

**RACIAL AND ETHNIC DIFFERENCES IN LEAVING AND RETURNING TO THE
PARENTAL HOME: THE ROLE OF LIFE-COURSE TRANSITIONS,
SOCIOECONOMIC RESOURCES, AND FAMILY CONNECTIVITY**

March 2015

Word count: 10,417 (excluding tables)

Number of Tables: 3

Number of Figures: 0

Running Head: Racial Differences in Leaving and Returning Home

RACIAL AND ETHNIC DIFFERENCES IN LEAVING AND RETURNING TO THE PARENTAL HOME: THE ROLE OF LIFE-COURSE TRANSITIONS, SOCIOECONOMIC RESOURCES, AND FAMILY CONNECTIVITY

Abstract

Although Black and Hispanic young adults are less likely than Whites to move out of the parental home and more likely to return, reasons for these differences have not been clearly identified. Data from the 2005-2011 waves of the Panel Study of Income Dynamics' Transition into Adulthood study ($N=1,491$, age 18 to 26) were analyzed to examine the ability of racial/ethnic disparities in life-course transitions, socioeconomic resources, and family connectivity to account for racial/ethnic differences in leaving and returning home. The bulk of the Black-White differences in the timing of both home-leaving and home-returning was explained by group differences in transitions into adult roles, the ability to afford independent living, and connections to the origin family. These factors also explained most of the Mexican-White difference in home-leaving. However, only a small portion of the Hispanic-White difference in returning home was attributable to the proposed explanatory variables.

Keywords: Living Arrangement, Race/Ethnicity, Adulthood, Mobility

RACIAL AND ETHNIC DIFFERENCES IN LEAVING AND RETURNING TO THE PARENTAL HOME: THE ROLE OF LIFE-COURSE TRANSITIONS, SOCIOECONOMIC RESOURCES, AND FAMILY CONNECTIVITY

Over the last half-century social, economic, and cultural changes have made the transition to adulthood more dynamic, complex, and diversified in western countries (Cordón, 1997; Mitchell, 2007; Settersten & Ray, 2010). In addition to extended post-secondary education and delayed marriage and childbearing, there has been a steady increase in the share of young adults living in the parental home (Furstenberg, 2010; Payne, 2012b). In the U.S. the percentage of young adults age 18-31 living in the parental home remained largely unchanged from 1981(31%) to 2007 (32%), but then increased to 36% in 2012 (Fry, 2013). Not only are U.S. young adults leaving home at an older age, but almost half of them return home after living independently (Goldscheider & Goldscheider, 1999). This appears to be a much higher rate of home-returning than in Canada and some European countries, including Britain, Germany, and Sweden (Mitchell, 2007). This prolonged dependence on parents is likely attributable to the declining job prospects for young adults, an increasing demand for higher education, and the rising cost of living (Newman, 2012). In addition, familistic values among some racial-ethnic and immigrant groups may encourage coresidence with parents (Waters, Carr, Kefalas, & Holdaway, 2011).

In the U.S., transitions out of the parental home are marked by considerable diversity across racial and ethnic groups. At least among young men, levels of co-residence with parents vary substantially by racial-ethnic background. In 2011, 31% of young Black men ages 25–34 lived in the parental home, compared with 21% of young Latino men and 15% of White men. Differences among young Black women (11%), Latino women (11%) and White women (9%) are substantially smaller (Mather, 2011). Prior research found that Black and Hispanic young adults leave home at an older age than their non-Hispanic White peers (Goldscheider, Hofferth,

& Curtin, 2014; Mulder & Clark, 2000) and are more likely to return after living away from home (Da Vanzo & Goldscheider, 1990; South & Lei, 2014).

Yet, despite these widely acknowledged racial-ethnic differences in young adults' propensity to move out of and back into the parental home, the source of these disparities remains unclear. Prior studies of this issue have often used cross-sectional data, which are incapable of identifying the events in young adults' life-course that might precipitate either home-leaving or home-returning. When longitudinal data have been used, the focus has been on long-term trends rather than contemporary differences (Goldscheider & Goldscheider, 1997). Recent research has attempted to explain racial-ethnic differences in parent-adult child coresidence by exploring the impact of immigration status (Glick & Van Hook, 2002), social and family roles and individual resources (Treas & Batalova, 2011), and attitudes towards marriage and family (Britton, 2013). However, Glick and Van Hook (2002) found that only a small share of racial/ethnic differences in parental coresidence is explained by compositional differences in nativity or recency of arrival to the U.S. Treas and Batalova (2011) eliminated the Black-White gap in parental coresidence by adjusting for young adults' social roles (e.g., spouse, parent, student, or worker) and economic resources, but were unable to explain completely the Hispanic-White difference. Britton (2013) found that higher rates of coresidence among minorities are not attributable to subcultural differences in attitudes toward family and marriage, but are partially explained by group differences in socioeconomic attainment and marital status.

Little attention has been given to other possible explanations for racial and ethnic differences in parental coresidence, particularly characteristics of the parental household and the emotional connectivity between adult children and their origin family. Previous studies have also been unable to examine the factors contributing to racial and ethnic differences in home-leaving

and in home-returning separately. This paper goes beyond previous studies by examining a broader array of potential explanations for why Black and Hispanic young adults are less likely than Whites to move out of the parental home and more likely to return.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The life course perspective provides a useful orientating framework for the study of home-leaving and home-returning. The life course is defined as a “sequence of socially defined events and roles that the individual enacts over time” (Giele & Elder Jr., 1998: 22). Moving out of the parental home is regarded as one of the key events marking the transition into adulthood. The life course perspective explicitly acknowledges the substantial inter-individual variability in the timing of moving out of the parental home (Shanahan, 2000), and characterizes returning home as an example of a transition reversal or counter-transition (Elder, Johnson, & Crosnoe, 2003; Mitchell, 2003). Several life course principles are utilized to guide our analysis of why racial and ethnic groups differ in the timing of leaving and returning home. The life course principle of *the timing of lives* maintains that the timing of transitions between school, work, and family roles is intertwined with leaving and returning home (Elder, et al., 2003), given extant social norms about the timing of life events. According to the *principle of heterogeneity*, inter-individual variation in the timing of transition out of the parental home could partially stem from young adults’ differential access to financial resources and parental assistance needed for establishing an independent household (Mitchell, 2003). The *principle of linked lives* emphasizes that the timing of life transitions is influenced by the characteristics of, and life events occurring to, other member of a social network, particularly family members (Elder, et al., 2003). This tenet directs attention to the role of family social capital in shaping the timing of both leaving and returning to the parental home.

Following the life course *principle of agency*, we view the delayed leaving and accelerated returning to the parental home as strategic choices made by young adults operating under social influences and constraints (Elder, et al., 2003; Marshall, 2005). Young adults from different racial and ethnic backgrounds may have different structural opportunities in schooling and working, unequal access to economic resources, and distinct cultural norms regarding to family relationships, all of which provide potential explanations for racial and ethnic differences in the timing of leaving and returning home.

Life Course Transitions: School and Work

The life course perspective emphasizes the co-occurrence of key events in individuals lives (Elder, et al., 2003). Indeed, moves out of and, to a lesser extent, back into the parental home have been viewed as consequences of concurrent, normative transitions in the young adult life course. Transitions from high school to college and from school to work tend to trigger young adults' decision to leave the parental home. Enrolling in college and finding a job often require geographical relocation in order for young adults to live close to school or the place of employment (Zorlu & Mulder, 2011). Similarly, returns to the parental home are often driven by changes in young adults' changes in schooling and labor market activities. Moving back to the parental home is often a result of an unsuccessful role transition, such as losing a job or failing to find a job after graduating from college (Kaplan, 2009; Stone, Berrington, & Falkingham, 2014). By returning home, adult children reduce their housing costs, share resources with parents, and take advantage of economies of scale (Goldscheider, Goldscheider, Clair, & Hodges, 1999).

Racial and ethnic disparities in the propensity to make these school and work transitions could potentially explain why minorities leave and return home at a different rate than Whites. Although the racial gap has narrowed over recent decades, Blacks and Hispanics continue to lag

behind Whites in the likelihood of attending college (Kao & Thompson, 2003). For example, between 2008 and 2010, 71.2% of White high school completers entered college, compared to only 62.4% of Black and 60.9% of Hispanic high school graduates (NCES, 2013a). After graduation from high school and college, the labor market outcomes of young Black adults are quite different from that of White and Hispanic. Fewer young Black adults than Whites and Hispanics make successful transitions from school to employment. Among high school completers, the unemployment rate for Black youth in 2010 was 48.7%, twice as high as that for Whites (23.9%) and Hispanics (22.5%) (NCES, 2013b). For young adults ages 25 to 34 who hold a bachelors degree, 96% of Whites and 94.2% of Hispanics are employed compared to only 90% of Blacks (NCES, 2013c).

