches the age of 14 during that same calendar year, may be employed in light work, which does not harm her/his health, development or schoolwork. A younger child may only be employed temporarily as a performer or assistant in art, culture and corresponding events.
- A child of compulsory school age is allowed to work no more than 12 hours per week during the school week and no more than seven hours per day on Saturdays and Sundays. The total amount of school and work hours may not exceed eight hours per day. Only half of the school holidays may be spent in paid work.
- A person who has reached the age of 15 has a right to enter a work contract and terminate it. Persons younger than 15 need the consent of their guardian, if they want to enter a work contract.

### 3 STUDY SETTING AND THE AIMS OF THE STUDY

The overall aim of this study has been to increase and widen our understanding of part-time work during the school year among Finnish girls and boys. Accordingly, the first objective was to undertake a detailed investigation, description and analysis of work among Finnish lower-level secondary school students.

The second and, at the same time, the primary purpose of the study was to examine the relationship between part-time work and deviant behaviour. At a general level, this study aimed at finding some preliminary answers to the complex question: is work beneficial, harmful or inconsequential for Finnish adolescents, and under which conditions? (see Greenberger & Steinberg 1986: 46; Steinberg & Cauffman 1995: 143). The intention was to examine the associations between adolescent work and different dependent variables: delinquency, victimization and substance use.

In prior research, the associations between intensive work and deviant behaviour have most often turned out to be positive – intensive work has been associated with an increased likelihood of deviant behaviour. In the present research, focus was placed on two forms of deviant behaviour, delinquency and substance use. This choice was motivated by the results of prior research: ‘If there is reason to be concerned about the possible deleterious consequences of extensive employment during the school year, [...] it is to be found in studies of working and problem behavior’ (Steinberg & Cauffman 1995: 158). Steinberg and Cauffman (1995: 158–159) further argue that two sets of findings, higher rates of drug and alcohol use as well as the more frequent delinquency among intensive workers, stand out as particularly worrisome.

The main research question can be summarized as follows:

‘How does part-time work among girls and boys relate to possible negative correlates identified in prior studies: higher rates of delinquency, victimization, heavy drinking and the use of drugs?’

Furthermore, in this summary, some results of my earlier qualitative study (Kouvonen 2000a) are briefly presented, in order to complement the pure quantitative approach, allowing thereby a better overall picture of the phenomenon ‘adolescent work in Finland’. That qualitative study was concerned with the attitudes of working girls and boys towards their own work. By including the meaning and significance of work in the everyday life

of adolescents, I wanted to take into account the criticism presented by Mizen et al. (1999a) (see Chapter 2.3), as well as the notions presented by Prout and James (1990), James et al. (1998) and Qvortrup (1985), who emphasise the active and productive role of children. They maintain that one should not see children only as human ‘becomings’, future adults or future participating members of society. Moreover, some researchers (e.g. Marsh 1991: 174) have argued that not enough attention has been paid to the reasons why adolescents work and to their attitudes to work. One purpose in my research (Kouvonen 2000a) was to show how adolescents view their actions (in this case working) as meaningful, and how adolescents are purposeful social actors, and not just a passive or deficient social group.

## 4 MATERIALS AND METHODS

### 4.1 Study population and data collection

The research questions posed were explored by using multiple samples and analysis methods. The study was published as a series of articles in international peer review journals. More specifically, the questions related to the association between adolescent work and delinquency were investigated with the use of two nationally representative surveys of 9<sup>th</sup> graders (data 1–2). The relationship between work and substance use (heavy drinking and the use of drugs) was studied in a large national sample of 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> graders (data 3).

*The following three data were used:*

- 1) the Finnish Self-Report Delinquency Study (n = 4 491) by the National Research Institute of Legal Policy, 1998 (Paper I)
- 2) the Finnish Self-Report Delinquency Study (n = 4 347) by the National Research Institute of Legal Policy, 2001 (Paper II)
- 3) the School Health Promotion Survey (n = 47 568) by the National Research and Development Centre for Welfare and Health, 2000 (Papers III–IV)

Because adolescent part-time work was a largely unexplored area in Finland at the early phase of this research, I carried out a small-scale pilot survey (n = 112) in two lower-level secondary schools in Helsinki in the spring term of 1999 (Kouvonen 2000b), in order to obtain a general picture. That pilot study, and especially earlier Finnish surveys (Tallavaara 1990; Hämäläinen 1990), were used when the questionnaire forms – more specifically the questions concerning work – of the Finnish Self-Report Delinquency Study 2001 and the School Health Promotion Survey were developed.

The Finnish Self-Report Delinquency Studies (FSRD) 1998 (Paper I) and 2001 (Paper II) are nationally representative surveys collected by the National Research Institute of Legal Policy. The wording of the questions used in the FSRD surveys is derived from the International Self-Report Delinquency (ISRD) -instrument. The ISRD -instrument was developed by criminologists from fifteen Western countries in the early 1990s, and was used in a comparative study published in 1994 (Junger-Tas et al. 1994). Since then, there have been no such international comparisons. Thus, the on-going Finnish Self-Report Studies make up a national project.

The criminological unit of the Finnish National Research Institute of Legal Policy has conducted four self-report delinquency studies (1995, 1996,

1998 and 2001) with the purpose of monitoring the level and structure of juvenile delinquency in Finland. In the present study, the most recent surveys (1998, 2001) were used. The target population consisted of Finnish-speaking students in the final grade of compulsory comprehensive schools run by municipalities. Recent methodological research (Kivivuori et al. 2001) has indicated that the exclusion of state and private schools from the sample does not compromise the generalizability of the results. However, the same study suggested that the FSRD results could not be generalised to the Swedish-speaking minority (6 % of the population) in Finland.

All 9<sup>th</sup> grade students of the selected schools comprised the target population. Participation was voluntary for the students. Students completed the questionnaires in school classrooms during regular school hours supervised by the liaison teachers, recruited to carry out the fieldwork and supervise the completion of the questionnaires. To ensure confidentiality, respondents put the anonymously completed questionnaires in envelopes and sealed them themselves. In the survey carried out in 2001, some new questions were added to the questionnaire, to be used in the present study. These questions concerned present and earlier work status as well as work type. The author and co-workers formulated the questions and the questions were partly based on earlier Finnish studies and the above-mentioned pilot study.

The material for Papers III and IV consists of the answers of 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> grade students of lower-level secondary school from the year 2000 School Health Promotion Survey (SHPS). The questions about adolescent work were formulated and added to the year 2000 survey to be used in the present study. The School Health Promotion Survey (<http://www.stakes.fi/kouluterveys>; e.g. Konu et al. 2002a; Konu et al. 2002b; Kaltiala-Heino et al. 2000) is a classroom survey among teenagers about their health, health behaviour and school experiences. It is an extensive survey that has been carried out annually in different regions of Finland since 1995, by the National Research and Development Centre for Welfare and Health.

The data collection of the SHPS takes place in co-operation with schools. The municipalities give the schools permission to participate. All secondary schools are contacted in the regions studied. If a school decides to participate, the questionnaires are distributed to the students during a school lesson supervised by a teacher, who ensures that the students could answer undisturbed by other students but who does not interfere with answering. The anonymous questionnaires are returned in closed envelopes at the end of the

lesson. Participation is voluntary for the students. The Ethical Committee of Tampere University Hospital has accepted the study.

In 2000, nine different regions (Helsinki, Keski-Uusimaa, Päijät-Häme, Kanta-Häme, Etelä-Karjala, the province of Itä-Suomi, Keski-Suomi, Kainuu, and the province of Lappi), altogether 156 municipalities, mostly the same municipalities as in 1998, were included in the survey. Totally 47 568 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> grade students in 334 comprehensive schools participated in the survey. The response rate was 82 %.

## 4.2 Operationalization of the main concepts

### *Adolescent work*

In the present study, ‘work’ was operationalized in slightly different ways in different data sets. In the FSRD 2001, respondents were asked whether they currently have a paid job out of home, and whether they had earlier work experience. In the SHPS, domestic work and work in family enterprise were excluded, and the question about work status (unlike the question about work intensity) covered the present school term. In the FSRD 1998, respondents were simply asked whether they currently go to work.

To summarize, in the present study, *adolescent work was regarded as paid work outside home* (see McKechnie et al. 1998: 38; Hobbs et al. 1996: 14) or family business (SHPS). Paid employment outside of the family is an activity which legislation seeks to control (McKechnie et al 1998: 38). Work could be done either in the formal or informal sector of the economy. In many American studies (e.g. Steinberg & Cauffman 1995) only regular formal paid work has been included, but I did not want to make this restriction because it is common knowledge, also confirmed by the pilot study (Kouvonen 2000b), that a part – may be even a considerable part – of Finnish adolescent work is done informally in the hidden economy.

Some European researchers have conceptualised ‘adolescent work’ or ‘child work’ more broadly than I have done in this study: they define ‘work’ to include all productive activity, such as helping out in a family enterprise, doing home chores (Morrow 1994: 132), selling lottery tickets and collecting empty bottles (Solberg 1994: 44–47), or ‘the work that is not paid, but for which an adult would get paid’ (Save the Children 1998: 62). This is justified in the sense that paid work seems to be only a minor part of the everyday life and productive activities of all children and adolescents in advanced

industrial countries. In addition, when domestic work is excluded, a gender bias enters the research picture, because girls are traditionally more involved in domestic chores than boys (Save the Children 1998: 62).

In this study I restricted myself to paid work outside home, by examining two dimensions or patterns of adolescent work: *wage labour* (a regular part-time job) and *marginal economic activities*/*'self-employment'*. Wage labour represents work done in the youth or adult labour market, whereas marginal economic activities often represent irregular and short-term work, such as babysitting for non-family, car washing and other odd jobs. (Morrow 1994: 131.)<sup>3</sup> It seems reasonable to limit the focus of study to paid work outside the family. I agree with Hobbs et al. (1996: 6) when they argue, that 'by including *unpaid* work and by including work undertaken *within the family* there is a danger of producing a notion of child work too broad to be useful' (original emphasis).

The study concentrated on work during the current school term and excluded thereby earlier work experience (e.g. work during summer holidays). The reason for this is that work during the school year means combining the worker and student roles, which sometimes means long total working weeks<sup>4</sup>.

### ***Work intensity***

It is widely accepted that the possible negative effects and correlates are related to extended numbers of working hours, not to the work status<sup>5</sup> (e.g. Cullen et al. 1997; Steinberg & Cauffman 1995; Steinberg et al. 1993). Work intensity was measured by weekly hours of work. This variable, which was continuous in the FSRD and 4-categorical in the SHPS, was encoded into three groups: non-workers (not working), moderate workers (working 1–10

---

<sup>3</sup> However, as James et al. (1998: 106) note, the complexity of the phenomenon makes classification a difficult task. For example, it is not clear that children working for kin are at lower risk than children working outside the family context.

<sup>4</sup> It is possible that work during summer is often beneficial to adolescents. Total weekly 'working hours' are usually lower when an adolescent works outside school terms. Marsh (1991: 186) found, that summertime working had some benefits and no apparent costs on education-related outcomes considered in his study.

<sup>5</sup> Undoubtedly also the work status itself is meaningful. Having a job may lead to new identities, new responsibility and autonomy in relation to parents (Phillips & Sandstrom 1990).

hours per week), and intensive workers (working more than 10 hours per week) (see Steinberg et al. 1993: 174). However, in the FSRD 2001, moderate workers were exceptionally defined as working 1–9 hours and intensive workers 10 or more hours weekly. This choice was made in order to avoid that the number of intensive workers would have been too limited in the FSRD 2001 data.

In many American studies, the dichotomous classification used is usually 1–20 hours and 21 hours or more. However, in those studies the respondents are mainly older than in this study, and across the high school years average weekly working hours increase gradually (McMorris & Uggen 2000: 281). It is also worth noticing that European adolescents in general work less weekly hours than their American counterparts. Moreover, if I had included only those who work at least 20 hours a week in the group of intensive workers, the group would have been too small to be analysed, especially in the FSRD data.

