THE SURVEY OF INCOME AND PROGRAM PARTICIPATION

AN ANALYSIS OF LEAVING HOME USING DATA FROM THE 1984 PANEL OF THE SIPP

No. 107

Alden Speare, Jr., Roger Avery and Frances Goldschieder

Brown University

U.S. Department of Commerce BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This is the final report for Joint Statistical Agreement 88-14 between the U.S. Bureau of the Census and Brown University. The views expressed are attributable to the authors' and do not necessarily represent the view of the Bureau of the Census.

SUMMARY

This project had three specific aims: (1) the construction of an individual level file of young adults and their household changes; (2) The use of these data to study nestleaving, including the calculation of rates by age, sex, race, education, .work status and income; (3) The investigation of the extent of reentry of children into their parents' households and the variables related to reentry.

The problem of studying household change was approached from the perspective of the individual household members. Measures of household change were calculated for individuals aged 15 to 29 by age, sex and other variables. An initial comparison of measures based on four month and one year intervals showed that the one year measures significantly undercounted the number of changes experienced by young adults and thus most of the analysis was based on four month intervals. The effect of sample attrition over time in the panel was addressed by using information from any relevant follow-up interview regardless of whether the person was interviewed in all relevant waves. Rates of change in household size, changes in living with parents and changes in living with spouse were than computed by age and sex.

Because the SIPP reinterviewed persons every four months over an average period of two and one half years and obtained data on household composition for each month, it is possible to observe short duration changes in households which are not observed when longer follow-up periods are used. Returning to the nest is shown to be much more likely during the first year away, and such returns are missed if measures are based only on annual observations. Rates of nest leaving and returning based on four-month intervals are calculated by age and sex and various household characteristics.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The objective of this project was to study household change from an individual perspective. In contrast to many studies of household change that use the household or family as the unit of analysis and relate these changes to characteristics of the .household head or householder, the individual perspective is particularly useful in understanding the changes experienced by persons who are not householders. The focus of this project is on young adults aged 15 to 29 and their exits from and returns to their parents' household. Because marriages, marital separations and other household changes for this age group are often related to nestleaving and nest returns, this report will also include some preliminary analysis of these events.

The study of household change is of interest because of the significant changes in the composition of households in the United States in the past two decades. Since 1970, the number of households in the United States has grown considerably faster than the population. Between 1970 and 1987, the major sources of this increase were the growth in one-parent families (from 3.8 to 8.9 million) and single person households (from 10.9 to 21.2 million). This fragmentation of households has had serious consequences for society. One of these is a loss in household economies of scale and this has affected the economic quality of life for many persons. For example, in 1986, a two-person family with an income of $11,000 had a standard of living which was 54 percent above the poverty level. However, if these two persons split into single person households and divided their income equally, they would both have been below the poverty level (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1987). Recent work has documented the effects of variation in household structure, including immediate effects on poverty (McLanahan, 1985; Wilson and Neckerman, 1985; Ruggles, 1987; David, 1988) and longer-run outcomes such as those of children's later economic and family patterns (Shaw, 1982; Hill, 1986; Kobrin and Waite, 1984).

There is growing evidence that nestleaving - the departure of young adults from their parents' household - is not a once and for all times event. Goldscheider and DaVanzo (1985) in following the high school class of 1972 from 1973 to 1974 observed almost 4 returns to the nest for every 10 departures. This may be part of a recent trend towards an increase in the proportion of young adults living with parents (Glick and Lin, 1986). While life course theory suggests that there is a normal sequence of events such as completing education, finding employment, marrying, and becoming a parent (Elder 1975; Marini 1984), recent studies have shown that many persons experience disorderly life cycles (Hogan, 1978, Marini 1987; Rindfuss, Swicegood and Rosenfeld 1987). Goldscheider and DaVanzo (1985) have shown that nestleaving, in particular, is not closely tied to the other events of early adulthood.

Analyses of family and household change that have focused analytically on the household level have documented frequent changes in household structure and the short duration of some households (White and Tsui, 1986; Koo, 1985; Citro and Watts, 1985; and Citro, Hernandez and Herriot, 1986). Richards, White and Tsui (1987) used the Panel Study of Income Dynamics to estimate individual rates of transition between types of households and the survival rates of individuals in particular types of households. This study used only those individuals who were

followed for 13 years however, and, given the significant amount of attrition which occurred during this period, their results may be seriously biased as a result.

DaVanzo and Goldscheider (1989) found that returns home were associated both with failures in marriage and work and with other transitions such as completing college or military service. They argue that the parental home serves as a "home base" to return to while experiencing turns in the road to independence. This study, which is based on the National Longitudinal Study of the High School Class of 1972, does not, however, provide detailed timing of events. Status is measured only at four time periods, 1973, 1974, 1976 and 1979 and the combined rates which they present are based on intervals which vary from one to three years.