We hypothesized that the delayed home leaving among Black and Hispanic youth compared with their White peers is potentially attributable to their lower propensity of transitioning from high school to college and their lower rates of employment after completing high school. Likewise, the lower employment rates for Black college graduates than for their White and Hispanic counterparts might help account for the racial-ethnic differences in young adults' propensity to return to the parental home.

Life-Course Transitions: Cohabiting Relationships and Parenthood

According to the life-course principle of *the timing of lives*, relationship transitions are closely entwined with residential changes (Goldscheider & Goldscheider, 1999; Treas & Batalova, 2011). Marrying or entering a cohabiting union encourages young adults to establish an independent household (Smits, Van Gaalen, & Mulder, 2010), whereas failing to form a union or dissolving a romantic relationship delays home-leaving and precipitates home-returning (Stone, et al., 2014). Racial-ethnic differences in the timing of home-leaving and home-returning

might be explained by the different propensities of White, Black, and Hispanic young adults to form families through marriage, cohabitation, and childbearing. Black men express weaker desires to marry than non-Hispanic White and, especially, Hispanic men (South, 1993). Differences in marriage and divorce rates by race and ethnicity are also well-known. Nearly one-third of non-Hispanic Blacks born during 1957–1964 had not married by the age of 46, compared to only 10% of non-Hispanic Whites and 15% of Hispanics (Aughinbaugh, Robles, & Sun, 2013). In addition, young Black adults marry at a later age than Whites; the median age at first marriage is 30 for Blacks and about 27 for Whites (Payne, 2012a). A national survey in 2002 reported that nearly sixty percent of White and Hispanic men are involved in a marital or cohabiting union relative to only 35% of Black men (Goodwin, Mosher, & Chandra, 2010). Among ever married persons, the percentage of Blacks who have divorced (48.4%) is higher than that of Whites (44.2%) and Hispanics (46.5%) (Aughinbaugh, et al., 2013).

The lower marriage rates and higher divorce rates among Blacks than among Whites and Hispanics are potentially important reasons for the delayed launch of young Black adults and their greater tendency to return to the parental home. Although racial-ethnic differences in attitudes toward marriage and family do not appear to explain higher rates of coresidence among non-Whites than among Whites, some of the difference in parental coresidence is attributable to racial differences in young adults' marital status (Britton, 2013). We hypothesized that racial-ethnic differences in the likelihood of making relationship transitions can account for some of the difference between Blacks and Whites, and to a lesser extent differences between Hispanics and non-Hispanic Whites, in the likelihood of moving out of and moving back into the parental home.

Socioeconomic Resources and Parental Assistance

Some of the inter-individual variability in life course events, such as leaving and returning home, likely stems from differential access to socioeconomic resources. Young adults with stable employment and sufficient income are able to afford routine expenses such as rent and food, which allows youth to establish and maintain an independent household (Goldscheider, 1997; Goldscheider & Goldscheider, 1994). Earlier research found that young adults with higher income are more likely to move out from the parental home (Mulder & Clark, 2000) and less likely to move back (Kaplan, 2009). Racial differences in economic attainment during young adulthood are well-known. Young Blacks and Hispanics are disadvantaged in the labor market due to both discrimination and differential qualifications (Alon & Haberfeld, 2007; Cancio, Evans, & Maume Jr, 1996). Early career wages are substantially lower for Black and Hispanic young workers than for their White counterparts (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2014). Therefore, racial disparities in young adults' earnings could account for the delayed home-leaving and higher risk of home-returning among Black and Hispanic young adults relative to Whites.

Families serve as the primary "scaffolding" for young people in the transition to adulthood (Swartz, Kim, Uno, Mortimer, & O'Brien, 2011). Financial transfers to children are an important dimension of this support. Parents who transfer resources to offspring can be driven both by altruism and by expectations of future reciprocal exchange (Hogan, Eggebeen, & Clogg, 1993). The amount of assistance is constrained by the resources available and influenced by the needs of offspring and the quality of intergenerational relationships (Hartnett, Furstenberg, Birditt, & Fingerman, 2013). Parents with higher socioeconomic status (SES) are more capable of contributing to the costs of setting up a new household, thereby hastening their children's home-leaving, especially to attend college or live independently (Blaauboer & Mulder, 2010). Although an affluent parental household can be attractive for young adults given its large

physical space and comfortable environment, parents with high educational and professional status tend to have greater needs for privacy and lower demand for the companionship of adult children (Avery, Goldscheider, & Speare, 1992). In general, then, adult children of high SES parents are expected to be more likely to leave home and less likely to return after living independently.

White, Black, and Hispanic youth differ in the economic capability of their parents and the amount of parent-to-child financial transfers. White households have substantially more transferable resources, including income, than Black and Hispanic households (DeNavas-Walt, Proctor, & Smith, 2013). Given their socioeconomic advantages, White parents are more capable than Black parents of providing financial assistance to their grown children (Rosenzweig & Wolpin, 1993). Thus, the greater likelihood of home-leaving and lower likelihood of home-returning among young White adults than their Black and Hispanic peers are possibly attributable to the privileged socioeconomic background of, and the more generous financial assistance provided by, their parents.

Family Connectivity and Support Needs

Yet another explanation for racial-ethnic differences in leaving and returning home is that Black and Hispanic families display distinctive cultural practices and preferences that encourage parent-child coresidence. Under the influence of West African cultural traditions, Blacks ostensibly place great value on mother/child relationships, communal childrearing, and extended kin ties (Collins, 1999; Sarkisian & Gerstel, 2004). Black youth tend to have stronger affective ties to their mothers than their non-Black peers (Lawton, Silverstein, & Bengtson, 1994). African American extended families could provide economic sustenance and social and emotional support to their members. Prior research showed that Blacks are more likely than Whites to take

in related children and to “double up” (Hill, 2003), and that young Black mothers are especially likely to live with adult kin (Hogan, Hao, & Parish, 1990). It has also been argued that Hispanic culture is characterized by familism -- a collective value orientation that emphasizes family roles and responsibilities over individual desires and that prizes the relationship between adult children and their parents (Landale & Oropesa, 2007). In a recent study 12.6% of young Hispanic adults thought it is important to live close to parents, but only 6.7% of Black and 7.6% of White young adults reported the same attitude (Britton, 2013). Hispanics are also more likely than non-Hispanic Whites to live in extended-family households (Kamo, 2000; Sarkisian, Gerena, & Gerstel, 2007), with non-nuclear members contributing to the livelihood of the family.

Immigrant Hispanic families tend to preserve more premigration family practices and norms than native-born Hispanics, whose beliefs and values may have undergone more changes in the process of assimilation (Foner 1997). Young adult children of immigrant families are more likely than children of native-born families to live with their parents (Rumbaut & Komaie, 2010). Accordingly, the higher percentage of immigrant families among Hispanics, especially Mexicans, than among non-Hispanic Whites and other groups could partially explain Hispanic-White differences in the timing of leaving and returning home.

According to the principle of *linked lives*, individual life course experiences are connected through the family and its network. Characteristics of other family members and the strength of family ties could affect the timing of life course events among young adults. Having siblings in the parental home, which likely serves as an indicator of a familistic culture, tends to postpone young adults' departure from the parental home to live alone or with a partner (Zorlu & Mulder, 2011). In addition, the social capital embodied in family relations is crucial for children's access to other types of resources within the family (Coleman, 1988; Mitchell, 2007). Adult children

might only enjoy living in the parental home if they also enjoy an emotionally satisfying relationship with their parents. Young adults who have strong emotional ties with parents are less motivated to move out of the parental home (Blaauboer & Mulder, 2010) and are more likely to return (Mitchell, Wister, & Gee, 2004). We hypothesized that racial and ethnic differences in the presence of adult siblings and the quality of the parental relationship can explain the delayed launch of young Black and Hispanic adults and their increased risks of home-returning.

Racial-ethnic differences in the likelihood of moving out of and back into the parental home might also be explained by group differences in parents' need for social or instrumental support. Coresidence with parents is more likely when parents have greater needs for support from their children (Smits, et al., 2010). For example, health problems of a parent generate greater needs for the presence of caregivers in the household (Choi, 2003) and could therefore encourage an adult child to move back to the parental home (Smits, et al., 2010). We explored whether racial-ethnic differences in parental health problems help to explain why Black and Hispanic young adults are less likely than White youth to leave the parental home but more likely to return.