### *Work type*

In the present study, the work type classification was mainly based on previous Finnish studies (Tallavaara 1990; Hämäläinen 1990), and my pilot study (Kouvonen 2000b). Work types were divided into ten (FSRD 2001) or eleven (SHPS) categories and encoded in dummy variables (1 = respondents related to that type of work, 0 = all other respondents). In the SHPS data, the types included distribution of advertisements, babysitting, cleaning, fast food restaurant work, other restaurant/cafe work, clerical work, hobby-related paid work, shop/retail work, packing/stock work and other work. Of the answers of those respondents, who had chosen more than one category, an additional dummy variable ‘several types of work’ was formed. In consequence, all workers could represent only one work type. In the FSRD 2001 data the classification was developed, and the alternatives were: distribution of advertisements, babysitting, cleaning, restaurant/cafe work, hobby-related paid work, shop/retail work, packing/stock work and other work. Because about one fourth of the workers, in the FSRD 2001, had chosen the category ‘other work’, two additional work type categories were formed based on open-ended answers. These were construction work and farm work. In the FSRD 2001 questionnaire the respondents were asked to report only that type of work, which they do most.

### ***Juvenile delinquency***

Indicators of 17 (FSRD 1998) and 18 (FSRD 2001) delinquent acts were used in this study, and the concept ‘delinquency’ was defined operationally by these variables. All asked delinquent acts were not criminal, and therefore the delinquent acts greatly varied by their severity: from truancy and running away from home to beating up someone and autotheft.

The question format was similar to the ISRD questionnaire: the respondent was asked if she or he had committed the delinquent act in question during the past 12 months (prevalence), and how many times during that period (incidence). Incidences during the past 12 months were classified into six categories: from ‘never’, encoded 0, to more than 50 times, encoded 5.

In Paper II, which was based on the FSRD 2001 data, the prevalences of 18 delinquent acts were used as dependent variables. Instead, in Paper I, which was based on the FSRD 1998 data, the dependent variables consisted of three delinquency dimensions. The factor analysis of the FSRD 1998 data suggested that there are three dimensions of delinquent behaviour (cf. Pedersen & Wichstroem 1995). These dimensions were operationalized by sum variables, which were formed out of variables describing encoded incidences, and consisting of the highly loading (at least .4) items of each dimension. The dimensions were: ‘school delinquency and vandalism’, ‘violence and speed’, and ‘drugs and escape’. Participation in the dimensions was further operationalized by dichotomous variables (0 = had not committed any of the delinquent acts in the dimension, 1 = had committed at least one delinquent act in the dimension at least once) and these were the final outcome variables.

### ***Victimization***

Measures of five kinds of experience of victimization were used in Paper II (FSRD 2001). The respondent was asked if she or he had been victimized by the delinquent act in question during the past 12 months. Victimization experiences examined in the present study included bullying at school, robbery, theft, the threat of physical violence and physical violence.

### ***Heavy drinking***

Heavy drinking (Paper III, SHPS) was investigated with the question: ‘How often do you use alcohol to the extent that you become really drunk?’ The alternatives were: ‘once a week or more often’, ‘once or twice a month’, ‘less frequently’, ‘never’. The willingness to report the frequency of heavy drinking was good: the missing data rate for heavy drinking was 0.8 %.

### ***Drug use***

The current pattern of drug use (Paper IV, SHPS) was measured by the use of drugs during the past 30 days. It was studied with the question: ‘Recall the past 30 days. How many times during that period have you used drugs (marijuana, hashish, thinner, glue, medicines with alcohol, medicines, ecstasy, heroin, cocaine, amphetamine, LSD)?’ The alternatives were: ‘Never’, ‘Once’, ‘2 to 4 times’, ‘5 times or more’. As in the case of heavy drinking, the rate of the valid responses to this question was high (98.4 %).

The outcome variable included both legal and illegal drugs. However, when the odds ratios (ORs) of lifetime experimentation of each drug category were compared between the categories of work intensity, there were no notable differences between legal and illegal drugs. The most frequently used drugs among Finnish adolescents are cannabis, and alcohol in combination with pills.

### ***Control variables***

In the different articles, partly different variables were controlled for. This was due to the variables available in the different data, and the nature of the research problems.

In Paper I, control variables included gender, parental control<sup>6</sup>, the socio-economic status (SES) of the parents, attitudes to school, the frequency

---

<sup>6</sup> In Papers III–IV, parental control was measured with the question ‘Do your parents know where you spend your Friday and Saturday evenings?’ In Papers I–II, the parental control -variable was an encoded sum variable derived from three original questions: ‘Does your father know who you are with when you are out?’, ‘Does your mother know, who you are with when you are out?’, and ‘If your parents get to know that you have done something forbidden, will they punish you?’.

of alcohol use, dating, and leisure-time spent with others. In Paper II, they were gender, father's SES, the employment status of the parents, family structure, attitudes to school, disposable allowances, the degree of urbanization, parental control, economic situation of the family, the threat of violence, physical punishment by parents, older boys as friends, dating, peer criminality, and the variety of delinquent acts.

In Paper III, the control variables included gender, grade level, parents' education, the employment status of the parents, family structure, economic situation of the family, the degree of urbanization, parental control, grade-point average (GPA), dating and disposable allowances. In Paper IV, the control variables were similar to Paper III, excluding economic situation of the family.

More information about selected control variables can be found in the original papers.

### 4.3 Statistical analysis methods<sup>7</sup>

Descriptive statistics were presented by cross-tabulations and percentages. Statistical significance in cross-tabulations was tested using Pearson's  $\chi^2$  -test with  $p < .05$  as the significance criterion. In addition to cross-tabulations, factor analysis and one-way ANOVA were used in Paper I as descriptive devices. Most descriptive analyses were estimated separately for female and male respondents because of the gender imbalance in many work types and gender differences in work intensity and deviant behaviour. Instead, in most of the multivariate models, gender was used as a control variable (however, see Paper IV, Table 2). There was a practical reason for this choice; the multitude of dependent (Papers I–II) and independent (all Papers) variables would have led to too many tables, if the analyses had been conducted separately for both genders. In addition, as Tables 4a–c in Paper I illustrate, controlling gender only very slightly altered the relationships between intensive work and delinquency.

Since the outcome measures were categorical in nature, logistic regression analysis was used as the main statistical method of analysis. Both binary and polychotomous logistic regression analyses were used. Binary

---

<sup>7</sup> All statistical analyses in the study were done using the statistical software SPSS 9.0.

logistic regression analysis was chosen in the delinquency articles (Papers I–II) mostly for two reasons. First, the dependent variables, delinquency dimension/act one-year-prevalence measures, were dichotomous ones. Second, logistic regression analysis predictors do not have to be normally distributed, linearly related, or of equal variance within each group (Tabachnik & Fidell 1996: 575). This second criterion applies to polychotomous logistic regression analysis as well. In the articles analysing substance use (Papers III–IV), more general polychotomous or multinomial logistic regression analysis was used (SPSS 1999; Hosmer & Lemeshow 1989; Moran et al. 1990), because outcome variables were multi-categorical, describing the frequency of current heavy drinking and drug use.

Logistic regression produces estimates called odds ratios (ORs). The odds of an event (in this case delinquency/victimization/heavy drinking/drug use), is the ratio of the number of doers/victims/users to the number of non-doers/non-victims/non-users. The aim is to find out if there is a relationship between work and these deviant behaviours. In the tables describing the results of binary and polychotomous logistic regression analyses, the antilogarithms of the regression coefficients ( $\text{Exp}(b)$ ) with their statistical significance, were presented.

In the logistic regression models, the ORs were calculated for the purpose of estimating the relationship between adolescent work intensity/type and delinquent dimensions/acts/victimization/heavy drinking/drug use, and their change when adjusting for background and other relevant factors. The first step involved calculating the odds of the dependent variable among the different categories of work intensity (no-work, moderate work and intensive work), or work types as dummy variables. When simultaneously taking other explanatory variables into account, the ORs are said to be adjusted for all other variables in the model. The OR is the increase or decrease in the odds of being in one outcome category (in this case e.g. committing a delinquent act or drinking heavily occasionally, monthly or weekly) when the value of the predictor (in this case work intensity or work type) increases by one unit. The odds could also be defined as the ratio of the probability that the event will occur to the probability that it will not (Norusis 1994: 6). In brief, the odds is a relative risk or likelihood of, for example, committing a delinquent act (Tabachnik & Fidell 1996: 607–608). The statistical significance of adding the independent variables in the models was tested through Pearson's  $\chi^2$ -test ( $p < .05$ ).

## 5 EMPIRICAL RESULTS

### 5.1 Adolescent work in Finland

The three data used in the present study gave a largely uniform general picture of adolescent work in Finland and they also complemented each other. The data revealed that some 13–15 % of lower-level secondary school 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> grade students had a paid job at the time of the questionnaire (during the school year) (see Table 1), and about half of the adolescents get some experience of paid work (during the term and/or during the holiday) at some point during their comprehensive school period (calculated from the SHPS). 15 % of the 9<sup>th</sup> graders reported that they do not currently have a paid job, but that they have been employed before parallel with their schoolwork (FSRD 2001). According to the FSRD 1998 and the SHPS, there was no difference in the employment rate according to gender. However, according to the most recent data, the FSRD 2001, working was somewhat more common among girls (15 % vs. 10 %).

**Table 1** Frequency of adolescent part-time work according to present data sources (%)

Study	Workers (% of all) <sup>1</sup>	Age group	Sample size
FSRD 1998	13	15–16	4491
FSRD 2001	13	15–16	4347
SHPS 2000	~15 <sup>2</sup>	14–16	47568

<sup>1</sup> at the time of the questionnaire

<sup>2</sup> 19 % during the present term

According to the FSRD 2001, about 80 % of working adolescents had only one job. In both data (FSRD 2001 and SHPS), there was a great variation in work types. Likewise, American and British researchers have noted that adolescents work in a rich variety of jobs, not only in those traditionally identified as ‘children’s jobs’<sup>8</sup> (Entwisle et al. 2000; Mizen et al. 1999: 425; Hobbs & McKechnie 1998: 13). Therefore, society’s conceptualisation of ‘children’s jobs’ does not cover the whole range of work done by adolescents (McKechnie et al. 2000).

In my study, the most often mentioned tasks were distribution of advertisements, cleaning, babysitting and hobby-related paid work (see Paper II, Appendix 2). Accordingly, among Nordic adolescents aged 13–15 years,

---

<sup>8</sup> Following McKechnie et al. (2000: 575), I nevertheless do not imply that these jobs are somehow more ‘suitable’ or appropriate for children and adolescents.

the most frequent work types are distributing advertisements/papers and babysitting (Nordic Council 1999: 159).

To some extent, the picture resembles the situation in the UK, where delivery jobs and babysitting are among the most common jobs among adolescents (Hobbs & McKechnie 1998: 12; Save the Children 1998: 62; Middleton et al. 1998: 47). On the other hand, very few Finnish adolescents of this age group work in the service and retail sectors, if we exclude distribution of advertisements and cleaning.

Adolescent jobs are often informal, irregular and temporary. Theme interviews have indicated that adolescents often find their jobs through personal contacts (Kouvonen 2000b: 65). Acquaintances, friends and family members, particularly parents, are central to the process of finding jobs (see also Mizen et al. 1999b). For some adolescents, work is based on a well-structured employment relationship (e.g. the regular working hours and the set rates of pay); for others, work is organised on a more casual basis (see Mizen et al. 1999b). The jobs seldom require particular skills. However, my qualitative interviews (Kouvonen 2000a) revealed that there are exceptions, such as when an individual talent is used in artistic work or when some specific sets of skills are required or acquired. However, only occasionally do adolescent jobs allow for this (see Mizen et al. 1999b; Mizen et al. 2000).

