Effects of Minimum Wage Laws on Teenage and Young Adult Employment

Posted on October 10, 2018

View this essay online:
https://academic-master.com/effects-of-minimum-wage-laws-on-teenage-and-young-adult-employment/

Introduction

Minimum-wage laws are often debated through their effects on teenagers and young adults because younger workers are disproportionately represented in entry-level, part-time, retail, hospitality, and seasonal jobs. The economic question is not whether a higher wage floor has only benefits or only costs. A binding minimum can raise hourly pay for workers who remain employed, reduce turnover, and improve job quality, while also leading some employers to reduce hiring, hours, training, or other compensation. The magnitude of these responses depends on the size of the increase relative to prevailing wages, local labor-market conditions, employer wage-setting power, and the ability of firms to adjust through prices or productivity. Current federal law still sets the minimum at $7.25 per hour, while many states and localities require higher rates. Because younger workers are more concentrated near wage floors, policy changes can affect them differently from experienced adults. A responsible analysis therefore compares theory with measured outcomes and treats estimates as conditional rather than as universal rules.

Why Youth Employment May Respond Differently

Young workers often enter the labor market with limited job experience, shorter employment histories, and fewer credentials that allow employers to estimate productivity confidently. They are also more likely to work in industries where labor represents a large share of operating costs and where schedules can be adjusted quickly. In a simple competitive model, a higher legal wage can reduce demand for workers whose expected productivity falls below the new cost of employment, leading firms to hire fewer inexperienced applicants, automate tasks, or use more experienced workers. Yet actual labor markets are not perfectly competitive. Search costs, transportation limits, irregular schedules, and incomplete information can give employers some wage-setting power, particularly over students and young adults with fewer alternatives. In such settings, a moderate wage floor can raise pay without producing the job losses predicted by the simplest model. This is why minimum wages cannot be evaluated from theory alone; empirical evidence is necessary to determine how particular increases affected particular groups.

Research Does Not Support a Single Universal Employment Effect

Empirical studies of minimum-wage changes produce a range of results rather than one settled numerical effect. Some studies find small or statistically uncertain changes in employment after moderate increases, while others find reductions in hiring or employment for teenagers and other low-wage groups, especially when the increase is large relative to local wages. The Congressional Budget Office similarly treats national minimum-wage proposals as producing both higher earnings for many affected workers and some reduction in employment, with substantial uncertainty around the size of each effect. These findings should not be converted into claims that every increase destroys jobs or that employment effects never occur. Research design matters because states differ in economic growth, industry composition, demographics, migration, and neighboring wage laws. Employers also respond through channels that job counts alone do not capture. The best interpretation is therefore contextual: the larger and more binding the increase, the more important it becomes to examine hiring, hours, prices, turnover, and training alongside headline employment numbers.

Employment Counts Miss Hours, Training, and Job Quality

A worker can remain employed while experiencing meaningful changes in hours, scheduling, workload, training, or benefits. Employers facing higher labor costs may reduce weekly hours, use fewer workers during quiet periods, intensify tasks, slow future wage growth, or limit formal training. They may also respond in ways that benefit workers, such as reducing turnover, improving management, adopting productivity-enhancing technology, or accepting lower profit margins. For teenagers and young adults, these adjustments can matter as much as whether a job technically exists. A predictable twenty-hour schedule may be more valuable than irregular availability that interferes with classes, and genuine training can improve long-term earnings even when starting pay is modest. Conversely, a nominal wage increase may provide little benefit if hours fall sharply. Policy evaluation should therefore measure total earnings, hours, job duration, training, schedule quality, and transitions into better employment. This broader approach also prevents an entry-level position from being treated automatically as valuable experience when the job provides little supervision, skill development, or advancement.

Schooling and Household Income Complicate the Youth Debate

Youth employment interacts with education and family finances in ways that make simple welfare

conclusions difficult. A higher hourly wage may allow some students to work fewer hours while meeting tuition, transportation, or household expenses, which can support continued study. For others, better pay may make employment more attractive relative to school, especially where academic pathways are weak or immediate family income is urgently needed. Job loss can also have different effects depending on whether a teenager is earning discretionary spending money or contributing materially to rent, food, and caregiving costs. Public policy therefore needs to consider who gains additional earnings and who loses employment opportunities rather than treating all young workers as economically interchangeable. Complementary policies can reduce trade-offs by expanding apprenticeships, summer employment, career education, transportation support, financial aid, and targeted training. A wage floor is only one institution in the transition from school to work, and its consequences depend partly on whether young people have credible educational and employment alternatives.

Conclusion

Minimum-wage increases can influence teenage and young-adult employment through several channels at once: hourly pay, hiring, weekly hours, training, turnover, prices, and school decisions. Economic theory provides reasons to expect job loss when a wage floor substantially exceeds the value employers assign to inexperienced labor, but theories of employer wage-setting power explain why moderate increases can sometimes raise pay with little reduction in employment. Empirical research supports neither the claim that every increase destroys large numbers of youth jobs nor the claim that employment effects are impossible. Results vary with the size of the increase, local wages, economic conditions, industry structure, and research method. Young workers who keep their jobs may gain meaningful income and stability, while those who lose an entry opportunity can face immediate and longer-term costs. The strongest analysis therefore evaluates a specific policy using multiple outcomes rather than a single national job-loss number. Wage standards are best understood as one part of a broader youth-employment system that also includes education, training, financial aid, and pathways into productive first jobs.

References

Congressional Budget Office. (2026). *The Effects of a Minimum-Wage Increase on Employment and Family Income*.

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2026). *Youth Labor Force and Minimum-Wage Statistics*.

Dube, A. (2019). *Impacts of Minimum Wages: Review of the International Evidence*. UK Government.