METHOD

Data

This study used data from the Panel Study of Income Dynamic's Transition into Adulthood project (PSID-TA) (<http://psidonline.isr.umich.edu/Studies.aspx>). The respondents for the PSID-TA were all "children" of PSID families age 18 and older who had participated in the Child Development Supplement survey launched in 1997 and whose families were still participating in the main PSID. Biennial interviews were conducted in 2005, 2007, 2009, and 2011 (the most recent year of available data). At each wave, the PSID-TA collected information on respondents' living arrangements, education and school attendance, employment and income,

marital and cohabitation status, childbearing, performance of various responsibilities, relationship with and help received from parents, physical and mental health, and other topics. Our study used data from the 2005 to 2011 waves of the PSID-TA, when respondents were between the ages of 18 and 26. The response rates for the four waves (among those eligible to be interviewed) ranged between 88.8% and 92%, and the average two-year attrition rate was 11%. Because the measurement of the dependent variables required data from successive interviews to form a migration interval, we only included respondents who were interviewed in at least two consecutive waves. After we excluded the thirty respondents of other races (because they are too few in number to sustain a separate analysis), our sample consisted of 1,491 non-Hispanic White (47%), non-Hispanic Black (41%), Mexicans (6%), and other Hispanic (6%) respondents. About half (53%) of the sample were females and the mean age was 20 years old.

Dependent variables. The two dependent variables for our analysis were binary indicators capturing whether the respondent moved out of or back into the parental home between successive interviews, among those at-risk of experiencing each event. At each wave of the PSID-TA interviews, respondents were asked about the place that they lived most of the time during the previous fall and winter (August through April); possibilities included parents' home (house or apartment), apartment or house that the respondent (or the respondent's parents) rented or owned, and college dormitory, sorority, or fraternity. We divided places of residence into two categories: parents' home versus all other arrangements, which we refer to collectively as "living independently." The indicator of a move out of the parental home was coded 1 if a respondent's place of residence changed from "parental home" to "independent living" between successive interviews. A move back to the parental home was coded 1 if the place of residence changed in the opposite direction.

We acknowledge that students living in college dormitories may not have achieved “independent living.” College students are still financially dependent on their parents and they frequently visit and occasionally reside with their family of origin. Yet, many young adults in other living arrangements also rely heavily on parental assistance to maintain an independent residence. For the purpose of measuring the timing of physical (not necessarily financial or emotional) separation from the parental home, we treat residence in college dormitories the same as other forms of independent living, as many other studies in this tradition have done (e.g., Goldscheider & Goldscheider, 1997; Goldscheider, et al., 2014; Zorlu & Mulder, 2011). Additionally, we acknowledge that the use of a two-year mobility interval will miss short-term moves that occur and reverse entirely between interviews. The effect of a given covariate could be underestimated if it most strongly affects short-term moves. However, sensitivity checks using a one-year migration interval derived from parental reports in the main PSID of the time that their child left or returned home yielded generally similar findings to those using the two-year migration window. Thus, our results do not seem to suffer appreciable bias from using a two-year migration interval.

Independent variables. The main explanatory variables included race and ethnicity, the occurrence of critical life-course transitions, access to socioeconomic resources, multiple dimensions of family connectivity, and support needs. Most of these measures were taken from young adults’ interviews in the PSID-TA study, but some came from their parents’ responses to the main PSID interviews. Time-varying explanatory variables measured respondents’ or parental characteristics at the beginning of each biennial migration interval, with the exception of the two life-course transitions variables that captured changes of status over this period. Table 1 lists all variables used in the analysis.

Table 1 about here

To measure respondents' race and ethnicity, we contrasted non-Hispanic Whites, non-Hispanic Blacks, Mexicans, and other Hispanic respondents. Ideally, we would have further differentiated the "other Hispanic" group by national origin (e.g., Puerto Rican, Cuban, etc.), but the size of the PSID-TA sample simply does not allow for such detailed categories. In some models we distinguished between children from immigrant families and children from native-born families among Mexican and other Hispanic respondents. (The sample includes too few children from immigrant Black and White families to make this distinction among these groups.) A respondent was deemed to be a member of an immigrant family if either the respondent was from the 1997 PSID immigrant refresher sample or if the head of the parental household grew up in a foreign country. To measure school and work transitions, our models included a series of dummy variables indicating whether respondents' primary activity shifted between attending school, working (including military service and keeping house), or being idle or inactive (which included being unemployed, looking for work, being laid off, or being disabled) during the two-year migration interval. In the models predicting "moving out," we contrasted respondents who transitioned from high school to college (the reference group) with stable college students (remaining in college at both time t and $t+2$), stable workers (working at both t and $t+2$), stable idlers (being idle at both t and $t+2$), and transitioners from student to worker, from student or worker to idler, from worker or idler to student, and from idler to worker. In the "moving back" models, we used stable college students as the reference category both for theoretical reasons and because few respondents who made the transition from high school to college began the migration interval living independently.

In a similar vein, we measured critical relationship transitions by a set of dummy variables

indicating whether respondents formed, dissolved, or remained in a marital or cohabiting union between the beginning and the end of each migration interval. For the moving out models, respondents who remained non-partnered (neither married nor cohabiting) over the interval (the reference group) were contrasted with those who initiated a partnership, dissolved a partnership, or remained partnered. In the models of moving back, remaining in stable partnership was used as the reference category, which allows us to show the effect of partnership dissolution on home-returning. A separate dummy variable was included to measure whether the respondent or the respondent's partner has a child or is pregnant at the beginning of each migration interval.

Access to socioeconomic resources was measured by multiple indicators of respondents' socioeconomic attainment, parental SES, and financial assistance from parents. Respondents' income refers to earnings from work received in the calendar year prior to the interview, measured in thousands of constant 2004 dollars. Respondents' income and family income (see below) were logged to reduce skewness. A time-varying dummy variable indicating whether the respondent completed high school (or received a GED) was also included as a predictor.

Measures of the characteristics of the parents and parental household were taken from the parents' interviews in the main PSID. Parental educational attainment was measured by the years of school completed by the PSID-TA respondent's mother when the respondent was 18 years old. Parental family income, a time-varying measure, included all sources of income in the year prior to the migration interval and was also measured in thousands of constant 2004 dollars (logged). Parental family wealth was the logged value of the sum of seven asset types (farm and business, money savings, real estate, stock, vehicles, other savings and assets, and retirement accounts), net of debts, measured at the beginning of each migration interval. Two time-varying variables derived from the PSID-TA interviews were used to measure the amount of financial resources

respondents received from the origin family. Help received from family was measured by the number of the following five types of financial assistance received from parents or other relatives during the year prior to the interview: purchasing a house, paying rent or mortgage, buying a car, paying tuition, and covering expenses or bills. The extent of respondents' personal responsibility for their own financial well-being was measured by the mean value of the following four items, each of which is rated on a five-point scale (1 = *somebody else does this for me all the time*, 5 = *I am completely responsible for this all the time*): earning your own living, paying rent or mortgage, paying bills, and managing your money.

We included multiple variables that reflect the connectivity between young adults and their origin family. The number of co-resident adult siblings included all of the respondent's sisters and brothers over age 18 residing in the parental home, measured at each interview. Our models also included a measure of the number of minor children present in the parental household. Respondents' emotional attachment to their parents was measured by items asking youth separately how close they feel to their mother (or step-mother) and to their father (or step-father), with values ranging from 1 (= *not close at all*) to 7 (= *very close*). Respondents' parents' health, a time-varying covariate reflecting parental needs for support, was measured by a dummy variable derived from a question in the main PSID and contrasted origin families in which either the household head or her/his spouse was in poor or fair health with families in which both heads and spouses were in good, very good, or excellent health.

We controlled for respondent's age and gender and for the temporal and geographical context. Age, which for most young adults indicates the length of period before moving out of the parental home, was measured by a set of dummy variables, contrasting each year of age with respondents age 17 or 18 (the reference group). Gender was coded 1 for females. To capture time

trends in leaving and returning home, we included indicators for the two-year migration intervals beginning in 2007 and 2009, with the interval beginning in 2005 serving the reference.

Geographic context was measured by the 10-point Beale-Ross rural-urban classification of counties (1 = *completely rural, not adjacent to a metropolitan area*; 10 = *central counties of metropolitan areas of 1 million or more population*) and treated as a time-varying covariate, measured at each PSID-TA wave.

Analytic strategy

Following most prior research in this area (e.g., Goldscheider & Goldscheider, 1999), we used event history regression models to examine the associations between the independent variables and, separately, the timing of leaving and returning to the parental home.

Respondents' residential histories were segmented into a series of two-year migration intervals, each interval, or person-period, pertaining to the period between successive interviews. There were 1,484 person-periods originating in the parental home and 1,464 person-periods originating in independent living. For person-periods originating in the parental home, the dependent variable was comprised of two outcomes: remaining in the parental home and moving out. For observations beginning in independent living, the outcomes were remaining in independent living and moving back to the parental home. After moving out or moving back, respondents were no longer at risk of moving again in the same direction. Observations were censored at the 2011 interview or, in a few rare cases, at the time of sample attrition. We used logistic regression to estimate the effects of the covariates on the log-odds of moving out and back to the parental home (Allison, 1984).