In line with the situation in other countries, the first jobs Finnish adolescents get when they enter the labour market are to some extent gender-biased (see Paper II, Appendix 2): girls and boys hold different kinds of jobs (Middleton et al. 1998: 46; Leonard 1998: 84; Hobbs et al. 1992: 100; Mortimer et al. 1990; Greenberger & Steinberg 1983; White & Brinkerhoff 1981), and this structure partly mirrors adult job segregation. In the Nordic countries, during school weeks, girls typically work as babysitters while boys deliver papers (Nordic Council 1999: 51). Moreover, at least in the US, gendered patterns have been found in household chores already in childhood (Entwisle et al. 1999: 372), and it is possible that the gender-specific labour market experiences during adolescence have some impact on later employment (Leonard 1998: 85) and occupational choices (Mizen 1992: 10). Besides, it is suggested that for girls, formal paid work lessens interest in traditional female gender roles (Stevens et al. 1992: 153). However, this may be of less importance in Finland, where it is a norm also for women to have a full-time job.

For most working adolescents, working hours were quite moderate (1–10 hours per week). However, about 16 % of the workers worked more than ten hours per week (calculated from the SHPS). The figure is

approximately the same as in the British studies (see Hobbs & McKechnie 1998: 14).

Working hours of 9<sup>th</sup> graders averaged about seven (calculated from the FSRD 1998 and 2001). It sounds low, but adolescents work parallel with their schoolwork. Thus, part-time work means often a whole additional working day, and ‘...even a short working week may mean that a child is ‘at work’ much longer than the average adult’ (Low Pay Unit 1985, ref. Mizen 1992: 12). Furthermore, it is worth noticing that in Finland, working more than 12 hours per school week is illegal for adolescents in compulsory education. This means that at least 14 % of working 9<sup>th</sup> graders, or 1.6 % of all 9<sup>th</sup> graders, work an illegal number of hours measured by this criterion. At the level of the base population, this means almost 900 9<sup>th</sup> graders. (Calculated from the FSRD 2001.) However, the number of adolescents working an illegal number of hours is probably much larger, because there are also other criteria: no more than seven hours of work per day on Saturdays and Sundays, and during weekdays the sum of daily school and working hours should not be more than eight hours. Because these things were not measured in the data, it was not possible to estimate the total prevalence of illegal working hours among Finnish adolescent workers.

All data uniformly showed that working boys tend to have significantly more weekly working hours. For example, in the FSRD 2001 data, weekly working hours averaged six among working girls, and ten among working boys. The median number of weekly hours worked was six for boys, and four for girls. More intensive working among boys could be explained by parents’ greater restrictions on the extent to which girls can work beside school (Mizen 1992: 10). In addition, it might represent a more general tendency of ‘total commitment’ (to work, hobbies, subculture etc.), which is more common among boys than among girls. Lahteenmaa (1992: 161–162) has noted that whereas boys may go e.g. into subcultural practices in an all-inclusive way, girls typically ‘check’ and ‘visit’ several different subcultures. Moreover, intensive work may be a part of a certain male youth lifestyle or subculture (cf. Willis 1977).

There were no notable differences in employment rates according to parents’ socio-economic status (SES). Nevertheless, working in general, as well as intensive work was most common among the children of self-employed parents. The most recent data (FSRD 2001) revealed that according to the father’s SES, 16 % of the children of self-employed had a job, compared with 14 % for the children of upper white-collar workers, 12 % for the children of lower white-collar and manual workers, and 10 % for the

children of farmers. It is interesting to note that adolescents from self-employed families work most. It is possible that these adolescents largely get employed in family businesses and the firms of their parents' acquaintances. Besides, these adolescents may have learnt self-activity and some kind of 'entrepreneurial spirit' from home and they may be more active than other adolescents in seeking jobs.

As could be expected, working was most common in cities, but the differentials according to the degree of urbanization were moderate. In the FSRD 2001, 14 % of the respondents living in cities had a job, compared with 11 % for the adolescents in high-density areas and 9 % in the countryside.

## 5.2 Adolescent work, delinquency and victimization (Papers I and II)

Papers I and II investigated the association between adolescent part-time work intensity and delinquency, and examined whether the association is general, or whether it can be located to some specific kinds of delinquent acts. In addition, Paper II explored the relationship between work intensity and victimization. Paper I drew on the FSRD 1998 data, and Paper II on the FSRD 2001 data. Existing research suggests that there is a positive association between intensive adolescent work and delinquency (e.g. Mihalic & Elliott 1997; Ploeger 1997; Steinberg & Dornbusch 1991; Greenberger & Steinberg 1986), as well as between work and victimization (Bachman & Schulenberg 1993).

The results reported in Paper I indicate that work intensity is relatively marginally associated with an increased likelihood of delinquent behaviour among Finnish adolescents, and that the relationship depends on the type of delinquency. Delinquent behaviour was somewhat more likely among intensive workers. As a whole, 89 % of the intensive workers reported that they had committed at least one delinquent act during the past 12 months. The figures for moderate workers and non-workers were 76 % and 71 %, respectively.

In Paper I, 17 delinquent acts were categorised by factor analysis into three dimensions: 'school delinquency and vandalism', 'violence and speed', and 'drugs and escape'. The relationship was not uniform across different dimensions of delinquency. When gender, parental control, the SES of the parents, attitudes to school, the frequency of alcohol use, dating, and leisure-

time spent with others were controlled for, only the association between intensive work and committing ‘violence and speed’ -acts persisted. Intensive workers’ likelihood to commit such acts was twice as high as the likelihood that non-workers commit such acts. This relationship was not a function of some prior variable such as gender or the use of alcohol, since it remained robust after the effect of the other variables had been controlled for. Moderate working was very slightly associated with an increased risk of ‘school delinquency and vandalism’.

In the same way, Paper II showed that the relationship between work intensity and delinquency is not neutral with respect to the form of delinquency. In that article, delinquency was not divided into dimensions, but was considered as 18 independent acts. When gender, background factors, attitudes to school, disposable allowances, parental control as well as strain and peer variables were controlled for, the relationship between intensive work and committing the acts of beating up someone, driving without a licence, buying stolen goods, vandalism at school and drunken driving persisted. Intensive workers’ likelihood to commit such acts was about two to three times as high as the likelihood that non-workers would commit such acts. These findings largely match the results of Paper I, where intensive work was associated with an increased likelihood of the ‘violence and speed’ -dimension of delinquent behaviour.

The results of Paper II further showed that adolescent part-time work does not appear to decrease victimization either. In the bivariate models, there were significant positive associations between intensive work and all the five items of victimization examined (bullying at school, robbery, theft, the threat of physical violence and physical violence). However, in the adjusted models these associations disappeared. The relationships were thus explained through controlled factors.

In sum, both articles indicate that intensive part-time work does not deter delinquency among adolescents. This implies that intensive work generally does not appear to enhance a socialisation of adolescents into adult values. Of course, it is also possible that even intensive work decreases delinquent behaviour among some adolescents.

Nevertheless, intensive work was generally not among the factors most strongly associated with an increased likelihood of delinquency among Finnish adolescents. Paper II shows that common criminological variables, such as parental control, peer criminality and other peer-related variables (spending time with older boys, having a boyfriend or girlfriend), as well as other variables such as gender, disposable allowances and the experience of

a threat of violence were more strongly associated with an increased likelihood of various types of delinquency, and in many cases they far outdistanced the relatively modest associations between work intensity and delinquency.

### 5.3 Adolescent work, heavy drinking and drug use (Papers III and IV)

#### *Heavy drinking*

The most well documented and strongest association between youth work and problem behaviour relates to substance use (Ploeger 1997: 660; Mortimer & Johnson 1998: 438). The relationship between (intensive) adolescent work and alcohol use is demonstrated in several studies (e.g. Mortimer & Johnson 1998; Mihalic & Elliott 1997; Ploeger 1997; Steinberg et al. 1993; Bachman & Schulenberg 1993; Steinberg & Dornbusch 1991; Tanner & Krahn 1991). Mortimer and colleagues (1996: 1257) argue that ‘it is with respect to alcohol use that we find the greatest cause for concern about some youth’s high investment in work’.

In the present study, the SHPS data were used for examining the relationship between part-time work (intensity and type) and heavy drinking (Paper III). The general pattern of the findings was in line with prior studies: intensive work was associated with an increased likelihood of alcohol use in adolescence. Among intensive workers, 45 % reported heavy drinking at least once a month, whereas the corresponding figure for non-workers was 25 %.

Compared with their age-mates that did not work, adolescents who worked more than ten hours per week during the school year had an increased risk of heavy drinking, and there was equally a connection between the frequency of heavy drinking and intensive work. When gender, grade level, parents’ education, the employment status of the parents, family structure, the economic situation of the family, the degree of urbanization, parental control, dating, grade-point average (GPA) and disposable allowances were adjusted for, the odds of weekly heavy drinking were almost three times the odds of not reporting heavy drinking among intensive workers, compared with non-workers.

When adjusted for the above factors, most work types had no significant relation to heavy drinking. Still, some categories, which I

categorised as ‘children’s jobs’<sup>9</sup>– distribution of advertisements, babysitting and hobby-related paid work – were marginally associated with a decreased likelihood of heavy drinking.

Working long hours was more strongly associated with an increased likelihood of weekly heavy drinking than more rare heavy drinking. This result was revealed through polychotomous logistic regression models: binary logistic regression would not have revealed it.

Nevertheless, in spite of the significant relationship between intensive work and heavy drinking in multivariate models, working was not among the most important factors associated with heavy drinking. Factors such as parental control, GPA, dating and disposable allowances were more strongly associated with an increased likelihood of heavy drinking. Compared with these, the association between intensive work and an increased likelihood of heavy drinking was not strong. Even so, intensive work was more strongly associated with an increased likelihood of heavy drinking, than the education of the parents or their employment status. Moreover, at a general level, intensive work does at least not protect adolescents from intensive alcohol use.

### ***Drug use***

Paper IV which is a continuation of Paper III, is similarly drawn from the SHPS data, exploring the relationship between adolescent work and another form of substance use, the use of drugs. A series of earlier studies have indicated that working adolescents, at least those who spend much of their time at work during the school year, have a higher likelihood to use cannabis or other drugs (e.g. Steinberg & Avenevoli 1998; Ploeger 1997; Bachman & Schulenberg 1993; Steinberg & Dornbusch 1991; Steinberg et al. 1982; Greenberger et al. 1981).

The SHPS data showed a positive relationship between intensive work and an increased likelihood of a frequent (at least five times during the past month) drug use, whereas this was not the case with more occasional experimentation (1–4 times). The direction of the results was similar for both genders, but among intensively working girls the odds of frequent use was higher than among intensively working boys.

---

<sup>9</sup> Jobs which are typically informal, irregular and casual, and most often filled by adolescents; adults rarely have these jobs.

When controlling for gender, grade level, socio-demographic background factors, parental control, school performance, dating and disposable allowances, the proportion of intensive workers among those reporting frequent drug use was about two times as high as among those not reporting use, compared with non-workers. Furthermore, when adjusted for these factors, engagement in some 'adult-like' jobs – clerical, fast food restaurant and cleaning work – was significantly associated with an increased likelihood of frequent drug use.

Thus, intensive work and some 'adult-like' jobs were only associated with an increased likelihood of frequent drug use, not with experimenting with drugs 1–4 times during the past month. Again, this outcome was revealed through polychotomous logistic regression models: binary logistic regression would not have revealed it.

However, we should not exaggerate the strength of the association between adolescent work and drug use: even if intensive work and some work types were significantly associated with an increased likelihood of frequent drug use also in multivariate models, there were other variables which were more strongly associated with an increased likelihood of drug use: a low degree of parental control was overwhelmingly the most important factor.