The SIPP offers advantages over previous data sets that have been used for the analysis of household change. The main advantage of the SIPP is that it follows individuals in the sample every four months and obtains data on many items for each of the intervening months. This frequent follow-up is particularly important in the study of household change, as it is desirable to observe characteristics of the household such as employment and income, as well as household composition immediately prior to the event. In addition, the SIPP has a relatively large sample, which is of critical importance for the analysis of relatively rare events. Finally, while there was sample attrition between waves of the SIPP, the attrition rates appear to be lower than those of most other longitudinal surveys (Herriot and Kasprzyk, 1986). As a result, the SIPP is an extraordinarily rich file for this analysis.

Watts (1987) used the SIPP to look at household changes experienced by children under 18 and specifically at changes in the number of parents in the household. His approach is similar to the one that we have adopted, although it looks at a different age group and does not try to deal with the problems associated with attrition.

However, the data's richness results in great complexity. To realize its full value requires the ability to link individuals not only over time, as information on them accumulates in the panel, but also to other individuals in the household.

DATA AND METHODS

The data for this report come from persons aged 15 to 29 at the first interview in the 1984 panel of the SIPP which occurred between October 1983 and January 1984.[1] Each of these persons was followed through as many of the eight follow-up interviews .as possible and various measures of household change were constructed based on observed changes in household composition between waves.

[1]Most of the data were obtained through SIPP ACCESS which was supported by NSF grant SES-8701911 and Sloan Foundation Grant B1987-46. The rest of the data were obtained from the 1984 SIPP Full Panel Research File provided by the Bureau of the Census.

Household change is a common event for persons 15 to 29 and it can take many forms. At age 15 most persons are living with one or both parents and usually some siblings. By age 30, most of these people have left their parents household and established a new household, most often with a marital partner. However, there are many other household changes that can occur during this time period. While living with parents, parents may die or move out, a single parent may remarry, siblings may come and go and other relatives and/or unrelated people may enter or leave the household. If the young person leaves his or her parent's household, he or she may return at a later date. Outside the parent's household, there may be several temporary households.

We limit the variety of household changes which can occur, focusing on those changes which involve primary family relationships, particularly those involving the person in either a parent-child relationship or a husband-wife relationship. We also look at all household changes involving a change in the number of persons in the household.

Although the SIPP data measure household composition for each month, we used four-month periods as our time unit of observation because the measures of household change from interview to interview are more accurate than those from one month to the next. SIPP did not code more than one move per individual per wave and an examination of the dating of these events showed an uneven distribution across the four months within a wave and a significant proportion of events occurring between the interview of one wave and the first month of the following wave.[2] This suggested that measures of monthly changes in households would be unreliable.

The information we used to measure household change was derived from two items in the data file. First, the person numbers of parents and spouses in the same household (generated for all 'persons with a parent or spouse in the household), and second the interview codes in the retention file created by SIPP ACCESS giving each person's status at the end of the wave. By matching household numbers of persons sharing a common address at the month of interview for each wave, we were able to calculate most aspects of the family structure at each interview for all persons' 15 - 29 years old as of the first interview.

In particular we calculated the number of five kinds of household members for all persons 15-29 as of each interviews:[3]

1. **spouses**; either 0 or 1, depending on whether a person number of a spouse was indicated.

[2]Since the month of interview was the same as the first reference month of the following wave, there should be few changes recorded. Only these changes which occurred between the date of the interview and the 15th of the same month would properly fall in this interval. In doing so, we discovered a few cases for which the person numbers for the parent and the spouse were the same and recorded these based on other waves.

[3]These counts were made using the Ingres program at the University of Wisconsin from a table which linked each person ages 15-29 with every other person in their household at the end of the interview period.

2. **children** ; a count of persons in the household with either the respondent's or the respondent's spouse's person number given as parent.

3. **siblings**; a count of persons in the household having the respondent's parent's person number as parent or person having the respondent's parent's spouse'sperson number as parent. This last group was very small.

4. **parents**; a count of persons in the household who were identified as either the parent of the person, the spouse of the parent, the parent of the spouse, or the spouse of the spouse's parent.

5. **others**; a count of all other household members (not in categories (1) through (4)).