Missing data were rare; on average less than 2% of values of the variables were missing. We used multiple imputation to adjust for missing data (Allison, 2001). Specifically, we used the

Stata command *mi impute* to conduct Multiple Imputation by Chained Equations that uses all the variables to sequentially impute missing values (StataCorp, 2009).

RESULTS

Table 1 presents descriptive statistics for all of the variables used in the analysis, separately for person-periods originating in and out of the parental home and by race and ethnicity. Over a typical interval beginning in the parental home, 44% of respondents moved out to live independently. Young White adults were more likely than their Black, Mexican, and other Hispanic peers to move out. For those living independently at the beginning of the interval, 19% returned to the parental home within two years, with Whites less likely than Blacks, Mexicans and Hispanics to move back.

There are also racial and ethnic differences in most of the potential mediating variables. Among respondents originally living in the parental home, Whites were more likely than Blacks, Mexicans, and other Hispanics to transition from high school to college, but were less likely to transition from student/working to idle and from idle to working. Mexican youth were more likely than the other groups to remain working. Among respondents living independently, Whites were more apt than minority group members to remain in college and to remain working over the interval, and less likely than Blacks to both start and end the migration interval idling. In terms of relationship status transitions, Blacks and other Hispanics were more likely to stay non-partnered compared with Whites and Mexicans. However, Black respondents were about twice as likely as the other three groups to report being or about to be a parent.

Unsurprisingly, of the four racial and ethnic groups Whites had the highest levels of high school completion, mother's education, parental family income, parental wealth, and help received from the origin family. Other Hispanics closely followed Whites in these characteristics

and had the highest annual income. Mexicans lagged behind the other groups in mother's education, whereas Blacks had the lowest personal income, parental family income, and parental wealth. Perhaps because they received the most assistance from parents, White youth were less responsible for their day-to-day sustenance than their minority peers.

Mexicans were almost twice as likely as other Hispanic respondents to hail from an immigrant family. White respondents' parental household tended to contain fewer coresiding adult siblings and minor children than Black, Mexican, and other Hispanic families.

Racial-ethnic differences in closeness to either parent were fairly small, but all youth tended to report being emotionally closer to their mother than to their father. Higher percentages of minority respondents had parents in poor or fair health than White respondents, perhaps indicating lower parental needs for support in White families. These racial-ethnic differences in life-course transitions, socioeconomic resources, and family connectivity imply that these variables are indeed plausible candidates for explaining racial and ethnic differences in the likelihood of leaving and returning to the parental home.

Explaining Racial and Ethnic Differences in Leaving Home

Table 2 presents the results of multivariate logistic regression models of the timing of moving out of the parental home. Included in Model 1 were the control variables (age, gender, year of observation and urbanization) and three dummy variables comparing Black, Mexican and other Hispanic respondents to Whites. Relative to the 17-18 year-old age group, the risk of leaving the parental home was significantly lower at age 19 and age 25. Young women moved out of the parental home sooner than young men. The coefficients for the year-of-observation dummy variables revealed a monotonic decline in the risk of leaving the parental home between 2005 and 2011. However, the risk of moving out did not vary significantly by the level of

urbanization of the county that young adults originally lived in. After controlling for these variables, Black and Mexican young adults' risk of moving out of the parental home was only about 70% that of their White peers ($e^{-.38}=.68, p<.01$ and $e^{-.42}=.66, p<.05$), but other Hispanics did not differ significantly from Whites.

Table 2 about here

Models 2 through 6 in Table 2 added to this baseline model sets of factors that potentially mediate the relationship between race-ethnicity and the timing of home-leaving. Model 2 included the measure of school and work transitions. Relative to respondents entering college from high school, respondents in all other categories were significantly less likely to leave the parental home; those who remain idle over the migration interval were least likely to move out. Young adults' school and work transitions explained a non-trivial but not substantial amount of the racial and ethnic differences in home leaving; when the school and work transitions were controlled, the coefficients for both Blacks and Mexicans in Model 1 were reduced by more than one-fifth ($0.26 = 1 - (-0.28)/(-0.38)$ and $0.21 = 1 - (-0.33)/(-0.42)$) and the coefficient for Mexicans was no longer statistically significant.

Model 3 added to Model 1 measures of relationship status transitions and parenthood. Young adults who began or maintained a partnership over the interval were significantly more likely than those who remained non-partnered to leave the parental home. Respondents who dissolved a partnership exhibited a lower risk of leaving home than stably non-partnered young adults. Being a parent (or parent-to-be) did not significantly affect the risk of moving out of the parental home in Model 3 (although it had a positive and borderline significant effect in the Model 7 which includes all mediating variables). As hypothesized, relationship status transitions and parenthood accounted for some of the Black-White difference in home-leaving but did not explain the

difference between Mexicans (or other Hispanics) and Whites. When these variables are included, the Black-White difference in Model 1 was reduced by about one fifth ($0.21 = 1 - (-0.30)/(-0.38)$), but the Mexican-White difference actually increased by about 17%.

Model 4 of Table 2 added to the baseline Model 1 the seven indicators of young adults' access to socioeconomic resources. Young adults' high school completion, annual income, and their parents' family income and family wealth were not significantly associated with the risk of leaving home. Mother's educational level was positively associated with the odds that young adults move out of the parental home. Although receiving financial assistance and taking responsibility for routine household expenditures were negatively associated with each other (correlation not shown), both were positively associated with young adults' risk of leaving the parental home. These indicators of socioeconomic resources explained a moderate share of the Black-White difference, and all of the Mexican-White difference, in the timing of leaving home; the Black-White difference was reduced by 34% ($0.34 = 1 - (-0.25)/(-0.38)$) and the Mexican-White difference dropped to almost nil and became statistically non-significant.

Models 5 and 6 examined whether indicators of the strength of social and emotional connections between young adults and their parents help to explain the racial/ethnic differences in home-leaving. Model 5 showed that Mexican young adults from immigrant families were less likely than Mexicans with native-born parents to move out of the parental home. More importantly, the difference between native-born Mexicans and Whites ($B = -0.30$) was about 29% smaller than the difference between all Mexicans and Whites ($B = -0.42$). Thus, consistent with our hypothesis, the high proportion of immigrant families among Mexicans explained some—though by no means all—of the Mexican-White difference in the timing of home-leaving.

As shown in Model 6, the number of coresident adult siblings in the parental household and

closeness to mother were negatively associated with the risk of leaving home at a borderline significance level. However, the number of minor children, emotional closeness to father, and parental health status did not evince a significant association. A modest portion of the racial/ethnic differences in home-leaving was mediated by family connectivity and support needs; the direct effects of being Black and being immigrant Mexican both dropped by 16% ($0.16 = 1 - (-0.32)/(-0.38)$; $0.16 = 1 - (-0.41)/(-0.49)$).

Model 7 added to the baseline model all the variables that were hypothesized to explain the racial and ethnic differences in the timing of leaving home. Save for coresident adult siblings, all of the coefficients that were statistically significant in previous models remained significant and of generally similar magnitude in this comprehensive model. The coefficient for parenthood became significant in this model. When all the hypothesized mediating factors were controlled, the Black-White difference in the timing of home-leaving vanished and the coefficients for Mexicans actually turned positive, albeit statistically non-significant. Racial and ethnic differences in the risk of moving out of the parental home were fully accounted for by group differences in young adults' life course transitions, access to socioeconomic resources, and family connectivity and support needs even though no single mediator or subset of mediators explained these differences.

Explaining Racial and Ethnic Differences in Returning Home

Table 3 presents parallel regression models of the timing of young adults' returning to the parental home, conditional upon having lived independently. In Model 1, the negative coefficients for age revealed a near-monotonic decline in the odds of moving back with increasing age. The time trend variables indicated that the risk of moving back between 2009 and 2011 was 75% higher than the risk between 2005 and 2007. Gender and urbanization level were

not significantly associated with young adults' likelihood of returning home. Net of the influence of these factors, young Black adults' risk of moving back was 84% ($1.84 = e^{0.61}$) higher than that of Whites, and young Mexicans' and other Hispanics' risks were 189% ($2.89 = e^{1.06}$) and 103% ($2.03 = e^{0.71}$) higher, respectively, than White respondents' risk.

Table 3 about here

As with the models for moving out, Models 2 through 6 assessed the degree to which the mediating variables could explain racial/ethnic differences in the risk of returning home. Adding to the baseline model measures of school and work transitions, Model 2 showed that, relative to students remaining in college (the reference category), young adults who remained idle and those who transitioned from idle to working had higher risks of returning to the parental home. Racial-ethnic differences in the likelihood of making transitions between school and work explained 17% ($0.17 = 1 - 0.50/0.61$) of the Black-White difference, but only 4% ($0.4 = 1 - 1.02/1.06$) of the Mexican-White difference and 5% ($0.05 = 1 - 0.71/0.75$) of other Hispanic-White difference in the risk of returning.