As is in the case with work and heavy drinking, intensive part-time work during the school year does not deter girls and boys from using drugs either. Intensive part-time work, especially in adult-like jobs, may sometimes be harmful for adolescents and already existing problems may be exacerbated for example due to decreasing parental control, new social contacts or greater disposable allowances.

## 6 DISCUSSION

The purpose of the present investigation has been to increase our knowledge about adolescent part-time work during the school year, and to examine the association between work and deviant behaviour among Finnish lower-level secondary school students. Two original articles (I–II) assessed the question of the relationship between adolescent part-time work and delinquency, while the task of the two other articles (III–IV) was to analyse the association between adolescent part-time work and substance use. The study aimed at moving beyond the undifferentiated views of adolescent work, by examining in which conditions part-time work during the school year is possibly harmful (or beneficial). The conditions explored were work intensity, that is, the number of weekly working hours (all Papers), and the type of work (Papers III–IV). There are no previous Finnish studies of the relationship between adolescent work and deviant behaviour, and furthermore there exists only one previous nation-wide survey of some general features of Finnish adolescent workers (Nordic Council 1999). Therefore all results, findings and information produced by the present study are new.

In this chapter, first, the results of four original studies presented above will be briefly summarized. Second, conclusions are drawn from these results. Third, the limitations of the study are reflected upon. Finally, some possible policy implications and suggestions for future studies will be presented.

### 6.1 Overview of the results

The results from the three data used in the present study suggest that the employment rate of adolescents attending the 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> grades of lower-level secondary school was 13–15 % at the time of the questionnaire (during the spring terms of 1998, 2000 and 2001), and that almost 50 % of the adolescents will have gained some experience of paid work by the time they leave compulsory education. Adolescents were employed in a wide variety of jobs, the most often mentioned job types being distribution of advertisements, hobby-related paid work, babysitting and cleaning. Jobs were gendered: girls typically baby-sit, clean and have hobby-related paid jobs, whereas boys more frequently than girls work as distributors of advertisements, construction and farm workers, and have packing or stock jobs.

For most working adolescents, weekly working hours were moderate. However, about one fourth of the working adolescents spent a significant amount of time, ten hours or more per school week, in their jobs (calculated from the FSRD 2001). It is notable that boys were over-represented among these intensive workers.

Papers I and II indicate that the relationship between intensive part-time work and delinquency is not similar across different kinds of delinquent acts. In Paper I, after controlling relevant other variables, a significant relationship between intensive work and an increased likelihood of committing 'violence and speed' -acts remained. Similarly, in Paper II, after controlling, intensive work was associated with an increased likelihood of only some delinquent acts (such as beating up someone, driving without a licence, buying stolen goods, vandalism at school, and drunken driving).

Moreover, intensive work did not appear to decrease victimization (Paper II), intensive alcohol use (Paper III) and drug use (Paper IV). In the bivariate models, there were significant positive associations between intensive work and five victimization items. Nevertheless, in the adjusted models these associations disappeared. This implies that the relationships were explained through adjusted variables, such as background factors and common criminological variables linked to control, strain and differential association theories.

Paper III showed that intensive work was associated with an increased likelihood of weekly heavy drinking. On the contrary, some categories of typical 'children's jobs' (distribution of advertisements, babysitting and hobby-related paid work) were associated with a decreased likelihood of heavy drinking. Likewise, Paper IV suggested that there was a relationship between intensive work and frequent drug use. The direction of the results was similar for both genders, but among girls working long hours the odds of frequent use were higher than among boys working long hours. Moreover, some 'adult-like' jobs – fast food restaurant, clerical and cleaning work – were significantly associated with an increased likelihood of drug use.

To summarize, the main result of the study is that intensive adolescent work appears to be significantly associated with an increased likelihood of deviant behaviour, measured as an engagement in delinquent activity, heavy drinking and the use of drugs. On the other hand, in most multivariate models, moderate work appeared to have no significant association with deviant behaviour, even if it was very slightly associated with an increased likelihood of some forms of delinquent behaviour and occasional and monthly heavy drinking. The finding that moderate

employment was associated very slightly or was not associated at all with deviant behaviour, suggests that adolescent employment is not harmful, at least not in the sense of criminogenic or substance use, if it is monitored and restricted to only a few hours per school week (see Cullen et al. 1997: 129).

Nevertheless, intensive work was not among the factors most strongly associated with an increased likelihood of deviant behaviour among Finnish adolescents. Variables typically used in criminological studies, such as parental control, peer criminality and other peer-related variables, as well as gender, disposable allowances and experiencing a threat of violence were more strongly associated with an increased likelihood of various types of delinquency. Similarly, a low degree of parental control was most strongly associated with an increased likelihood of substance use. Even so, it is important to note that *after controlling other variables, intensive work was still significantly associated with an increased likelihood of all deviant behaviours examined: delinquency, heavy drinking and drug use.*

It is worth noticing that the findings reported here apply only to girls and boys attending lower-level secondary school. Therefore, I do not claim that work might not decrease a likelihood of deviant behaviour among older adolescents or among (young) adults. Indeed, it is possible that among the older youth, working might actually reduce the risk of delinquent behaviour or substance use (Cullen et al. 1997: 131). Tanner and Krahn (1991: 299–300) point out that probably the prolonged unemployment of young non-students is a more potent source of stress, delinquency and substance use. Nevertheless, this does not nullify the potential risks or harms associated with intensive employment among adolescents while they still attend school.

## 6.2 Conclusions

### ***Balancing the results by introducing qualitative data***

British Ellen Heptinstall has pointed out that the negative and even over-pessimistic results of some American researchers have counterbalanced the common sense assumptions that part-time work is solely a positive thing for adolescents. However, she also cautions about over-generalisation that ignores variations in adolescents' experiences. (Heptinstall 1998: 104.) It is probable that for some adolescents even intensive work is good and it can decrease or deter their delinquent behaviour or substance use. Moreover, it is worth noting that the majority of intensively working adolescents do not

commit serious delinquent acts, neither do they drink weekly, nor use illegal drugs. This study only claims that among intensive workers, these behaviours are somewhat more likely than among non-workers.

In order to avoid too one-sided and over-pessimistic picture of Finnish adolescent work, and in order to balance the results, I will next briefly present some results of my earlier qualitative study (Kouvonen 2000a), which shows that, at least on the level of self-reported meanings, adolescent work is not always so bad: some adolescents genuinely like their work, and they get also good things (such as money, self-realisation and the opportunity to develop social skills), from their jobs.

In that study, my intention was to add to previous research where ‘only scant attention has been given to the meanings and significance of work for children’ (Mizen et al. 1999a: 432). The data consisted of 15 semi-structured theme interviews with lower-level secondary school students aged 13–16 years, who were currently working or had been working prior to the interviews. The main result of that study was that working adolescents had also other motivations for working than solely earning money for their immediate personal consumption. The data suggested that there were two main logics that organised the adolescents’ attitudes towards work: work as a source of income and work as self-realisation (work being interesting and enjoyable). Work as a source of income was divided into the motives of paying for personal free time consumption and marginally of making a contribution to the family’s basic economy. However, these two components cannot always be separated because adolescents, while paying for their free time consumption, hobbies, clothes etc., at the same time also decrease their family’s overall costs (see also Leonard 1998: 86–87; Middleton et al. 1998: 54–55; Morrow 1994: 139; Greenberger et al. 1980: 192). Actually, as McKechnie et al. (2000: 577) note: ‘In a sense all children’s incomes are a part of the family budget’.

These results are in line with studies carried out in the UK, where researchers (e.g. Morrow 1994) have similarly observed that working adolescents find other factors than sole money earning important in their work. Adolescents have mentioned that work gives them confidence and independence and they see work as a useful experience for the future. Furthermore, adolescents sometimes enjoy their work and some of them work for charities. (Morrow 1994: 141.) Besides, adolescents have also indicated that they work to combat boredom (McKechnie et al. 2000: 578; Mizen et al. 2000). Even so, unsurprisingly, for most adolescents also in the UK, earning

money for personal consumption seems to be the primary reason for working (Save the Children 1998: 63; Mizen et al. 1999b; Morrow 1994).

According to my study (Kouvonen 2000a: 302), it would appear that in comparison to adults, the logics according to which adolescents' relate to their work can occur in more 'pure' forms. For example, in the data, the adolescents with monotonous and marginal jobs, such as distribution of advertisements, could have one sole motivation for working, namely earning money, whereas in some jobs several aspects (e.g. wage, social relations, esteem, challenges) were combined. Adolescents can have a completely non-instrumental attitude towards meaningful jobs because, unlike the majority of adults, they do not have to support themselves financially. In the data there were adolescents who were willing to work for a very small wage or even for no wage at all, when the job was interesting enough. In these cases, the border between a hobby and a job dissolves. In contrast, adolescents with unpleasant jobs might gain self-realisation through leisure-time activities and an increased power to consume. On the one hand, work interferes with leisure; on the other hand it makes consumption possible during leisure-time spent with other young people.

Therefore, we should not oversimplify the question of adolescent work. The present study does not imply that adolescent work is inherently bad, that somehow it unambiguously causes harms or is always associated with negative things. My earlier study (Kouvonen 2000a) suggests, in line with earlier studies from the UK and the US (e.g. Mizen et al. 2000; Steinberg et al. 1981), that at some workplaces girls and boys may learn and develop important social capabilities or skills, such as how to interact with customers and other unfamiliar adults, and similarly they may gain other skills. It is possible that some jobs help adolescents to become more autonomous as consumers and citizens and to increase their human capital.

Moreover, my qualitative data showed that there is a benefit of 'enjoyment' (see Hobbs et al. 1992: 101) or even self-realisation in some jobs. In spite of that, my qualitative interviews also confirm the warnings against over-generalisation presented by McKechnie et al. (1996) and Hobbs et al. (1992: 103): all adolescent jobs do not offer the same possibilities. Besides, there are tradeoffs: a job good in one respect may not be good in other respects (Greenberger & Steinberg 1981: 208).

In brief, 'going to work' is not a unitary experience with consistent effects on all adolescents (see Williams et al. 1996); under certain conditions work can be protective and enhancing, whereas under other conditions it may pose clear risks (Mortimer & Johnson 1998: 427, 469). Of equal importance

is the question how a young worker manages to combine different spheres (work, school, family, peers, hobbies etc.) of her or his life.

In the present study, harmful conditions were long weekly working hours and in some instances jobs, which were called 'adult-like' because they are jobs that in Finland are typically held by adults, and at these workplaces adolescents meet adults. More 'adult-like' jobs are also generally more formal: e.g. they are situated in public contexts, not in households, and work contracts are often signed. When working intensively, especially in 'adult-like' jobs, the identity of a worker may supersede the more child-like identity of a student (Mortimer & Johnson 1998: 472). Furthermore, intensive adolescent work and 'adult-like' jobs share some features. Intensive work is generally more adult-like in character: it gives greater wages, increases adolescent's purchasing power and perhaps also the feeling of economic independence (see Mortimer & Johnson 1998: 450). In addition, as the present research showed, significantly more hours are worked in 'adult-like' than in 'child-like' jobs.

### ***Selection, socialisation and money***

Selection or socialisation mechanisms, or both, can make intensive adolescent work and deviant behaviour combine. Moreover, these explanations have connections to the criminological theories presented in Chapter 2.4.