From the interview codes for each wave,[4] we ascertained whether or not sufficient information had been obtained about the respondent's household to determine if a household change had taken place. Those with codes 0 to 4 were either interviewed or had proxy interviews. These persons were in households for which an interview was obtained. For these we assumed that the count of persons matched on household identification and address codes and the spouse and parent numbers were accurate.[5]

In its recent redesign of the data set, SIPP ACCESS added interview codes 5 through 9 to indicate that an interview was obtained from someone in the household who had been present in the household for at least one month during the wave but had either moved to a new address and could not be interviewed or had ceased to be in the sample because of death or movement to the armed forces, an institution, or a foreign country. This group of added codes also included a few individuals who were sample relevant, not interviewed and not coded as refusals. These added codes enabled us to make inferences about the nature of household change in some cases. Using the exit reasons we were able to identify those who had died or entered an institution and exclude them from the analysis. We did not exclude those who ceased to be "sample relevant" because they entered the armed forces or moved abroad. [6] Other persons were assumed to be living with all of those who shared the same address code.

For our analysis, we constructed a record for each interval of observation between two waves, beginning with the interval between waves 1 and 2 and continuing to the interval between waves 8 and 9. In households in which no one was interviewed in a particular wave because of refusal, movement to an unknown location, or other reasons, we use the data for the next wave in which

[4]These were obtained from the RETENTION table created by SIPP ACCESS.

[5]A check of cases from the 2 percent sample showed that our count was always identical to the number of persons coded on the household record.

[6]SIPP considers these people to be out of the sample and does not follow them while they are away, but includes them again if they reenter the household.

there was an interview.[7] If there was no subsequent interview, we were unable to make any inference about changes in household composition and such intervals were excluded.

These excluded intervals account for only three percent of the total intervals with an initial interview.[8]

We compared household structures between each wave and the following wave and constructed several measures of household change, each based on a four-month observation period. In 'Addition, for those missing information in the following wave, ;de measured change to the next available interview and divided by the number of four-month intervals to standardize the length of the period for which the rates were calculated.[9]

Our initial sample consisted of 13,408 persons aged 15 to 29 who had nonzero weights in wave 1.[10] We had to exclude 448 cases with no household interview after wave 1. This left 12,960 cases contributing at least one follow-up wave of information. In all we included 72,465 periods of observation during which the respondent was aged 15 to 29.

By comparing the counts of total persons in the household and in each of the five categories-of household members between pairs of waves, we classify individuals in terms of household changes. For each type of household member we classified changes as follows:

1. **Joining**: No one in this category of household member at beginning of interval but some at end.

2. **Increase**: increase in number of persons in this category between waves.

3. **No change**: same number of persons in this category in both waves.

4. **Decrease**: decrease in number of persons in this category between waves.

---

[7]When the interval between waves was more than four months, we increased the base for computing rates in proportion to the length of the interval, up to a maximum of 12 months. It was felt that for intervals of greater than one year, the effect of increased duration was offset by the greater likelihood of missing multiple events. Only about 0.1 percent of all intervals were greater than one year.

[8]This calculation understates the overall effect of attrition because persons who are lost at one of the earlier waves are only counted in the denominator for the periods in which they had an initial interview.

[9]When the interval between interviews exceeded one year, we divided by 3 intervals since rates of change did not appear to increase with the length of the interval for intervals longer than one year. There were very few cases with intervals exceeding one year.

[10]A small number of cases were also excluded who were either identified in wave 2 (or a later wave) to have been erroneously included in the sample or had an age at the time of the first interview that was outside our range.

5. **Leaving**: Some persons in this category at beginning of interval not none at end.

6. **None**: No one in this category at either wave.

The Choice of Length of Observation Period

The effects of two alternative lengths of observation illustrated in Table 1 where we have calculated a. of entry and exit from households containing a pat of the young adult. [11] This table demonstrates that more significantly events are counted if we look at changes for each four-month period than if we look only at changes between the beginning of the year (wave 1) and the end of the year (the fourth wave[12]). For example, a comparison of the first two rows of table 1 shows that, for persons interviewed in all four waves, there were 820 exits from the parent's household when all changes observed during four-month intervals are summed, compared only with 689 when only one change can be observed for the entire year. Since the net number of nestleavers is the same in both cases, the difference is entirely due to persons who both entered and exited from the household during the year. If we are interest in separations of less than a year's duration, then we need to use the shorter observation periods in order to count these events accurately.

If we used shorter periods of observation, we would observe even more events. We have not tried calculating rates based on a one-month period because, while SIPP provides measures of household composition for each month, these are based on information about entries and exits recorded on the control card and apply to persons who were either in the household at the time of interview or at the time of the previous interview. No attempt is made obtain information about people who both enter and exit from the household during the four-month period covered by the interview. For many purposes, the presence or absence of a person for periods as short as a month may not be of interest and change over a four-month period may be relevant. The recent National Survey of Families and Households defined leaving and returning home in terms of durations of four months or more (Sweet, Bumpass and Call, 1988). For our study, we also feel that the four-month is a reasonable time interval to use.