Model 3 added to the baseline model young adults' relationship status transitions and parenthood status. Being consistently non-partnered or having dissolved a partnership over the interval was associated with a substantial and significant increase in the risk of returning relative to being stably partnered (the reference category). In addition, young adults who formed a new partnership were significantly less likely than those who remained partnered to move back to the parental home. Including relationship transitions and parenthood in the model reduced the coefficient for Blacks by 25% ($0.25 = 1 - 0.46/0.61$) relative to Model 1, but the coefficients for Mexicans and other Hispanics barely changed. This result is consistent with the hypothesis that transitions in relationship status mainly explain the Black-White difference in returning home,

not the Hispanic-White gap.

The indicators of access to socioeconomic resources were added in Model 4. The effects of socioeconomic resources on the risk of moving back to the parental home were somewhat less consistent than their influence on the risk of leaving home (Table 2). Only high school completion and personal responsibility were significantly (and inversely) associated with the odds of returning at even a borderline level. However, these factors explained a nontrivial portion of the racial and ethnic differences in the risk of returning home, providing some support for our hypothesis; the coefficient for Blacks decreased by 28% ($0.28 = 1 - 0.44/0.61$), for Mexicans by 27% ($0.27 = 1 - 0.77/1.06$) and for other Hispanics by 17% ($0.17 = 1 - 0.62/0.75$).

Parallel to the models for moving out, Models 5 and 6 considered the ability of immigration status and family connectivity to explain racial-ethnic differences in the risk of moving back to the parental home. Model 5 showed that immigration status did not alter the Mexican-white difference in the risk of returning home, but the coefficient for native-born other Hispanics was non-significant and 45% smaller than the coefficient for all “other” Hispanics (Model 1). This finding indicates that the difference between other Hispanics and Whites in the risk of returning home is to some degree attributable to the behavior of youth from immigrant families.

Model 6 incorporated the indicators of family connectivity and support needs. Two indicators had a significant effect. Having coresident adult siblings in the parents’ household and having a parent in ill health raised the risk of moving back home. Compared to their values in Model 5, the coefficient for immigrant Mexicans was reduced by one-quarter ($0.25 = 1 - 0.76/1.01$), and the coefficients for Blacks, native-born Mexicans, and immigrant other

Hispanics declined by 21%, 8%, and 17%, respectively. This result provides support for our hypothesis that family connectivity accounts for some of the racial and ethnic differences in the timing of returning home.

The final model in Table 3 (Model 7) included all variables that potentially mediate the relationship between race-ethnicity and the risk of returning home. Only a few coefficients changed relative to previous models. Among school and work transitions, the coefficients for stable working and for transitioning from student to working grew larger and became statistically significant. Even young adults experiencing these normal transitions were more likely than their counterparts who remain in college to move back into the parental home. After controlling for these factors, the coefficients for Blacks and immigrant Mexicans were reduced by 79% and 51%, respectively, (relative to Model 1) and driven to statistical non-significance. However, the differences between Whites and both native-born Mexicans and immigrant other Hispanics were reduced by substantially less (17% and 33%, respectively), and both differences remained statistically significant.

DISCUSSION

Despite pronounced racial and ethnic differences in the timing of young adults' home-leaving and home-returning, we know little about why Black and Hispanic young adults are less likely than their White peers to move out of the parental home and more likely to return. We addressed this issue here by using recent longitudinal data from the Panel Study of Income Dynamics' Transition into Adulthood module to explore factors that help to explain the lower risks of home-leaving and higher risks of home-returning among Blacks and Hispanics relative to Whites. Our analysis goes beyond previous research by hypothesizing and testing a wider variety of potentially mediating mechanisms, by measuring residential moves both out of and

back into the parental home, and by conducting parallel analyses of both home-leaving and home-returning. Our use of longitudinal data extends prior cross-sectional studies of this issue (e.g., Britton, 2013; Glick & Van Hook, 2002; Treas & Batalova, 2011) by allowing us to determine whether factors that help explain racial and ethnic differences in young adults' propensity to reside with their parents operate through group differences in home-leaving, through group differences in home-returning, or both.

Our conceptual framework for exploring racial and ethnic differences in leaving and returning home was grounded in the life course perspective. We drew on several principles of the life course approach, including those related to the timing of events, heterogeneity, linked lives, and agency, to develop hypotheses for why Black, Mexican, other Hispanic, and White young adults differ in the timing at which they leave home and the likelihood that they return. Our analysis leads to several broad conclusions.

First, we found that although no single factor or even subset of factors completely explains minority youths' lower propensity to leave home and higher propensity to return, multiple factors combine to account for much of these differences. Broadly consistent with the life course principle of the timing of lives and with prior cross-sectional research (Treas & Batalova, 2011), ethno-racial disparities in transitions between school and work and into and out of cohabiting unions explain a portion of these differences. Black and Mexican young adults' lower tendency to enter and to remain in college partially explains their delayed timing of home leaving and their higher risk of home returning relative to Whites. Consistent with our hypothesis, young Blacks exhibit different patterns of relationship formation than Whites, and differences in the likelihood of establishing and maintaining a romantic relationship help to account for the Black-White differences in home leaving and returning. This finding is also consistent with prior

cross-sectional research (Britton, 2013). Racially-differentiated access to socioeconomic resources, reflected especially in mother's education and financial assistance received from parents, is another important part of the explanation for why White and minority young adults differ in the timing of home leaving and returning.

Second, our findings suggest that comprehensive explanations for racial/ethnic differences in leaving and returning home need to go beyond coincident life-course transitions and the financial wherewithal to establish and maintain an independent household. In particular, differences in aspects of familism between minority and White youth appear to be important. The presence of coresident siblings in the parental home and the degree of emotional connectivity between parents and adult children partially explain why Black and Hispanic youth tend to delay leaving home while also evincing higher rates of "boomeranging." The residential mobility of immigrants appears to explain part of the Mexican-White difference in home-leaving and part of the difference between non-Mexican Hispanics and Whites in home-returning (cf. Glick & Van Hook, 2002). The influence of familism and other cultural differences could be considered a manifestation of the life course principle of linked lives.

Third, although racial and ethnic differences in life-course transitions, access to socioeconomic resources, and family connectivity explained much of the racial and ethnic differences in home-leaving and home-returning, the specific factors accounting for the Black-White differences and for Hispanic-White differences differed in some respects. Black-White differences in both leaving and returning to the parental home were attributable to all three groups of mediating variables--school-to-work and relationship transitions, socioeconomic resources, and family connectivity. However, the Mexican-White difference in the timing of leaving home was mainly attributable to group disparities in school-to-work

transitions and the availability of financial resources.

Fourth, although the proposed mechanisms were able to account for the vast bulk of the Black-White and Mexican-White differences in the timing of leaving home, and most of the Black-White difference in the likelihood of returning home, the models were much less successful in accounting for the Hispanic-White—and especially the Mexican-White—difference in returning home. These differences remained large and statistically significant even in the most comprehensive model of potential mediators, indicating that there is considerable life course heterogeneity in these transitions unaccounted for by our model. Perhaps these differences are attributable to other unmeasured aspects of family connectivity, such as young Hispanic adults' perceived obligation to provide economic and social support to family members and their emotional closeness to siblings. Compared to Whites, young Hispanic adults may be more comfortable with sharing living spaces with parents and less likely to view parental coresidence as a barrier to the transition to full adulthood. Future research might explore these and other explanations for Hispanic youths' unusually high likelihood of returning to the parental home after having lived independently.

Future research might also profit from exploring more directly the influence of macroeconomic conditions on racial and ethnic differences in home-leaving and home-returning. Our findings revealed a decline in the likelihood that young adults leave home and a concomitant increase in the likelihood that they return between 2005 and 2011, a period bracketing the Great Recession. The high unemployment and housing market crisis that defined the recession likely altered young adults' calculus of living arrangements, making independent living financially infeasible and rendering coresidence with parents a more attractive option. And, these economic constraints may have impacted minority youth more strongly than White youth. Quantifying the

impact of macroeconomic fluctuations on race-specific transitions out of and back into the parental home is an important task for future research.

Further research is also needed to address some of the limitations of this analysis. As noted above, our use of a two-year rather than shorter transition interval likely incurs measurement error both because some short-term moves will be missed and because it is not possible to observe the exact duration spent in the various living arrangements. We also acknowledge that leaving home to attend college results in a semi-autonomous living arrangement in which adult children are not completely independent of their parents. Future research might profit by using a more detailed measure of the various routes to leaving home, perhaps distinguishing moves to attend college from other pathways. Unfortunately, the PSID-TA dataset is too small for us to utilize such a detailed measurement strategy.