The selection effect may operate at least in two ways. First, adolescents who decide to start to work intensively, may have committed more delinquent acts, may have drunk more and may have had prior experiences with drugs. Furthermore, they may have been more independent of their parents to begin with, but work and economic independence further increase their autonomy. This may lead to diminishing parental control and more problem behaviour (Hirschi 1983; Williams et al. 1996: 203). Second, a low commitment to school prior to employment may affect the decision both to work intensively and to 'behave badly'. Poor grades can motivate some youngsters to invest in work, as they thereby can obtain economic independence, prestige from peers, and other rewards (Finch & Mortimer 1985: 174). Therefore, as may be interpreted in the traditional forms of strain theory, some poor-performing students can direct their energies towards working life as an alternative route to achieve conventional goals, success or personal fulfilment (Merton 1968; Entwisle et al. 2000: 292). From work they can get human capital (Ruhm 1997: 735). Nevertheless, as Greenberger and

Steinberg (1982) argue, it really does not make sense that most poorly achieving students put the most time into working life.

Hence, it is possible that for young people under minimum school leaving age intensive work does not function as a bond to society. Instead, it may further alienate adolescents from school (the 'normal' activity for them). Job opportunities will be the best among those adults who have acquired the highest levels of education (Mihalic & Elliott 1997: 495). In consequence, for most adolescents school can be seen as a better investment for the future and a better bond to society than intensive work. When an adolescent works only moderate hours, connections to school or family are not usually weakened, whereas working long hours can even generate or reinforce problems.

The socialisation effect implies that working has an independent effect by exposing adolescents to opportunities and associates that facilitate substance use and delinquency (McMorris & Uggen 2000: 276). First, work itself can incite to some acts; delinquency can be a consequence of an opportunity to on-the-work-access to money and goods, for instance (Clinard & Quinney 1973). Second, at the workplace, adolescents may meet adults or age-mates that procure alcohol or illegal drugs, and who simultaneously can act as role models or encourage delinquent activity and substance use. This explanation is in line with criminological interactional theory (Thornberry 1987), social learning theory (Burgess & Akers 1968) and differential association theory (Sutherland & Cressey 1978).

Third, work may foster greater materialism (Greenberger & Steinberg 1986: 140) and consequently property delinquency. Fourth, work can sometimes be stressful to adolescents, or produce other kinds of strain, and in consequence, adolescents may try to ease their stress or strain by substance use (see Agnew 2001; Agnew 1992; Greenberger & Steinberg 1986; Greenberger & Steinberg 1982). Moreover, job stress can lead to the breakdown of adaptive behaviours, such as rule following (Greenberger & Steinberg 1986: 134). Williams et al. (1996: 204) have argued that 'when young workers face noxious stimuli (e.g., overbearing boss, heavy workload), or lose positively valued stimuli (e.g., are fired or demoted), they will experience anger and potentially respond with a range of delinquent acts'.

Moreover, beyond the selection and socialisation effects, there is still another explanation: especially intensive work in more 'adult-like' jobs, often gives adolescents a considerable disposable income, which is usually out of parental control (Kouvonen 2000b) and offers opportunities to finance alcohol and drug use. In turn, substance use may lead to a need to work more in order to purchase money. Money means independence and growing

autonomy: adolescents gain greater autonomy to spend money e.g. on items they want to buy but that their parents would not finance, such as cigarettes and alcohol (Mizen et al. 2000). Therefore, for example, work and self-earned money can ease adolescent's adoption of one essential adult cultural practice, adult-like drinking habits (see Karvonen 2002: 89).

Already in the 1980s researchers found that there is a relationship between drinking frequency and spending money among adolescents: the more money adolescents have the more likely they are to drink and get drunk (Ahlström 1982; Marsh et al. 1986; Rahkonen & Ahlström 1989). Hence, the effect of money is obviously present especially in substance use, but it may be an important factor also in other kinds of deviant behaviour. This could be interpreted through Agnew's (1990: 535) notion of the relationship between adolescents' resources and delinquency: money is, among other things, a resource, which provides the adolescent with the power and autonomy, which may be used to reduce social control and increase 'illegal means', which in turn increase the likelihood of delinquency.

All in all, it seems plausible that the operative process is a dynamic and reciprocal one, where adolescents both actively choose and are affected by the environment they encounter (Steinberg et al. 1993: 178). Consequently, both effects, pre-employment (selection) and employment (socialisation), can be present (Mihalic & Elliott 1997: 469). This conception can be seen in relation to the notions of children as the active agents of their lives, and the construction and the reconstruction of childhood (see Prout & James 1990).

In the analyses presented in the original papers, the effects of important independent variables suggested by criminological theories, selection hypothesis and prior research, were taken into account. These variables included e.g. socio-demographic background factors, parental control, school performance, attitudes towards school, disposable allowances, peer criminality, spending leisure-time with others and dating. Controlling for them diminished but did not totally eliminate the significant relationship between work and an increased likelihood of deviant behaviour. Hence the relationship was partly, but not wholly, mediated by these factors. Unfortunately, in the questionnaires, there was no information available about peer or adult influence at the workplace, neither about the stressfulness of the job, which equally represent potential sources of socialisation and strain effects generating from work. Moreover, there was no information about some important factors related to adolescent drinking: the alcohol or drug dependence of parents as well as of the influence of the attitudes and

behaviours of peers and siblings (see Ary et al. 1993; Needle et al. 1986). Thus I could not empirically test whether these factors could explain the rest of the relationship.

### ***Too autonomous too early?***

In addition, one further possible interpretation can be generated from the present study that relates on the one hand to the psychological and psychosocial concept of pseudomaturity or ‘the precocious development perspective’ (see Safron et al. 2001), and on the other hand to the transition to adult roles and autonomy. At stake here is the relationship between intensive work and deviant behaviour (presented in this study), as well as some positive things which working adolescents get from their work (Kouvonen 2000a). These can be associated with differential selection to intensive work: intensive workers may be more autonomous or mature than their age-mates even before starting to work. As a result, it would appear that intensive work, delinquency and frequent heavy drinking are all dimensions of the same phenomenon during early and mid adolescence, displaying a precocious transition to adult social roles, or a specific youth lifestyle, which could be called ‘pseudomaturity’ or ‘precocious development’ (see Bachman & Schulenberg 1993; McMorris & Uggen 2000; Greenberger & Steinberg 1986).

The data of the present study show that intensively working adolescents also more frequently aim at acquiring other adulthood symbols, such as dating, smoking, or drinking. Besides, as the data revealed, they have greater disposable allowances and they spend more time with other people and more often have older friends. (Calculated from the FSRD 2001.) It seems that these adolescents are on average somehow more mature than their peers, and this general maturity or pseudomaturity could explain a part of the relationship between intensive working during the school year and deviant behaviour, which might both reflect the same phenomenon. Similarly, Safron et al. (2001) found a clustering of behaviours including intensive work, unstructured social activities with peers, and substance use. They argue that because ‘adolescent-organised’ unstructured social activities – unlike such ‘adult-organised activities’ like sport teams – can be planned at the last minute, they easily fit in around a rapidly changing work schedule and are thus suitable for intensive workers. Moreover, the opportunity of substance use is higher in informal situations without adult supervision. (Safron et al. 2001: 428–429.)

Safron and colleagues (2001: 427) further note that the extent of participation in youth activities such as unstructured social activities or substance use is a key difference between normative participation in youth culture and precocious development. 'Premature' adolescents participate in those activities at much higher rates than the majority of their peers (Newcomb and Bentler 1988).

To some extent, pseudomaturity can reflect the differential timing of biological maturity. Nevertheless, it is not reducible to it, and from a sociological point of view, society also produces pseudomaturity for example through media, popular culture and fashion. Some adolescents may be more responsive to this lifestyle than others. Furthermore, the culture of pseudomaturity can be a kind of mirror image of the 'Peter Pan' culture that makes adults behave as if they were adolescents. Popular culture may function as a leveller: adolescents aspire to be adults, and adults aspire to look like young people.

The concept of pseudomaturity comes close to Hans-Erik Hermansson's (1988) notions of adolescents' lifestyles, and to the model of the deviance syndrome presented by Jessor and Jessor (1977). The deviance syndrome is characterised by several problem behaviours such as aggressiveness, substance abuse and criminal activities (Jessor & Jessor 1977). It is possible that for some adolescents intensive part-time work is a part of a more general 'deviance' and 'premature' lifestyle, even if I would avoid the term 'syndrome' in this context. Safron et al. (2001: 427) and Newcomb (1996) see that precocious development differs from problem or deviant behaviour perspective by also including desirable activities (such as work and peer relationships) that are nonetheless engaged in to an extent that is problematic at that particular age.

Through his interviews among Swedish adolescents, Hermansson (1988) singles out three categories of adolescents' lifestyles: parent-directed, peer-group-directed, and community-directed. On the basis of the findings of my present study, it is probable that peer-directed or premature adolescents are over-presented in the group of intensive workers. Hermansson (1988: 143) argues that peer-group directed adolescents have an age-specific contact net priority for the peer-group, they despise schoolwork, but give a high priority to youth culture. Moreover, their parents have weak control over them. These adolescents place strong emphasis on independence and strive for their own disposable income and work. (See also Gerrard et al. 1999.) The group is heterogeneous: some youngsters are more consumption-oriented, while others tend to become marginalized and, for example, begin

to commit crimes. Furthermore, my data showed that intensive workers more often had school problems (see also Entwisle et al. 2000: 290): e.g. they more frequently had lower grades, they more rarely liked to go to school, they were more likely to have to repeat a grade, and more frequently they were in special education groups because of disciplinary or learning difficulties (calculated from the FSRD 2001 and the SHPS).

Working adolescents who represent different lifestyles (peer-, community- or parent-directed) are likely to have different kinds of motives for working, their jobs can vary, and they can work varying number of hours per school week. One could suppose, for example, that community-directed adolescents, who have defined career-minded ambitions, give a high priority to schoolwork, favour parental control through dialogue, demand independence in a goal directed way, and often come from the middle class, may work in more interesting and better jobs. On average they may work less hours per week than their peer group -directed age-mates, especially those who commit criminal offences and stand the risk of being marginalized.

However, there is an obvious limitation and a problem associated with the pseudomaturity concept: it is derived from an adult standpoint. Surely the adolescents themselves do not consider themselves, or their behaviour and lifestyle as 'pseudomature'. Moreover, as I have indicated above, gaining of autonomy and independence is an essential part of the transition from childhood and adolescence to adulthood. For example, substance use seems to make possible first concrete steps to adulthood without the responsibilities and roles involved in adulthood (Karvonen 2002: 92). Drinking is one part of the independence or maturity, when there is a rejection of the role of a dependent child, and a desire for a more active and adult-like social role. Having a job and a wage – that is, money not controlled by parents – mean to adolescents an access to commercialised social life. The wage gives a greater sense of choice and autonomy, and money assists in getting access to adult-like and peer group activities. In consequence, working and economic independence may further increase autonomy and an adult appearance of adolescents. (See Mizen et al. 1999b.)

In addition, adolescent's working can support the growth of her/his autonomy in many other ways. Work can give adolescents human capital and other benefits. To have a paid job can indirectly be a symbol of adulthood for young people. At least in some cases, work can give an opportunity to relate to adults on relatively equal terms, to gain experiences, to assume responsibility and to learn to function outside school and home. Moreover, work can dismantle age-segregation, and it can bring some respect from the

peer group. These things may accord with adolescents' other possible aspirations towards greater emotional/sexual maturity, in addition to mere material or economic maturity (see Morrow 1994: 142).

Therefore, I want to emphasise, as my theme interviews (Kouvonen 2000a) have indicated, that increasing autonomy expressed and gained in work does not necessarily merely assume a negative expression, such as delinquency or substance use. In summary, intensive adolescent part-time work may in some cases be part of a positive element of maturity or independence, and a part of the normal transition to adulthood; in other cases it may be a less positive sign. Perhaps the difference between 'precocious development' and normative participation in youth culture or 'normal' transition to adulthood, lies in the extent of participation in desirable and less desirable activities, such as peer friendships, dating, working, smoking, heavy drinking etc. (cf. Safron et al. 2001).