The Problem of Sample Attrition

A major problem for panel studies is the selectivity bias caused by attrition between waves (Berk, 1983; Heckman,. 1979). Attrition primarily results from households which refuse to continue in the panel, households in which no one is at home at the times ..when the interviewer calls, households which move to an unknown address. McArthur and Short (1985) have shown that attrition rates in the SIPP are higher for young adults, males, blacks, Hispanics, never married

[11]Sampling errors for these rates are considerably larger than those estimated assuming a simple random sample because of the complex nature of the SIPP sample and the fact that we use multiple intervals from the same individual.

[12]Becaise rotation group 4 did not receive wave 2, the fourth wave for that rotation group is wave 5.

persons, primary individuals and persons not related to the reference person in the household.

Jean and McArthur (1984) estimated that 80 percent of the persons who changed addresses were followed between waves one and two and we estimated that 72 percent of the interstate migrants were reinterviewed. The extent of the bias in measures of geographical mobility in the SIPP panel was explored by Clark and Speare (1988) for the case of residential mobility. In most cases of attrition it was possible to determine whether or not residential mobility had occurred. However, where the entire household dropped out of the panel, it was not possible to determine whether the married couple or child-parent relationship had continued.

A common response to sample attrition is to restrict the analysis only to persons who were interviewed in all eight or nine waves. If we had done so, we would have lost about 24 percent of the periods of observation which are available for persons aged 15 to 29. However, since it is likely that the rate of nestleaving is considerably higher for those who are not interviewed in all waves than for those who were interviewed, we chose to include all cases with two or more waves of data.

Another problem in the SIPP data arises when young people leave their parental home not for a new residence but for group quarters, particularly the military and college dormitories. The SIPP treats these cases differently. Unmarried students attending college are treated as if they still lived with their parents as long as the parents maintain a room for them and consider them to be "part of the household", following CPS procedures. As a result, their "first" departure from home and return are ignored. Those entering the military are treated as no longer "sample relevant", but can be identified if they leave a household where someone is interviewed in a later interview. We have chosen to treat these persons as relevant to our analysis for the interval in which they leave the sample household.

The effects of sample attrition upon the results are illustrated in Table 2, where alternative rates are calculated for groups with different response patterns. About one third of the attrition results because cases were randomly dropped in waves 5 and 6 because of funding difficulties. These cases are not very different from those which were interviewed in all waves. However, they have higher rates of household change in all comparisons except for those joining spouses. These differences are probably due to somewhat lower rates in the later waves which are missing for this group.

The third and fourth groups in Table 2 include groups missing one or more interviews. In 11 out of 12 comparisons these two groups have higher rates of all types of household change than the cases which were interviewed in all waves and in 9 out of 12 comparisons they have higher rates than the "planned attrition" group. On average, the entry and exit rates for the two groups with missing interviews were about one-third higher than the rates for those with all 8 or 9 interviews. The biggest differences were observed between entry rates into the parent's household and exit rates from the spouse’s household.

Finally, there were 915 intervals in which young adults left households which continued to be interviewed although they were not interviewed. Most of these were intervals in which the departure was recorded in the interview at the end of the interval. About 22 percent of these intervals were ones in which they were recorded as having left an interviewed household in the interview at the beginning of the interval and were interviewed in a later wave. Some of these cases involve movement outside the sample of eligible persons - either to the armed forces or abroad. For those cases who left interviewed households, we can usually tell whether the parent or spouse remained, if the parent or spouse had been in the household at the end of the previous wave. Thus, we can infer nestleaving or spousal separation in these cases, but are unable to tell, for those not living with a parent or spouse at the previous interview, whether or not they joined the parent or spouse at the new address. For those with a subsequent interview, we can tell whether or not they joined a parent or spouse, but not whether they had left one. Nevertheless, the rates of household change for these persons are very high and it would appear that the common practice of excluding these cases may bias estimates of change. While this group accounts for only about 1.2 percent of all intervals, it includes about 17 percent of all nestleavers and 13 percent of all persons who leave their spouse.

In addition to the types of attrition shown in Table 2, there are those who refuse to continue in the panel, move to an unknown address, or can not be interviewed again for other reasons. In examining these cases, we found that 15 percent of those lost from the panel moved away from their parents' household during the preceding wave, in comparison with 2 to 3 percent for intervals for which there was a later interview.

These findings are similar to those of Ernst and Gillman (1988), Jean and McArthur (1987) and Clark and Speare (1988) in suggesting that limiting the analysis to those who have complete interviews in all relevant waves can seriously bias the results. We shall therefore endeavor to the extent possible to use all available information in order to infer household changes for as high a proportion of the total sample as possible.