As with most observational studies, causal inference remains tentative. Some of the life course transitions may be both a cause and a consequence of home-leaving. For example, remaining in the parental home might detract from men's desirability in the marriage market, and the degree of this devaluation might vary by race and ethnicity. We acknowledge as well that our sample is limited to youth no older than 26. It is possible that racial and ethnic differences in the timing of home-leaving and home-returning observed in our sample differ at older ages. Perhaps race-specific rates of leaving and returning home converge or even reverse at older ages. It is also possible that the factors accounting for these differences vary by stage in the life course. The use of subsequent waves of the PSID-TA data will help to address this limitation.

Future research on racial and ethnic differences in the timing of leaving and returning to the parental home might also benefit by incorporating additional racial and ethnic groups. Because of limitations in sample size, our analysis is unable to consider the residential mobility patterns

of Asian American young adults. Moreover, the relatively small number of non-Mexican Hispanics in the sample prohibits a comparison of specific national-origin subgroups such as Cubans, Puerto Ricans, and Dominicans. Young adults from specific Hispanic subgroups might exhibit different patterns of home leaving and returning, and the reasons these patterns differ from those of non-Hispanic groups could vary substantially.

Finally, more research is needed on the consequences of parent-adult child coresidence for young adults' transition to adulthood, for their relationships with their parents, and for parents' own marital quality and well-being. The pronounced racial and ethnic differences in leaving and returning to the parental home may suggest that the consequences of parent-child coresidence for these and other life domains might also vary across racial and ethnic groups.

REFERENCES

- Allison, P. D. (1984). *Event history analysis: Regression for longitudinal event data*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Allison, P. D. (2001). *Missing data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Alon, S., & Haberfeld, Y. (2007). Labor force attachment and the evolving wage gap between white, black, and hispanic young women. *Work and Occupations*, 34(4), 369-398. doi: 10.1177/0730888407307247
- Aughinbaugh, A., Robles, O., & Sun, H. (2013). Marriage and divorce: Patterns by gender, race, and educational attainment: Bureau of Labor Statistics.
- Avery, R., Goldscheider, F., & Speare, A. (1992). Feathered nest/gilded cage: Parental income and leaving home in the transition to adulthood. *Demography*, 29(3), 375-388.
- Blaauboer, M., & Mulder, C. H. (2010). Gender differences in the impact of family background on leaving the parental home. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 25(1), 53-71. doi: 10.1007/s10901-009-9166-9
- Britton, M. L. (2013). Race/ethnicity, attitudes, and living with parents during young adulthood. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 75(4), 995-1013. doi: 10.1111/jomf.12042
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2014). Table 3. Median usual weekly earnings of full-time wage and salary workers by age, race, hispanic or latino ethnicity, and sex, quarterly averages, not seasonally adjusted. Retrieved from <http://data.bls.gov/pdq/SurveyOutputServlet>.
- Cancio, A. S., Evans, T. D., & Maume Jr, D. J. (1996). Reconsidering the declining significance of race: Racial differences in early career wages. *American Sociological Review*, 61(4), 541-556.
- Choi, N. G. (2003). Coresidence between unmarried aging parents and their adult children who moved in with whom and why? *Research on Aging*, 25(4), 384-404. doi: 10.1177/0164027503025004003
- Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94, S95-S120.
- Collins, P. H. (1999). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. New York: Routledge.
- Cordón, J. A. F. (1997). Youth residential independence and autonomy a comparative study. *Journal of family issues*, 18(6), 576-607.
- Da Vanzo, J., & Goldscheider, F. K. (1990). Coming home again: Returns to the parental home of young adults. *Population Studies*, 44(2), 241-255.
- DeNavas-Walt, C., Proctor, B. D., & Smith, J. C. (2013). Income, poverty, and health insurance coverage in the united states: 2012, current population reports: U.S. Census Bureau.
- Elder, G. H., Jr., Johnson, M. K., & Crosnoe, R. (2003). The emergence and development of life course theory. In J. T. Mortimer & M. J. Shanahan (Eds.), *Handbook of the life course* (pp. 3-19): Springer.

- Fry, R. (2013). A rising share of young adults live in their parents' home. Philadelphia, PA: Pew Research Center.
- Furstenberg, F. F. (2010). On a new schedule: Transitions to adulthood and family change. *The Future of Children*, 20(1), 67-87. doi: 10.1353/foc.0.0038
- Giele, J. Z., & Elder Jr., G. H. (1998). Life course research: Development of a field. In J. Z. Giele & G. H. Elder Jr (Eds.), *Methods of life course research: Qualitative and quantitative approaches* (pp. 5-27). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Glick, J. E., & Van Hook, J. (2002). Parents' coresidence with adult children: Can immigration explain racial and ethnic variation? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 64(1), 240-253. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2002.00240.
- Goldscheider, F. (1997). Recent changes in us young adult living arrangements in comparative perspective. *Journal of Family Issues*, 18(6), 708-724.
- Goldscheider, F., & Goldscheider, C. (1994). Leaving and returning home in 20th century america. *Population Bulletin*, 48(4), 2-37.
- Goldscheider, F., & Goldscheider, C. (1997). The historical trajectory of the black family: Ethnic differences in leaving home over the twentieth century. *The History of the Family*, 2(3), 295-307.
- Goldscheider, F., & Goldscheider, C. (1999). *The changing transition to adulthood: Leaving and returning home*. Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Goldscheider, F., Goldscheider, C., Clair, P. S., & Hodges, J. (1999). Changes in returning home in the united states, 1925–1985. *Social Forces*, 78(2), 695-720.
- Goldscheider, F. K., Hofferth, S. L., & Curtin, S. C. (2014). Parenthood and leaving home in young adulthood. *Population Research and Policy Review*, 33(6), 771-796. doi: 10.1007/s11113-014-9334-9
- Goodwin, P. Y., Mosher, W. D., & Chandra, A. (2010). Marriage and cohabitation in the united states: A statistical portrait based on cycle 6 (2002) of the national survey of family growth. *Vital and Health Statistics, Series 23, Data from the National Survey of Family Growth*(28), 1-45.
- Hartnett, C. S., Furstenberg, F. F., Birditt, K. S., & Fingerman, K. L. (2013). Parental support during young adulthood why does assistance decline with age? *Journal of Family Issues*, 34(7), 975-1007. doi: 10.1177/0192513X12454657
- Hill, R. B. (2003). *The strengths of black families*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Hogan, D. P., Eggebeen, D. J., & Clogg, C. C. (1993). The structure of intergenerational exchanges in american families. *American Journal of Sociology*, 98(6), 1428-1458.
- Hogan, D. P., Hao, L., & Parish, W. L. (1990). Race, kin networks, and assistance to mother-headed families. *Social Forces*, 68(3), 797-812.
- Kamo, Y. (2000). Racial and ethnic differences in extended family households. *Sociological Perspectives*, 43(2), 211-229. doi: 10.2307/1389794
- Kao, G., & Thompson, J. (2003). Racial and ethnic stratification in educational achievement and

- attainment. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 29, 417-442. doi: 10.1146/annurev.soc.29.010202.100019
- Kaplan, G. (2009). Boomerang kids: Labor market dynamics and moving back home. *Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis. Working Paper*, 675.
- Landale, N. S., & Oropesa, R. S. (2007). Hispanic families: Stability and change. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 33, 381-405. doi: 10.1146/annurev.soc.33.040406.131655
- Lawton, L., Silverstein, M., & Bengtson, V. (1994). Affection, social contact, and geographic distance between adult children and their parents. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 56(1), 57-68.
- Marshall, V. W. (2005). Agency, events, and structure at the end of the life course. *Advances in Life Course Research*, 10, 57-91. doi: :10.1016/S1040-2608(05)10002-1
- Mather, M. (2011). In U.S., a sharp increase in young men living at home. Retrieved from <http://www.prb.org/Articles/2011/us-young-adults-living-at-home.asp>.
- Mitchell, B. A. (2003). Life course theory. In J. J. Ponzetti (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of marriage and family*, 2nd ed (pp. 1051-1055). New York: Macmillan.
- Mitchell, B. A. (2007). *The boomerang age: Transitions to adulthood in families*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Mitchell, B. A., Wister, A., & Gee, E. M. T. (2004). The ethnic and family nexus of homeleaving and returning among canadian young adults. *The Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 29(4), 543-575. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3654710>
- Mulder, C. H., & Clark, W. A. (2000). Leaving home and leaving the state: Evidence from the united states. *International Journal of Population Geography*, 6(6), 423-437. doi: 10.1002/1099-1220
- NCES. (2013a). Table 302.60. Enrollment rates of 18- to 24-year-olds in degree-granting institutions, by level of institution and sex and race/ethnicity of student: 1967 through 2012. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d13/tables/dt13_302.60.asp.
- NCES. (2013b). Table 504.10. Labor force status of 2010, 2011, and 2012 high school completers, by college enrollment status, sex, and race/ethnicity: October 2010, 2011, and 2012. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d13/tables/dt13_504.10.asp.
- NCES. (2013c). Table 505.20. Among 25- to 34-year-olds with a bachelor's or higher degree, percentage who were employed in any occupation, by undergraduate field of study, sex, race/ethnicity, nativity, and citizenship status: 2011. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d13/tables/dt13_505.20.asp.
- Newman, K. S. (2012). *The accordion family: Boomerang kids, anxious parents, and the private toll of global competition*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Payne, K. K. (2012a). Median age at first marriage, 2010 (fp-12-07): National Center for Family & Marriage Research. Retrieved from http://ncfmr.bgsu.edu/pdf/family_profiles/file109824.pdf.
- Payne, K. K. (2012b). Young adults in the parental home, 1940-2010. (fp-12-22). National