However, Mortimer and Johnson (1998: 431) pose an interesting question of which little is known: whether contemporary intensively working adolescents in fact grow up faster and move into adult-like family/residential arrangements and full-time work roles more rapidly than other youths? Generally, it is difficult to determine whether the findings of the relationship between intensive adolescent work and deviant behaviours are best interpreted as evidence that working speeds the normal autonomy development or maturity process, or whether working is associated with premature independence from parental control (Steinberg & Cauffman 1995: 160).

### 6.3 Limitations of the study

There are limitations in the data as well as in the study, which deserve to be acknowledged. First, the data were based on self-reports, and self-reporting is always subjective by its nature. It is possible that the reports have been affected by perceived social desirability. Adolescents are especially likely to be influenced by their peer group. Even so, studies have shown that self-reports of behaviour are acceptably reliable and valid. (Lintonen 2001: 57.)

Second, school absenteeism was the most important source of missing data. For this reason, it is possible that adolescents who are less engaged in school, less controlled and monitored by parents, and more inclined to deviant behaviour, are under-represented (see Steinberg et al. 1993: 173). Correspondingly, it may be that among the absent students there

are some that devote more time to their jobs (McKeechnie et al. 1998: 45). On the other hand, the analysis of teachers' reports in the Finnish self-report delinquency -monitoring project has consistently indicated that 'nice' and 'obedient' students are over-represented in the absent group (Kivivuori 1998). The selection may have some influence on the strength of the relationships, but the tendency of the results is in all likelihood still right.

Third, this study focused merely on the immediate associations between adolescent part-time work and deviant behaviour. However, adolescent work may also have long-term effects or associations. Ruhm (1997: 768) found that senior year high school employment yielded lasting benefits: for example, seniors employed 20 hours per week on average earned more and worked in higher status occupations 6–9 years later than their counterparts who did not work during late adolescence. Furthermore, Carr et al. (1996) found that working adolescents were less likely to attend or complete four or more years of college, but working during high school had a positive effect on many labour force outcomes (participation in the labour force, employment status, income) a decade later.

Fourth, the study measured only the intensity and type of work. On the other hand, the duration of work would similarly be an important work-related variable, because adolescents move in and out of work and frequently change their jobs and hours of work. For this reason, the fact that a student is employed intensively at the time of a particular survey may have little relation to the pattern of employment over a longer time period. (Mortimer & Johnson 1998: 471.)

Fifth, as Ruhm (1997: 768) notes, just a small part of adolescent workers have the heavy job commitments that have raised concern in previous research. This must particularly be taken into account in Finland, because only about 3 % of all adolescents work more than ten hours per week.

Finally, all data had a cross-sectional character. In a cross-sectional study, conclusions cannot be drawn about causality. Working out the causal sequences would require longitudinal and experimental data. Therefore, on the basis of the results, I cannot claim that intensive employment or working in adult-like jobs causes delinquency or substance use in adolescence. The possibility that a third variable causes associations cannot be excluded on the basis of the present research. For example, in the study of Mortimer et al. (1994) there was evidence that students who already were engaged in school misconduct chose to work long hours in the following year. Thus we cannot exclude the possibility that adolescents with deviant propensities, or lifestyle,

self-select themselves to adolescent workplaces (see Steinberg & Dornbusch 1991: 311).

Therefore, although adjustment for other relevant variables – done in this study – partly is an answer to the problem, I could not test the precise mechanisms through which adolescent work fosters delinquency and substance use.

## 6.4 Implications for policy

This work, as well as all research concerning the possible effects of adolescent work, has potentially practical implications for law and social policy. Adolescent work is, and continues to be, under legislative control. The evidence gained from the present study suggests that the existing Finnish regulations concerning adolescent work at least should not be relaxed. As indicated above, adolescents working 10 or more hours per week manifested an increased likelihood of becoming involved in various kinds of problematic behaviour. While the present study cannot ascertain causal links, the results nevertheless suggest that the present legal limit of 12 hours per school week may be too high. In this field of regulation, we should perhaps err on the side of caution.

However, we need to be aware of the fact that probably a considerable part of adolescent employment, as well as problems associated with it, lie in the informal, totally unregulated hidden economy. The problems of implementing legal regulation in this area are consequently formidable, and we should not be too optimistic about the power of legal norms in this respect. This suggests that the responsibility of monitoring adolescents' working hours should lie with the parents and other potential sources of informal social control. Of course, legal norms can have 'pedagogic' functions if parents and employers respect the law and are thus willing to act accordingly.

The results of this research have made me convinced that a reasonable number of working hours (e.g. less than ten hours per school week) in suitable work in lawful, monitored, controlled and restricted conditions is at least inconsequential for most adolescents, but that intensive work can be harmful and – in most cases – does not protect from delinquency or substance use. Therefore, I suggest some caution in encouraging adolescents to work long hours in 'adult-like' jobs during the school year. Moderate work in a good social environment, or work during the summer

holiday, are perhaps the best options for adolescents. As Cockburn (2000) notes, adolescents' working experiences are crucial in their transitions to independence, and these experiences need to be encouraged, even if protection against exploitation is of course essential. It has been shown that benefits seem to be attained from working low or moderate number of hours (Hobbs et al. 1996: 16; D'Amico 1984: 162; Greenberger 1983: 104). Moreover, it is possible that a positive and rewarding work experience may deter workplace delinquency (Wright & Cullen 2000: 866). Nevertheless, my data did not suggest that moderate work in general is better than no work at all, if we consider delinquency, heavy drinking or the use of drugs. In sum, the outcome can best be described by noting that moderate work was not associated with deviant behaviour, even if in some models there was a very slight association between moderate work and an increased likelihood of some forms of delinquent behaviour and heavy drinking.

Finally, I argue that intensive adolescent work could be a contributing and mediating factor leading to delinquency and substance use, exacerbating thereby existing problems, as well as constituting a risk-prone context (see Steinberg & Avenevoli 1998: 393) at least for some adolescents. In this context, it especially concerns me why boys are over-represented among intensive workers.

In conclusion, I agree with McKechnie and colleagues (1998: 45) when they note:

‘Children, parents, local authorities, schools, professionals dealing with child health and welfare, and, not least, employers should be encouraged to become aware that child work is problematic. Children and their parents should be encouraged to weight up disadvantages and advantages, the risks and opportunities of paid employment’.

## 6.5 Challenges for future studies

In view of the findings, it cannot be concluded that working itself is deleterious at this age, but it can be said that it may be so in some conditions and contexts, and it seems to increase the likelihood of deviant behaviour. Thus, future empirical research should pay more careful attention to the conditions of adolescent part-time work, work intensity, and especially to the often neglected question of job quality including work type and other job characteristics, such as the possibility to acquire and use specific skills or to develop social abilities. In addition, more attention should be paid to gender

differences with relation to adolescent work, as well as to the question of selection to work. Moreover, as Cullen and co-workers (1997: 131–132) note, future research should examine whether the effects of adolescent work differ during the school year vs. summer and other holidays, as well as the effect of employment on deviant behaviour across the life-course.

In sum, more longitudinal and large-scale survey research on adolescent work and its relationship to deviant behaviour and health behaviour is needed. Besides, we should take a theoretical, historical and qualitative look at the wider societal ramifications, and personal experiences of adolescent work. Similarly, the relationship between adolescent work and the developments on the labour market, as well as economic questions need to be assessed.

One further aspect that merits attention is the question of what meaning adolescents themselves give to work. Accordingly, qualitative research could open up interesting new perspectives on adolescent work and on its role in adolescents' everyday life and practices. To conclude, in the words of James and colleagues (1998: 123), in research it is essential that 'children are understood as social actors who are not only shaped by their circumstances but also, and most importantly, help shape them'.

## REFERENCES

- Agnew, R. (1990). Adolescent resources and delinquency. *Criminology* 28 (4): 535–565.
- Agnew, R. (1992). Foundation for a general strain theory of crime and delinquency. *Criminology* 30 (1): 47–87.
- Agnew, R. (2001). Building on the foundation of general strain theory: specifying the types of strain most likely to lead to crime and delinquency. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 38 (4): 319–361.
- Ahlström, S. (1982). Ungdomens alkoholbruk. *Alkoholpolitik* 45: 3–22.
- Ary, D. V., Tildesley, E., Hops, H. & Andrews, J. (1993). The influence of parent, sibling and peer modeling and attitudes on adolescent use of alcohol. *The International Journal of the Addictions* 28 (9): 853–880.
- Autio, M. (1998). Työn ja opiskelun risteysasemalla. Työministeriö, Työpoliittinen tutkimus 196.
- Bachman, J. G. & Schulenberg, J. (1993). How part-time work intensity relates to drug use, problem behavior, time use, and satisfaction among high school seniors: are these consequences or merely correlates? *Developmental Psychology* 29 (2): 220–235.
- Burgess, R. L. & Akers, R. L. (1968). A differential association – reinforcement theory of criminal behavior. *Social Problems* 14 (Fall): 128–147.
- Carr, R. V., Wright, J. D. & Brody, C. J. (1996). Effects of high school work experience a decade later: evidence from the national longitudinal survey. *Sociology of Education* 69 (1): 66–81.
- Clarke, R. V. G. (1980). ‘Situational’ crime prevention: theory and practice. *British Journal of Criminology* 20 (2): 136–147.
- Clinard, M. & Quinney, R. (1973). *Criminal behavior systems: a typology*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Cockburn, T. (2000). Youth transitions and citizenships: a socially interdependent model of career. Paper presented in NYRIS 7 Youth Research Symposium, Helsinki, 7–10 June.
- Cohen, L. E. & Felson, M. (1979). Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activity approach. *American Sociological Review* 44 (4): 588–608.
- Cullen, F. T., Williams, N. & Wright, J. P. (1997). Work conditions and juvenile delinquency: is youth employment criminogenic? *Criminal Justice Policy Review* 8 (2–3): 119–143.
- D’Amico, R. (1984). Does employment during high school impair academic progress? *Sociology of Education* 57 (July): 152–164.
- Entwisle, D. R., Alexander, K. L., Olson, L. S. & Ross, K. (1999). Paid work in early adolescence: developmental and ethnic patterns. *Journal of Early Adolescence* 19 (3): 363–388.
- Entwisle, D. R., Alexander, K. L., Olson, L. S. (2000). Early work histories of urban youth. *American Sociological Review* 65 (2): 279–297.
- Finch, M. D. & Mortimer, J. T. (1985). Adolescent work hours and the process of achievement. *Research in Sociology of Education and Socialization* 5: 171–196.