Calculation of Sample Weights

Because of the complex sample design and because of differentials in attrition, it is important to employ appropriate weights when analyzing data from the SIPP. However, the selection of appropriate weights is not obvious. The public use files include weights for each month and each wave that are suitable for cross-sectional analysis. However, these weights assume that all household members will be included in the analysis whether or not they were present in the sample interviewed in the first wave. Since we analyze only those persons who were interviewed in wave one (including proxy interviews), the weights on the public use files are appropriate only for wave one. However, if we apply these weights to later waves, we do not take account of attrition.

We have calculated weights for each wave by starting with the wave one weights for each respondent and multiplying these by an adjustment factor that adjusts for attrition of persons with

similar characteristics. Adjustment factors were calculated for the six subgroups of the population that accounted for the greatest variation in attrition rates. These were race (whites and others versus blacks, Hispanics and American Indians), household type (living with parent or spouse versus all others) and sex for those not living with parent or spouse. Whites and others who were living with their parent or spouse had the lowest attrition rates whereas black, Hispanic and Indian males who were not living with parent or spouse had the highest attrition rates. A total of 48 adjustment factors were calculated (six groups by eight follow-up waves) and these varied from close to 1.0 to a maximum of 1.98. These factors were calculated so that the weighted sum of all persons approximated the number of survivors in the noninstitutional civilian population of the United States.[13]

Variation in Rates by Duration in Panel

We also examined the variation in rates of household change by duration in the panel. Table 3 compares the proportions experiencing a change in household size, a change in living with parents, and a change in living with spouse, by year in the panel. In order to make the persons in each year as comparable as possible, the age during the particular year has been calculated and each year's data are restricted to persons aged 17 to 29 during that year. For all events there is a decline in the rates of occurrence from years one and two to year three. While the reasons for this decline are not entirely clear, we suspect that it is due to the effects of attrition in removing some of the most mobile people from the panel in the later years. The decline in rates is most noticeable for nestleaving and for changes in household size. Rates of return to the parents household and changes in living with the spouse show less decline. Between years one and two, rates are about as likely to increase as they are to decrease. While these data raise some questions about the under reporting of-events in year three due to cumulative attrition of persons who are more likely to experience events, the total rates for changes in living with parents and spouse are close to those for years one and two and it therefore makes sense to use all of the waves in the analysis.

RESULTS

Rates of Household Change by Age and Sex

Our major focus is on nestleaving, here defined as being a move from a household containing at least one parent to one with no parents. In each four-month interval, a respondent is defined as either joining parents, remaining with them, leaving them or remaining separated from them. Categories four and one represent leaving and joining, respectively. The difference represents the net nestleaving flow. Percentages in these categories are presented in table 4. In the upper panel,

[13]At wave 1, the weighted total of persons 15 to 29 in our sample agrees well with estimates prepared by the Bureau of the Census. Our weighted total was 60,329,000. The average of July 1, 1983 and July 1, 1984 estimates of the civilian population aged 15 to 29 was 60,605,500 (see "United States Population Estimates by Age, Sex and Race, 1980 to 1987," **Current Population Reports** P-25, No. 1022). If one applies the 1980 proportion noninstitutional to this number, the resulting estimate is 60,121,000.

the denominator is all cases. These percentages represent gross flows; they can be added and their difference represents the net flow out of the parental household. In the bottom panel, the denominators are the persons at risk of the particular event, those living apart from their parents for joining and those living with their parents for leaving. The denominators are shown in table Al.

The results for both types of gross flows for both males and females show an inverted U-shaped curve by age, with the percentages rising to a peak flow at ages 20-21 and then rapidly declining.[14] Clearly the process of nestleaving starts slowly around age 15, rapidly increases to age 21 and then declines as most persons have already left home. As indicated in table Al, most persons 20-21 have not left home, while most of those 22-24 have already left. The peak age for leaving parents appears to be earlier for females, which is consistent with the sex difference in age of marriage. Rates for leaving are higher for females up to about age 19 and higher for males thereafter. Rates of return are similar for males and females up to age 25, and are higher for males after age 25.

The net flows of nestleaving are substantial during much of this period. On a yearly basis these flows average about 4.2 percent from 15 to 17, 9.6 percent from 18 to 21, 6.3 percent from 22 to 24 and 2.7 percent from 25-29.

There is a significant counter-flow back to the household that averages about 40 percent of those leaving. From analysis of individual cases in the 2 percent sample, it appears that much of this counterflow is short term, with young people spending relatively small amounts of time with their parents after return. These results are similar to those of Goldscheider and DaVanzo (1985).