- Center for Family & Marriage Research. Retrieved from http://ncfmr.bgsu.edu/pdf/family_profiles/file122548.pdf.
- Rosenzweig, M. R., & Wolpin, K. I. (1993). Intergenerational support and the life-cycle incomes of young men and their parents: Human capital investments, coresidence, and intergenerational financial transfers. *Journal of Labor Economics*, *11*(1), 84-112.
- Rumbaut, R. G., & Komaie, G. (2010). Immigration and adult transitions. *The Future of Children*, *20*(1), 43-66.
- Sarkisian, N., Gerena, M., & Gerstel, N. (2007). Extended family integration among euro and mexican americans: Ethnicity, gender, and class. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *69*(1), 40-54. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2006.00342.x
- Sarkisian, N., & Gerstel, N. (2004). Kin support among blacks and whites: Race and family organization. *American Sociological Review*, *69*(6), 812-837. doi: 10.1177/000312240406900604
- Settersten, R., & Ray, B. E. (2010). *Not quite adults*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Shanahan, M. J. (2000). Pathways to adulthood in changing societies: Variability and mechanisms in life course perspective. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *26*, 667-692. doi: 10.1146/annurev.soc.26.1.667
- Smits, A., Van Gaalen, R. I., & Mulder, C. H. (2010). Parent-child coresidence: Who moves in with whom and for whose needs? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *72*(4), 1022-1033. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00746.x
- South, S. J. (1993). Racial and ethnic differences in the desire to marry. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *55*(2), 357-370.
- South, S. J., & Lei, L. (2014). *Failures to launch and boomerang kids: Contemporary determinants of leaving and returning to the parental home*. Paper presented at the Population Association of America 2014 Annual Meeting, Boston, MA.
- StataCorp. (2009). *Stata survey data reference manual: Release 11*. College Station, TX: Stata Corporation.
- Stone, J., Berrington, A., & Falkingham, J. (2014). Gender, turning points, and boomerangs: Returning home in young adulthood in great britain. *Demography*, *51*(1), 257-276. doi: 10.1007/s13524-013-0247-8
- Swartz, T. T., Kim, M., Uno, M., Mortimer, J., & O'Brien, K. B. (2011). Safety nets and scaffolds: Parental support in the transition to adulthood. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *73*(2), 414-429. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00815.x
- Treas, J., & Batalova, J. (2011). Residential independence: Race and ethnicity on the road to adulthood in two us immigrant gateways. *Advances in Life Course Research*, *16*(1), 13-24. doi: 10.1016/j.alcr.2011.01.001
- Waters, M. C., Carr, P. J., Kefalas, M. J., & Holdaway, J. (2011). *Coming of age in america: The transition to adulthood in the twenty-first century*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Zorlu, A., & Mulder, C. H. (2011). Ethnic differences in leaving home: Timing and pathways. *Demography*, 48(1), 49-72. doi: 10.1007/s13524-010-0012-1

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Dependent and Independent Variables by Residence at Origin and Race: Transition into Adulthood Study, 2005-2011

Variable	Living in Parental Home at <i>t</i>					Living Independently at <i>t</i>				
	Mean (SD)					Mean (SD)				
	Total	White	Black	Mexican	Other Hispanic	Total	White	Black	Mexican	Other Hispanic
Dependent variables										
Move out of parental home (between <i>t</i> and <i>t+2</i>)	.44	.50	.39	.40	.42	--	--	--	--	--
Move back into parental home (between <i>t</i> and <i>t+2</i>)	--	--	--	--	--	.19	.15	.24	.32	.29
Mediating variables										
<i>Life-course transitions</i>										
School and work transitions (between <i>t</i> and <i>t+2</i>)										
High school to college	.14	.21	.09	.08	.10	.01	.01	.01	.01	.00
Stable college student	.12	.16	.08	.11	.15	.23	.25	.19	.23	.24
Stable working	.26	.27	.25	.31	.22	.30	.35	.25	.32	.19
Stable idle	.06	.01	.11	.03	.03	.04	.01	.07	.06	.04
Student to working	.15	.16	.14	.18	.18	.19	.20	.17	.18	.24
Student/working to idle	.10	.05	.13	.10	.13	.07	.05	.09	.06	.17
Working/idle to student	.09	.08	.10	.11	.13	.09	.08	.12	.08	.07
Idle to working	.07	.04	.09	.09	.07	.07	.05	.09	.05	.06
Relationship status transitions (between <i>t</i> and <i>t+2</i>)										
Stable non-partnered	.75	.71	.80	.68	.76	.59	.56	.63	.50	.67
Newly partnered	.15	.17	.13	.17	.13	.14	.14	.14	.17	.11
Partnership dissolution	.03	.03	.03	.05	.02	.07	.05	.10	.09	.07
Stable partnered	.07	.09	.04	.11	.09	.20	.24	.13	.24	.15
Parenthood (at <i>t</i>)	.17	.09	.26	.14	.14	.24	.16	.39	.26	.10
<i>Socioeconomic resources</i>										
High school graduation or GED (at <i>t</i>)	.88	.95	.83	.80	.85	.91	.94	.87	.88	.90
Respondents' income (logged, at <i>t-1</i>)	1.35 (1.32)	1.47 (1.09)	1.24 (1.14)	1.27 (1.22)	1.51 (1.19)	1.58 (1.22)	1.66 (1.22)	1.47 (1.20)	1.37 (1.27)	1.70 (1.27)
Mother's education when respondent was age 18	12.70 (2.31)	13.49 (1.82)	12.64 (1.80)	9.05 (3.38)	12.16 (2.48)	13.34 (2.46)	14.16 (2.10)	12.77 (1.80)	9.73 (3.06)	12.54 (3.50)
Parental family income (logged, at <i>t-1</i>)	3.95 (0.72)	4.35 (0.61)	3.59 (0.68)	3.80 (0.69)	3.94 (0.63)	4.09 (0.91)	4.47 (0.68)	3.57 (0.86)	3.81 (0.60)	3.99 (0.93)
Parental family wealth (logged, at <i>t</i>)	13.37 (0.53)	13.53 (0.48)	13.24 (0.33)	13.32 (0.24)	13.34 (0.46)	13.48 (0.33)	13.64 (0.62)	13.26 (0.40)	13.31 (0.30)	13.37 (0.39)
Help from family during past 12 months (at <i>t</i>)	0.97 (1.06)	1.25 (1.20)	0.72 (0.83)	0.82 (0.91)	1.17 (0.97)	1.17 (1.64)	1.39 (1.86)	0.90 (1.29)	0.86 (1.01)	1.03 (1.14)
Personal responsibility scale (at <i>t</i>)	3.60 (1.00)	3.49 (1.02)	3.71 (0.95)	3.56 (1.08)	3.59 (0.98)	3.96 (1.07)	3.83 (1.13)	4.14 (0.96)	4.10 (0.95)	3.98 (1.09)