- Furlong, A. & Cartmel, F. (1997). *Young people and social change. Individualization and risk in late modernity*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Gerrard, M., Gibbons, F. X., Zhao, L., Russell, D. V. & Reis-Bergan, M. (1999). The effects of peers' alcohol consumption on parental influence: a cognitive mediational model. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol* 13: 32–44.
- Gottfredson, D. C. (1985). Youth employment, crime and schooling: a longitudinal study of a national sample. *Developmental Psychology* 21 (3): 419–432.
- Gottfredson, M. R. & Hirschi, T. (1990). *A general theory of crime*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Greenberger, E., Steinberg, L. D., Vaux, A. & McAuliffe, S. (1980). Adolescents who work: effects of part-time employment on family and peer relations. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 9 (3): 189–202.
- Greenberger, E., Steinberg, L. D. & Vaux, A. (1981). Adolescents who work: health and behavioral consequences of job stress. *Developmental Psychology* 17 (6): 691–703.
- Greenberger, E. & Steinberg, L. D. (1981). The workplace as a context for the socialization of youth. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 10 (3): 185–210.
- Greenberger E. & Steinberg, L. D. (1982). Statement on proposed changes in child labor regulations. Hearings of the House Subcommittee on Labor Standards, July 28, 1982.
- Greenberger, E. & Steinberg, L. D. (1983): Sex differences in early labor force experience: harbinger of things to come. *Social Forces* 62 (2): 467–486.
- Greenberger, E. (1983). A researcher in the policy arena. The case of child labor. *American Psychologist*, January: 104–111.
- Greenberger, E. & Steinberg, L. D. (1986). *When teenagers work: the psychological and social costs of adolescent employment*. New York: Basic Books.
- Heiser, J. (2000). The relationship between part-time work, adolescent alcohol use and alcohol-related problems: a theoretical integration and an empirical test. Paper presented in American Criminological Association 52<sup>nd</sup> Annual Meeting, San Francisco, 15–18 November.
- Heptinstall, E. (1998). Children at work: healthy or harmful? In: Pettitt, B. (ed.) *Children and work in the UK. Reassessing the issues*, 93–106. London: Child Poverty Action Group and Save the Children.
- Hermansson, H-E. (1988). *Fristadens barn. Om ungdomarnas livsstilar, kulturer och framtidsperspektiv i 80-talets Sverige*. Göteborg: Daidalos.
- Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of delinquency*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hirschi, T. (1983). Crime and the family. In: Wilson, J. (ed.) *Crime and public policy*, 53–68. San Francisco: ICS Press.
- Hobbs, S., Lavalette, M. & McKechnie, J. (1992). The emerging problem of child labour. *Critical Social Policy* 12 (1): 93–105.
- Hobbs, S., Lindsay, S. & McKechnie, J. (1996). The extent of child employment in Britain. *British Journal of Education and Work* 9 (1): 5–18.
- Hobbs, S. & McKechnie, J. (1998). Children and work in the UK: the evidence. In: Pettitt, B. (ed.) *Children and work in the UK. Reassessing the Issues*, 8–21. London: Child Poverty Action Group and Save the Children.

- Honkatukia, P. (1999). Gender, social identity and delinquent behaviour. *Retfaerd* 22 (3): 41–52.
- Hosmer, D. W. Jr & Lemeshow, S. (1989). *Applied Logistic Regression*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Hämäläinen, S. (1990). Askel itsenäisyyteen. Helsinkiläisten koululaisten lukukausien aikainen työssäkäynti. Helsingin kaupungin tilastokeskuksen Tutkimuksia ja selvityksiä 1990:2.
- ILO (2000). *Statistics: revealing the hidden tragedy*.  
<http://www.ilo.org/public/english/standards/ipecc/simpoc/stats/>
- James, A., Jenks, C. & Prout, A. (1998). *Theorizing childhood*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Jessor, R. & Jessor, S. L. (1977). *Problem behavior and psychosocial development*. New York: Academic Press.
- Junger-Tas, J., Terlouw, G-J. & Klein, M. W. (eds.) (1994). *Delinquent behavior among young people in the western world: first results of the international self-report delinquency study*. Amsterdam/New York: Ministry of Justice and Kugler Publications.
- Kaltiala-Heino, R., Rimpelä, M., Rantanen, P. & Rimpelä, A. (2000). Bullying at school – an indicator of adolescents at risk for mental disorders. *Journal of Adolescence* 23: 661–674.
- Karvonen, S. (1997). The regional context of health behaviour among Finnish adolescents. *Stakes Research Reports* 76.
- Karvonen, S. (2002). Hyvästit lapsuudelle? Päihteisiin liittyvät kulttuuriset käytännöt varhaisnuoruudessa. In: Kuure, T., Vuori, M. & Gissler, M. (eds.) *Viattomuudesta vimmaan. Lapsuudesta nuoruuteen -siirtymävaiheen tarkastelua*, 89–94. Jyväskylä: Nuorisotutkimusverkosto.
- Keskinen, V. (2001). Kiirettä pitää. Kaverit, koti, koulu ja nuorten vapaa-aika Helsingissä 2000. Helsingin kaupungin tietokeskus *Tutkimuksia* 2001:10.
- Kivivuori, J. (1998). Delinquent phases. The case of temporally intensified shoplifting behaviour. *British Journal of Criminology* 38 (4): 663–680.
- Kivivuori, J., Karvonen, S. & Rimpelä, M. (2001). Nuorten rikoskäyttäytymisen yleisyys kyselyjen valossa. *Oikeuspoliittinen tutkimuslaitos, Tutkimustiedonantoja* 54.
- Komonen, K. (2001). Työn moraalista koulutuksen moraaliiin. In: Kuure, T. (ed.) *Aikuistumisen pullonkaulat. Nuorten elinolot -vuosikirja*, 70–85. Helsinki: Nuorisotutkimusverkosto/Nuorisotutkimusseura, julkaisuja 16.
- Konu, A., Lintonen, T. & Rimpelä, M. (2002a). Factors associated with schoolchildren's general subjective well-being. *Health Education Research* 17: 155–165.
- Konu, A., Lintonen, T. & Autio, V. (2002b). Evaluation of well-being in schools – a multilevel analysis of general subjective well-being. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement* 13: 187–200.
- Kouvonen, A. (2000a). Koululaisten suhtautuminen työssäkäyntiinsä. *Sosiologia* 37 (4): 291–305.
- Kouvonen, A. (2000b). Lapset ja nuoret palkkatyössä. Työministeriö, *Työpoliittinen tutkimus* 215.

- Kouvonen, A. (2001). Koululaisten työssäkäynti ja ongelmakäyttäytyminen. Työministeriö, Työpoliittinen tutkimus 225.
- Laaksonen, H. (2001). Nuorten siirtyminen työmarkkinoille 1990-luvun Suomessa. In: Kuure, T. (ed.) Aikuistumisen pullonkaulat. Nuorten elinolot - vuosikirja, 86–96. Helsinki: Nuorisotutkimusverkosto/Nuorisotutkimusseura, julkaisuja 16.
- Lavalette, M. (1998). Child labour: historical, legislative and policy context. In: Pettitt, B. (ed.) Children and work in the UK. Reassessing the issues, 22–40. London: Child Poverty Action Group and Save the Children.
- Leonard, M. (1998). Children's contribution to household income: a case study from Northern Ireland. In: Pettitt, B. (ed.) Children and work in the UK. Reassessing the issues, 80–92. London: Child Poverty Action Group and Save the Children.
- Lintonen, T. (2001). Drinking patterns among Finnish fourteen year-olds from 1977 to 1999. Acta Universitatis Tamperensis 832. Tampere: Tampere University Press.
- Lucas, R. (1997). Youth, gender and part-time work – students in the labour process. *Work, Employment & Society* 11 (4): 595–614.
- Lähteenmaa, J. (1992). Tytöt jännitystä etsimässä. Sukkulointia ja irrottelua. In: Näre, S. & Lähteenmaa, J. (eds.) *Letit liehumaan. Tyttökultturi murroksessa*, 155–170. Helsinki: SKS.
- Marsh, A., Dobbs, J. & White, A. (1986). Adolescent drinking. London: HMSO.
- Marsh, H. W. (1991) Employment during high school: character building or a subversion of academic goals? *Sociology of Education* 64 (3): 172–189.
- McKechnie, J., Lindsay, S., Hobbs, S. & Lavalette, M. (1996). Adolescents' perceptions of the role of part-time work. *Adolescence* 31 (Spring): 193–204.
- McKechnie, J., Hobbs, S., Lindsay, S. & Lynch, M. (1998). Working children: the health and safety issue. *Children & Society* 12: 38–47.
- McKechnie, J., Lavalette, M. & Hobbs, S. (2000). Child employment research in Britain. *Work, Employment & Society* 14 (3): 573–580.
- McMorris, B. J. & Uggen, C. (2000). Alcohol and employment in the transition to adulthood. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 41(3): 276–294.
- McNeal, R. B. Jr. (1997). Are students being pulled out of high school? The effect of adolescent employment on dropping out. *Sociology of Education* 70 (July): 206–220.
- Merton, R. K. (1968). *Social theory and social structure*. New York: The Free Press.
- Middleton, S., Shropshire, J. & Croden, N. (1998). Earning your keep? Children's work and contributions to family budgets. In: Pettitt, B. (ed.) *Children and work in the UK. Reassessing the issues*, 41–58. London: Child Poverty Action Group and Save the Children.
- Mihalic, S. W. & Elliott, D. (1997). Short- and long-term consequences of adolescent work. *Youth & Society* 28 (4): 464–498.
- Mizen, P. (1992). Learning the hard way: the extent and significance of child working in Britain. *British Journal of Education and Work* 5 (1): 5–17.
- Mizen, P., Bolton, A. & Pole, C. (1999a): School age workers: the paid

- employment of children in Britain. *Work, Employment & Society* 13 (3): 423–438.
- Mizen, P., Pole, C., & Bolton, A. (1999b). Work, labour and economic life in late childhood. Full report of research activities and results. July 1999.
- Mizen, P., Pole, C. & Bolton, A. (2000). Why be a school age worker? Paper presented in ESRC Children 5–16 Final Conference, London, 20–21 October.
- Moran, M. A., Engelman L., Fitzgerald, G. & Lynch, B. (1990). Polychotomous stepwise logistic regression. In: Dixon, W. J., Brown, M. B., Engelman, L. & Jennrich, R. I. (eds.) *BMDP Statistical Software Manual Vol 2*, 1047–1077. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Mortimer, J. T. , Finch, M. D., Owens, T. J. & Shanahan, M. (1990). Gender and work in adolescence. *Youth & Society* 22 (2): 201–224.
- Mortimer, J. T., Finch, M., Shanahan, M. & Ryu, S. (1992a). Work experience, mental health, and behavioral adjustment in adolescence. *Journal of Research on Adolescence* 2 (1): 25–57.
- Mortimer, J. T., Finch, M., Shanahan, M. & Ryu, S. (1992b). Adolescent work history and behavioral adjustment. *Journal of Research on Adolescence* 2 (1): 59–80.
- Mortimer, J. T., Shanahan, M. J. & Ryu, S. (1994). The effects of adolescent employment on school-related orientation and behavior. In: Silbreisen, R. K. & Todt, E. (eds.) *Adolescence in context. The interplay of family, school, peers, and work in adjustment*, 304–326. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Mortimer, J. T., Finch, M. D., Ryu, S., Shanahan, M. J. & Call, K. T. (1996). The effects of work intensity on adolescent mental health, achievement, and behavioral adjustment: new evidence from a prospective study. *Child Development* 67 (3): 1243–1261.
- Mortimer, J. T. & Kirkpatrick Johnson, M. (1998). New perspectives on adolescent work and the transition to adulthood. In: Jessor, R. (ed.) *New perspectives on adolescent risk behavior*, 425–496. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Morrow, V. (1994). Responsible children? Aspects of children's work and employment outside school in contemporary UK. In: Mayall, B. (ed.) *Children's childhoods: observed and experienced*, 128–143. London: Falmer Press.
- Needle, R., McCubbin, H., Wilson, M., Reineck, R., Lazar, A. & Mederer, H. (1986). Interpersonal influences in adolescent drug use. The role of older siblings, parents, and peers. *The International Journal of the Addictions* 21 (7): 739–766.
- Newcomb, M. D. (1996). Pseudomaturity among adolescents: construct validation, sex differences, and associations in adulthood. *Journal of Drug Issues* 26: 477–504.
- Newcomb, M. D. & Bentler, P. M. (1988). *Consequences of adolescent drug use: impact on the lives of young adults*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