Looking at nestleaving from the perspective of the percentage of those eligible changes the results significantly. For both sexes, there is a steady increase in the propensity to leave the parental household. Thus by age 25, about 11 percent of those living with their parents leave within four months. This is equivalent to nearly one-half leaving within a two-year period. At all ages, females are more likely to leave than males.

The counter-flow of those rejoining parents also looks different from the perspective of those eligible. The rate of return is so high for teenagers that those who have left home are more likely to return than teenagers at home are likely to leave. Thereafter there is a monotonic decline in the return rate. Thus by age 25, the return rates are very small, close to one percent. Males are more likely to return at all ages. This return flow for males is an underestimate as we miss those returning from the armed forces or institutions who were excluded from the original survey. Thus more males remain at home both because females are more likely to leave, and because males are

[14]Age was determined at the beginning of each wave from the age reported in that interview, with adjustments for inconsistencies of more than two years between waves. For ages 15 and 16, weights were adjusted to account for the fact that we did not include younger persons who aged into these ages during the duration of the panel.

more likely to return.

The flows joining or leaving spouses are given in table 5. This analysis does not measure marriage rates directly, only changes in the presence or absence of a spouse. Approximately 96 percent of those joining a spouse became married during the interval and approximately 90 percent of those leaving a spouse became separated or divorced. The rest were temporary absences.

The pattern of gross flows for joining or leaving a spouse are roughly comparable to those of joining or leaving parents. For both sexes there is an inverted U-shaped curve for joining a spouse with a peak at ages 20 to 24 for females and 22 to 24 for. males. Females are more likely to join a spouse than males. Females are also more likely to join a spouse than to join parents. For males, the total flow rates to parents and spouses are similar with young males more likely to join parents and males aged 22 and over more likely to join spouses. The flows of persons leaving a spouse are relatively low, lower than those leaving parents at all ages. These flows are higher for females than males and increase steadily with age.

Taking into account those eligible to join or leave a spouse presents a different picture. The rates for joining a spouse are significantly higher and peak at a later age than is the case for nestleaving. In fact for males, the rates continue to rise to age 25 to 29, the highest age group observed. The female rate of joining spouses peaks at ages 22 to 24, and then declines slightly.

The proportions living with a spouse who separate steadily declines with age for both sexes. This proportion is higher for males than females, except at ages 25 to 29. The rate at which those under 20 living with a spouse leave that spouse is roughly similar to the rate at which those living with parents leave them.

In order to put household changes involving joining or leaving spouses and parents in perspective, we also calculated the proportion of respondents for whom household size changed during a four-month period. The results are given in table 6. Changes in household size include almost all household changes. If we define a change of household as a change in the number of any of the enumerated relatives, spouse, parents, children and siblings, or in the number of other persons in a household, then 94 percent of all household changes involve a change in total household size.

As indicated in table 6, the percentage of those experiencing a household change is substantial in all age groups for both sexes. Clearly most changes in household do not involve either leaving or joining parents, or leaving and joining a spouse. However, the age pattern of all household changes, an inverted U peaking at 20-21, follows the same pattern as leaving parents. The age pattern of the frequency of household changes not involving leaving parents shows much less variation. The differences in household size change rates by sex also follow the pattern suggested by the frequency of leaving parents: women are more likely to experience a change in household size at ages under 20, while men are more likely to experience such a change at ,.ages after 22. Thus most young Americans experience frequent household changes, not involving their own nestleaving or joining or leaving a spouse. About 10 percent experience such a change every 4

months, independent of their age or sex. The amount of such changes swamp the frequency of nest leaving and joining or leaving spouses.

Rates of Nestleaving and Returning By Characteristics

Tables 7 through 12 present rates of nestleaving and returning by characteristics of the individuals and their households. These rates are all based on four-month periods of observation from one wave to the next. Annual rates would be somewhat less than three times these rates because some individuals have two or three events within one year and if they both leave and return within a year, an annual measure would show no change. These tables include controls for age and sex only; in the last section, logit regression results will be presented which include most of the variables.

Nestleaving

The results in Table 7 show that Blacks of both sexes are less likely to leave home than whites, particularly at young ages. Whites with their own families are extremely likely to separate from their parents (see Table 9). Young blacks with families are also more likely to leave parents than those without families, but are less affected by family status than whites. Thus three generational families are more likely among blacks. Teenage Hispanics of both sexes are more likely to leave home than whites. The numbers are small but it appears that except for ages 15-17, persons of other races (mainly Asians) are less likely to leave home than other groups.