<i>Family connectivity and support needs</i>										
Immigrants	--	--	--	.65	.36	--	--	--	.63	.31
Coresident adult siblings in parental home (at <i>t</i>)	0.39 (0.62)	0.30 (0.53)	0.45 (0.70)	0.58 (0.65)	0.34 (0.58)	0.33 (0.59)	0.25 (0.49)	0.40 (0.65)	0.59 (0.78)	0.42 (0.66)
Minor children in parental home (at <i>t</i>)	1.07 (1.17)	0.82 (0.99)	1.22 (1.21)	1.59 (1.51)	1.08 (1.20)	0.75 (1.03)	0.61 (.92)	0.87 (1.14)	1.13 (1.11)	0.90 (0.98)
Closeness to mother (at <i>t</i>)	6.22 (1.54)	6.04 (1.37)	6.39 (1.54)	6.21 (1.34)	6.27 (1.58)	6.03 (2.15)	5.95 (1.76)	6.21 (1.99)	6.09 (2.49)	5.91 (1.60)
Closeness to father (at <i>t</i>)	5.21 (1.86)	5.22 (1.67)	5.12 (2.06)	5.47 (1.40)	5.32 (1.96)	5.30 (1.75)	5.36 (1.67)	5.16 (1.90)	5.43 (1.60)	5.33 (1.77)
Mother or father in poor/fair health	.22	.15	.26	.31	.30	.18	.13	.24	.27	.22
Control variables										
Age (at <i>t</i>)	19.53 (1.90)	19.27 (1.78)	19.76 (1.97)	19.59 (1.86)	19.63 (1.97)	20.80 (1.84)	20.78 (1.81)	20.86 (1.87)	20.94 (2.02)	20.40 (1.67)
Female	.51	.54	.48	.57	.40	.58	.57	.61	.50	.50
Year of observation (<i>t</i>)										
2005	.26	.27	.24	.25	.27	.18	.19	.17	.15	.11
2007	.33	.34	.33	.35	.30	.34	.34	.35	.33	.38
2009	.40	.38	.42	.40	.43	.48	.47	.48	.51	.51
Urbanization scale (at <i>t</i>)	7.63 (2.38)	7.00 (2.47)	8.03 (2.28)	8.03 (1.89)	8.45 (2.29)	7.68 (2.30)	7.41 (2.34)	7.99 (2.24)	7.79 (2.03)	8.23 (2.19)
<i>N</i> of person-periods	1,484	622	663	111	88	1,464	791	532	78	72
<i>N</i> of persons	1,049	460	456	70	63	902	467	335	50	50
% of persons	100%	44%	43%	7%	6%	100%	52%	37%	6%	6%

Note: *t* refers to beginning of migration interval, *t*+2 refers to end of migration interval. Standard deviations (SD) shown for continuous variables only.

Table 2. Logistic Regression Models of the Timing of Moving Out of the Parental Home: Transition to Adulthood Study, 2005-2011

Variables	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7
<i>Age</i>							
17-18 (reference)							
19	-0.30†	-0.04	-0.41**	-0.43**	-0.30†	-0.27†	-0.18
20	-0.17	0.11	-0.40*	-0.37*	-0.17	-0.16	-0.23
21	-0.08	0.21	-0.32	-0.34†	-0.08	-0.05	-0.15
22	0.07	0.35	-0.16	-0.24	0.07	0.11	-0.00
23	0.13	0.42	-0.18	-0.19	0.12	0.17	-0.07
24	-0.09	0.19	-0.33	-0.39	-0.09	-0.06	-0.20
25-26	-1.82†	-1.56	-2.14†	-2.12*	-1.82†	-1.74	-2.07†
Female	0.33**	0.32**	0.18	0.40***	0.33**	0.33**	0.21†
<i>Year of observation</i>							
2005 (reference)							
2007	-0.27†	-0.28†	-0.26†	-0.35*	-0.27†	-0.27†	-0.37*
2009	-0.37**	-0.39**	-0.37*	-0.38**	-0.37**	-0.38*	-0.43**
Urbanization scale	-0.01	-0.02	0.00	-0.03	-0.01	-0.02	-0.03
<i>Race and ethnicity</i>							
White (reference)							
Black	-0.38**	-0.28*	-0.30*	-0.25†	-0.38**	-0.32**	0.03
Mexican	-0.42*	-0.33	-0.49*	0.06			
Native-born Mexican					-0.30	-0.23	0.15
Immigrant Mexican					-0.49†	-0.41	0.19
Other Hispanic	-0.24	-0.15	-0.24	-0.11			
Native-born other Hispanic					-0.22	-0.18	0.12
Immigrant other Hispanic					-0.27	-0.23	-0.08
<i>Life-course transitions</i>							
<i>School and work transitions</i>							
High school to college (reference)							
Stable college student		-0.71**					-0.90***
Stable working		-0.76***					-1.25***
Stable idle		-1.17***					-1.42***
Student to working		-0.99***					-1.35***
Student/working to idle		-0.82***					-1.11***
Working/idle to student		-0.99***					-1.27***
Idle to working		-0.70**					-0.93**
<i>Relationship status transitions</i>							
Stable non-partnered (reference)							
Newly partnered			1.02***				1.18***
Partnership dissolution			0.64*				0.62†

Stable partnered			1.63***					1.69***
Parenthood			0.11					0.29†
<i>Socioeconomic resources</i>								
High school graduation or GED					0.15			0.09
Respondent's income					0.07			0.08
Mother's education					0.09**			0.08*
Parental family income					-0.05			-0.02
Parental family wealth					0.09			0.24
Help from family					0.16**			0.18**
Personal responsibility scale					0.35***			0.35***
<i>Family connectivity and support needs</i>								
Coresident adult siblings							-0.17†	-0.12
Minor children							-0.01	0.00
Closeness to mother							-0.08†	-0.10*
Closeness to father							-0.01	-0.02
Mother or father in poor health							-0.07	0.03
Constant	0.25	0.83**	-0.02	-2.18***	0.25	0.86*	-0.91	
N of person-periods	1,484	1,484	1,484	1,484	1,484	1,484	1,484	1,484
N of persons	1,049	1,049	1,049	1,049	1,049	1,049	1,049	1,049

Note: † $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$, two-tailed tests

Table 3. Logistic Regression Models of the Timing of Moving Back into the Parental Home: Transition to Adulthood Study, 2005-2011

Variables	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7
<i>Age</i>							
17-18 (reference)							
19	-0.15	-0.12	-0.13	-0.09	-0.16	-0.20	-0.08
20	-0.47*	-0.50*	-0.41†	-0.40†	-0.46†	-0.53*	-0.45†
21	-0.28	-0.34	-0.19	-0.16	-0.28	-0.44†	-0.30
22	-0.61*	-0.73**	-0.52*	-0.46†	-0.60*	-0.74**	-0.65*
23	-1.22***	-1.33***	-1.12**	-1.09**	-1.23***	-1.42***	-1.35***
24	-1.58***	-1.73***	-1.43***	-1.35***	-1.57***	-1.74***	-1.56***
25-26	-2.41*	-2.48*	-2.22*	-2.25*	-2.42*	-2.54*	-2.19*
Female	-0.03	0.01	-0.01	-0.08	-0.04	-0.06	-0.02
<i>Year of observation</i>							
2005 (reference)							
2007	0.19	0.21	0.21	0.21	0.19	0.26	0.34
2009	0.56**	0.56**	0.57**	0.55**	0.55**	0.62**	0.67**
Urbanization scale	0.03	0.03	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.02
<i>Race and ethnicity</i>							
White (reference)							
Black	0.61***	0.50**	0.46**	0.44**	0.61***	0.48**	0.13
Mexican	1.06***	1.02***	1.08***	0.77*			
Native-born Mexican					1.15**	1.06*	0.96*
Immigrant Mexican					1.01**	0.76*	0.49
Other Hispanic	0.75**	0.71*	0.71*	0.62*			
Native-born other Hispanic					0.41	0.33	0.16
Immigrant other Hispanic					1.39**	1.16*	0.93†
<i>Life-course transitions</i>							
<i>School and work transitions</i>							
High school to college		0.59					0.78
Stable college student (reference)							
Stable working		0.31					0.55*
Stable idle		1.34***					1.23***
Student to working		0.34					0.43†
Student/working to idle		0.44					0.32
Working/idle to student		0.34					0.43
Idle to working		0.54†					0.55†
<i>Relationship status transitions</i>							
Stable non-partnered			1.18***				1.34***
Newly partnered			0.88**				0.99**
Partnership dissolution			1.13***				1.18***

Stable partnered (reference)								
Parenthood			0.28					0.14
<i>Socioeconomic resources</i>								
High school graduation or GED								-0.34
Respondent's income								0.06
Mother's education								-0.04
Parental family income								-0.05
Parental family wealth								-0.49
Help from family								0.05
Personal responsibility scale								-0.17 [†]
<i>Family connectivity and support needs</i>								
Coresident adult siblings							0.46***	0.48***
Minor children							-0.06	-0.09
Closeness to mother							0.08	0.09
Closeness to father							-0.01	-0.02
Mother or father in poor health							0.44*	0.40*
Constant	-1.78***	-2.07***	-2.73***	-0.20	-1.77***	-2.32***	-2.30*	
<i>N</i> of person-periods	1,464	1,464	1,464	1,464	1,464	1,464	1,464	1,464
<i>N</i> of persons	902	902	902	902	902	902	902	902

Note: [†] $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$, two-tailed tests