- Nordic Council (1999). Barn- och ungdomsarbete i Norden. Nord 1999: 23. Kobenhavn: Nordisk Ministerråd.
- Norusis, M. (1994). SPSS Advanced Statistics 6.1. Chicago: SPSS.
- Pedersen, W. & Wichstrom, L. (1995). Patterns of delinquency in Norwegian adolescents. *British Journal of Criminology* 35 (4): 543–562.
- Pettitt, B. (1998). Introduction. In: Pettitt, B. (ed.) *Children and work in the UK. Reassessing the issues*, 1–7. London: Child Poverty Action Group and Save the Children.
- Phillips, S. & Sandstrom, K. L. (1990). Parental attitudes toward youth work. *Youth & Society* 22 (2): 160–183.
- Ploeger, M. (1997). Youth employment and delinquency: reconsidering a problematic relationship. *Criminology* 35 (4): 659–675.
- Pollock, G. (2000). Contingent identities: updating the transitional discourse. Paper presented in NYRIS 7 Youth Research Symposium, Helsinki, 7–10 June.
- Prout, A. & James, A. (1990). A new paradigm for the sociology of childhood? Provenance, promise and problems. In: James, A. & Prout, A. (eds.) *Constructing and reconstructing childhood*, 7–34. London: Falmer Press.
- Qvortrup, J. (1985). Placing children in the division of labour. In: Close, P. & Collins, R. (eds.) *Family and economy in modern society*, 129–145. London: Macmillan.
- Rahkonen, O. & Ahlström, S. (1989). Trends in drinking habits among Finnish youth from 1973 to 1987. *British Journal of Addiction* 84: 1075–1083.
- Rahikainen, M. (1996). Miksi lasten työnteko päättyi – ja miksi se alkoi uudestaan. *Janus* 4 (1): 22–38.
- Rahikainen, M. (1999). Kaupunkilaisnuorten töitä 1950–1970. In: Parikka, R. (ed.) *Suomalaisen työn historiaa. Korvesta konttoriin*, 335–369. Helsinki: SKS.
- Rikowski, G. & Neary, M. (1997). Working schoolchildren in Britain today. *Capital and Class* 63 (Autumn): 25–35.
- Ruggiero, M., Greenberger, E. & Steinberg, L. D. (1982). Occupational deviance among adolescent workers. *Youth & Society* 13 (4): 423–448.
- Ruhm, C. J. (1997). Is high school employment consumption or investment? *Journal of Labor Economics* 15 (4): 735–776.
- Safron, D. J., Schulenberg, J. E. & Bachman, J. G. (2001). Part-time work and hurried adolescence: the links among work intensity, social activities, health behaviours, and substance use. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 42: 425–449.
- Sampson, R. J. & Laub, J. H. (1993). *Crime in the making. Pathways and turning points through life*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Save the Children (1998). Children's perspectives on work. In: Pettitt, B. (ed.) *Children and work in the UK. Reassessing the issues*, 59–79. London: Child Poverty Action Group and Save the Children.
- Shanahan, M. J., Finch, M., Mortimer, J. T. & Ryu, S. (1991). Adolescent work experience and depressive affect. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 54 (4): 299–317.
- Siurala, L. (1991). Nuorten muuttuva suhde työhön, koulunkäyntiin ja kulutukseen. In: Lähteenmaa, J. & Siurala, L. (eds.) *Nuoret ja muutos*, 75–82. Tilastokeskus, Tutkimuksia 177.

- Snellman, G. R. (1908). Tutkimus Helsingin, Turun, Tampereen ja Viipurin kansakoululasten työskentelystä koulun ulkopuolella. Työtilasto A, V. Tutkimus, Keisarillisen senaatin kirjapaino, Helsinki.
- Solberg, A. (1994). Negotiating childhood. Nordic Institute for Studies in Urban and Regional Planning. Dissertation 12, Nordplan, Stockholm.
- SPSS (1999). SPSS regression models 9.0. Chicago: SPSS.
- Steinberg, L. D., Greenberger, E., Jacobi, M. & Garduque, L. (1981). Early work experience: a partial antidote for adolescent egocentrism. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 10 (2): 141–157.
- Steinberg, L. D. (1982). Jumping off the work experience bandwagon. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 11 (3): 183–205.
- Steinberg, L. D., Greenberger, E., Garduque, L., Ruggiero, M. & Vaux, A. (1982). Effects of working on adolescent development. *Developmental Psychology* 18 (3): 385–395.
- Steinberg, L. & Dornbusch, S. M. (1991). Negative correlates of part-time employment during adolescence: replication and elaboration. *Developmental Psychology* 27 (2): 304–313.
- Steinberg, L. D., Fegley, S. & Dornbusch, S. M. (1993). Negative impact of part-time work on adolescent adjustment: evidence from a longitudinal study. *Developmental Psychology* 29 (2): 171–180.
- Steinberg, L. & Cauffman, E. (1995). The impact of employment on adolescent development. *Annals of Child Development* 11: 131–166.
- Steinberg, L. & Avenevoli, S. (1998). Disengagement from school and problem behavior in adolescence: a developmental-contextual analysis of the influences of family and part-time work. In: Jessor, R. (ed.) *New perspectives on adolescent risk behavior*, 392–424. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stern, D., Stone, J. R. III, Hopkins, C. & McMillion, M. (1990). Quality of students' work experience and orientation toward work. *Youth & Society* 22 (2): 263–282.
- Stevens, C. J., Puchtell, L. A., Ryu, S. & Mortimer, J. T. (1992). Adolescent work and boys' and girls' orientations to the future. *The Sociological Quarterly* 33 (2): 153–169.
- Sutherland, E. H. & Cressey, D. R. (1978). *Criminology*. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company.
- Tabachnik, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. (1996). *Using multivariate statistics*. Harper Collins: College Publishers.
- Tallavaara, M-S. (1990). Koululaiset palkkatyössä. Helsingin yläasteen ja lukion oppilaiden työssäkäynti keväällä 1989. Helsingin kaupungin kouluviraston julkaisusarja A4:1990.
- Tanner, J. & Krahn, H. (1991). Part-time work and deviance among high-school seniors. *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 16 (3): 281–302.
- Thornberry, T. P. (1987). Toward an interactional theory of delinquency. *Criminology* 25 (4): 863–891.
- White, L. K. & Brinkerhoff, D. B. (1981). The sexual division of labor: evidence from childhood. *Social Forces* 60 (1): 170–181.

- Williams, N., Cullen, F. T. & Wright, J. P. (1996). Labor market participation and youth crime: the neglect of 'working' in delinquency research. *Social Pathology* 2 (3): 195–217.
- Willis, P. (1977). *Learning to labour*. Farnborough: Saxon House.
- Wright, J. P. & Cullen, F. T. (2000). Juvenile involvement in occupational delinquency. *Criminology* 38 (3): 863–896.

# TIIVISTELMÄ

Tämän tutkimuksen tarkoituksena on laajentaa tietämystämme suomalaisten peruskoululaisten lukukausien aikaisesta työssäkäynnistä sekä tutkia koululaisten työssäkäynnin ja poikkeavan käyttäytymisen tai ongelmakäyttäytymisen välistä suhdetta.

Tutkimus koostuu yhteenvetoartikkelista sekä neljästä erillisestä artikkelista, joissa käytettiin yhteensä kolmea kyselyaineistoa: nuorten itse ilmoittamaa rikollisuutta selvittäviä kyselyjä (FSRD) vuosilta 1998 (n = 4 491) ja 2001 (n = 4 347) sekä Kouluterveys 2000 -kyselyä (SHPS) (n = 47 568). Kahdessa ensimmäisessä artikkelissa tutkimuskohteena oli nuorten työssäkäynnin ja itse ilmoitetun rikollisuuden välinen suhde, kolmas artikkeli keskittyi työssäkäynnin ja humalajuomisen yhteyden tarkasteluun, ja neljännessä artikkelissa kohteena oli työssäkäynnin ja huumeidenkäytön yhteys. Tulokset ovat yleistettävissä 14–16-vuotiaisiin peruskoululaisiin.

Tutkimuksen tulokset osoittavat, että runsas (yli 10 tunnin) viikoittainen työssäkäynti on tilastollisesti merkitsevästi yhteydessä rikollisuuden, humalajuomisen ja huumeidenkäytön kasvaneeseen todennäköisyyteen. Runsas työssäkäynti ja työskentely 'aikuismaisissa työpaikoissa' eivät pidä nuoria 'poissa kaduilta' tai 'poissa pahanteosta'. Näin ollen koulun ohessa tapahtuvaa runsasta työssäkäyntiä ei voi käyttää poikkeavaa tai ongelmallista käyttäytymistä ehkäisevänä keinona tai strategiana.

Runsas työssäkäynti ei kuitenkaan ollut niiden tekijöiden joukossa, jotka olivat selvimmin yhteydessä suomalaisnuorten ongelmakäyttäytymiseen. Keskeiset kriminologiset muuttujat kuten vanhempien kontrolli ja vertaisryhmään liittyvät tekijät, sekä muut tärkeät muuttujat kuten sukupuoli ja viikoittain käytettävissä oleva rahamäärä, olivat vahvemmin yhteydessä erityyppisten rikollisten ja kiellettyjen tekojen tekemiseen. Vastaavasti alhainen vanhempien kontrolli oli runsasta työssäkäyntiä vahvemmin yhteydessä kasvaneeseen todennäköisyyteen käyttää päihteitä. Näistä tuloksista huolimatta on kuitenkin tärkeä huomata, että olennaisten muuttujien vakioimisen jälkeenkin runsaan työssäkäynnin ja poikkeavan käyttäytymisen eri muotojen lisääntyneen todennäköisyyden välillä säilyi tilastollisesti merkitsevä yhteys. Sen sijaan vähäinen tai kohtuullinen työssäkäynti ei pääosin ollut yhteydessä poikkeavaan käyttäytymiseen.

Tutkimuksen tulosten perusteella ei voida päätellä, että nuorten työssäkäynti aiheuttaa ongelmakäyttäytymistä, tai että työssäkäynti on aina pahaksi koululaisille. Tutkimus osoittaa ainoastaan, että tietyissä olosuhteissa lukukausien aikainen työssäkäynti voi olla haitallista. Toisin sanoen peruskoululaisten työssäkäynti itsessään ei ole hyvää tai pahaa, vaan olennaisia ovat työn ominaisuudet, erityisesti viikoittaisten työtuntien määrä.

**Avainsanat:** nuoret; työ; rikollisuus; alkoholi; huumeet

# ABSTRACT

The purpose of the present research is to increase our knowledge about adolescent part-time work during the school year, and to examine the association between work and deviant behaviour among Finnish lower-level secondary school students.

Three data, Finnish Self-Report Delinquency Studies 1998 (n = 4 491) and 2001 (n = 4 347) and School Health Promotion Survey 2000 (n = 47 568), were analysed in four separate articles. In addition, the study includes the summary article. In two of the original papers the relationship between adolescent part-time work and delinquency was studied, one article explored the association between work and heavy drinking while the remaining one examined the relationship between work and drug use. There is a sound basis for a generalisation of the results for 14 to 16 year-olds.

The study shows that there is a significant association between intensive (more than 10 hrs per week) adolescent part-time work and an increased likelihood of delinquency, heavy drinking and drug use. Intensive work and 'adult-like' jobs do not keep adolescents 'off the streets' or 'out of trouble'. Part-time work cannot therefore be used as a strategy for preventing deviant behaviour.

However, intensive work was not among the factors most strongly associated with an increased likelihood of deviant behaviour among Finnish adolescents. Common criminological variables, such as parental control and peer-related variables, as well as other relevant variables, such as gender and disposable allowances, were more strongly associated with various types of delinquency. Similarly, low parental control was more strongly associated with an increased likelihood of heavy drinking and the use of drugs. Even so, after controlling several relevant variables, there still remains a significant association between intensive work and an increased likelihood of all deviant behaviours examined. In contrast, moderate work was mostly not associated with deviant behaviour.

This research does not claim that adolescent work causes delinquency or substance use, or that work is always bad for adolescents. The study indicates that under certain conditions, working during the school year may be potentially harmful. Work as such is neither good nor bad. It is the characteristics of the job that is essential, among which the number of hours worked, is the most important.

**Keywords:** adolescence; work; delinquency; alcohol use; drug use