The effects of education are complex. Broadly speaking, those with less education are more likely to leave home at the youngest ages and less likely to leave home at later ages. For those with a high school education or less, the chances of leaving home does not continue to increase from 22-24 to 25-29 but decreases for females and remains the same for males. Among the less well educated, those who were still at home at ages 25 and over have been there a long time since completing their education and may have a strong motivation to remain home. In contrast, among those with more education, those aged 25 and over who were still at home may have been there only a short time since completing their education and may have less motivation to remain there.

Because unmarried college students are coded as remaining members of the parental household As long as a room in the parental home is maintained for them, transitions into and out of college are not generally counted as moves in the SIPP. Thus those remaining in college are particularly unlikely to leave home, while those leaving college are particularly likely to have a separation from parents.

Duration of residence with the parents has a substantial impact on nestleaving for those persons for whom we can measure duration.[15]

[15]The duration variable indicates whether or not they have been with their parents for at least one year. This variable was created by observation of residence patterns over the preceding year and necessitated dropping of

Those who have lived with their parents for a year or less are much more likely to leave home at any age. Since those with short durations of residence with their parents are primarily returnees, this suggests that many return for only a short time.

Within the relatively short observation period of the SIPP, there were many individuals who were observed to have multiple events of nestleaving and returning. Of the 2084 persons who left their parents' household during the panel, 242 returned at a prior time during the panel and 350 returned at a later time.[16] Of the 853 individuals who were observed to return to their parents' household, 592 (69 percent) also left the household during the panel.

It seemed possible that some of the short durations between nestleaving and returning could be due to interviewing or coding errors where an individual or their parent was omitted from the household list for a particular wave. We checked all of these cases to see whether there was either a move or a change in the number of people in the household during the same wave as the nestleaving or returning and found very few cases without one of these types of corroborating evidence of an event.[17]

For those young persons who are employed, higher income is associated with higher rates of nestleaving, particularly for males. Males who are working, irrespective of income. For females, there are no clear differences between working and not working.

The income of others in the household, which is usually the parents' income, appears to have a slight tendency to reduce nestleaving among males, but shows no clear trend among females.

Family structure and changes in family structure have strong influences on nestleaving (see Table 8). The most important determinant of nestleaving is having started a new family either by marriage or becoming a parent. Such persons are much more likely to leave home than other persons irrespective of other characteristics. On average, 18% of young persons with own families living with their parents separate during a four-month period. Depending on the age and sex of the young person, this proportion can vary between 12% and 26%. In contrast, among those who do not have their own families nestleaving varies between 1% and 10%.

---

intervals beginning with wave 1, 2, or 3. We experimented with the alternative of inferring duration of residence from data obtained in the Topical Module on migration. Because this information was only collected in wave 8 and that wave included only three rotation groups, we actually had information for fewer segments and there appeared to be some bias toward excluding cases which had high mobility rates either because they had dropped out of the panel before wave 8 or because they had moved more than once since the first interval and thus did not have information on duration at wave 1.

[16]These numbers refer only to the first nestleaving event. Out of the group who left and returned, 129 persons left a second time.

[17]Out of 592 individuals who experienced both a nestleaving and a nest returning event, only 28 had neither a corresponding move nor a change in household size (which would suggest that the parents moved).

Not surprisingly, joining a spouse was also particularly likely to be associated with leaving parents. Among those females who already had their own family but remained with parents, those with spouses are more likely to leave parents than those with a child but not a spouse. Among males there were too few cases of those with their own family living with parents to distinguish categories.

Those with fewer close relatives are more likely to leave home. Thus those with one parent are more likely to separate than those with two, although this effect attenuates after age 21. Those without siblings at home are also more likely to leave than those with one or particularly two or more siblings. On the other hand the presence of others, either unrelated persons or more distant relatives, increases the chance of nestleaving.

Table 9 shows the effects of various variables for those with and without their own family. In general the effects of race, education and siblings remain the same.

Nest Returning

The differentials in the rate of return to parents are not as great or consistent as in the rates of leaving home. At young ages there are relatively few cases to study, because most persons have not yet left home, so we shall concentrate our ,analysis on those 20 and over. Among these, Blacks and Hispanics .are less likely to return home at ages 20-21, but more likely to return home at older ages (see Table 10). Those with lower levels of education, are generally more likely to return home at most ages, while college graduates have relatively low rates of return. Those who entered or left college during the interval tended to have slightly higher rates of return.

Paralleling the results for duration and nestleaving, duration away from parents had a strong effect upon the probability of returning. Those who have been away from their parents for less than a year are particularly likely to return home. Those 25 and over who have been away for less than a year are 7 or 8 times more likely to return than those who have been away for longer.

Unemployment, particularly for males, is associated with higher rates of nest returning. Among the employed, rates of return tend to decline with income. The relationship between employment and income and nest returning is not a strong for females.

Those who have either a spouse or a child are less likely to return home (Tables 11 and 12). Those with spouses are particularly unlikely to return home. Not surprisingly, there is an exception if the individual separates from his/her spouse during the period. Such persons are particularly likely to return home. However, even in this case the percentage returning home ranges only between 12% and 18%, depending on age and sex.

Disaggregation by Whether in College or Not

In most cases, unmarried college students were treated as continuing to live with their parents,

whether or not they had a dormitory room or apartment during the school year. This results in lower rates of observed nestleaving while they are in college, and confuses the results somewhat. The tables have been disaggregated into those not in college (tables 13 and 14) and those in college (tables 15 and 16).

For those who are not in college, patterns of differentials in nestleaving rates are similar to those for all cases, although the nestleaving rates are higher in general. Whites, Hispanics, those with more education, those employed, and those with spouses or children are more likely to leave home than those in other racial, education, employment or family status categories.

Overall, college students are less likely to leave home (which is partly due to the way in which leaving home is defined). Among college students, those who are white, those with more education, those who are employed, those with only one parent, and those who have no one else in the household (other than their parent(s)) are most likely to leave (see tables 15 and 16).

Nestleaving for Marriage

Marriage is closely associated with nestleaving and Goldscheider and DaVanzo (1989) have shown that the process of leaving home is. different for those who leave to get married and those who leave for other reasons. To study these differences, we have shown those who both leave and marry as a separate outcome in tables 17 and 18. This analysis is restricted to those who were not in college at the beginning of the interval and who were not already married at the beginning of the interval.

When the events of nestleaving and marriage are considered jointly, the higher rate of 'leaving for whites appears to be entirely due to higher marriage rates among white than other racial-ethnic groups. Those with college education are both more likely to leave the nest and more likely to get married around the time of leaving the nest.

Income and employment appear to have a particularly strong impact on the proportion of nestleaving involving marriage, although their impact on overall nestleaving is minor. Those with high incomes and those employed have significantly greater changes of nestleaving and marriage. Those who are unemployed who have mainly noninvestment income (mainly government transfers) are particularly unlikely to become married.

Family structure is an important determinant of whether or not marriage occurs at the time of leaving home. Not surprisingly, those living with two parents are more likely to leave home to marry than those with only one parent. Those with no nonrelatives in the household and those without children are also more likely to marry in conjunction with nestleaving, in spite of the fact that those persons are also more likely to be nestleavers.

Logistic Regression Results

Logistic regressions were run including the most important variables that had effects on nestleaving or nest returning. For both events, two sets of regressions were run, one with the duration variable and one without. Because including the duration variable reduces the number of cases by about 45 percent and may introduce some biases in the sample, we have shown two models for this subsample to enable the effects of duration to be separated from any effects of changes in the sample.

The results for nestleaving are shown in table 19. In general, the results for most variables are very similar in the three columns. Nestleaving increases with age to ages 22-24 and then declines at the highest ages. Males are slightly less likely to leave than females, although the effect is weak and only significant when all the cases are used. College graduates have the highest rates of leaving while those still in college have lowest rates.

The effects of income and employment are only significant for the full sample, although the pattern is the same in all three models. For those who are employed, rates of leaving increase with income. This suggests that while the ability to support oneself is a determinant of nestleaving, it is not as important as might have been expected. Those who are not employed, whether or not they receive welfare support, are less likely to leave home than those who are employed.

In all three models, other household income has a negative effect on nestleaving. The more the income of the parents, or other adults in the household, the less likely the young person is to leave.

As shown in the earlier tables, married persons with a spouse present are much more likely to leave than young adults with no family of their own. Those who have a child, but no spouse present have intermediate rates of nestleaving. Clearly, for this latter group, there may be some advantages of receiving help from the older generation.

Among racial groups, whites have the highest rate of nestleaving and blacks and other (largely Asians) have the lowest rates. Hispanics have intermediate rates.

Finaly, duration of residence has a very strong effect even when all the other variables are controlled. It appears that those children who have been away from their parents and return have a high chance of leaving again within the next year.

The logistic regression results for nest returning are shown in Table 20. Rates of return decline sharply with age. Those who leave before age 20 are very likely to return, while those who leave at age 25 or older are unlikely to return. Males are more likely to return than females.

The effects of education on returning to the nest are small. In general, the higher the level of education, the less likely one is to return. This correlates with the effects of income which are also negative. However, those without employment who receive welfare income are less likely to

return than whose who are not employed but lack such income or those who are employed, but lack such income or those who are employed, but have low income.

Having one's own family, especially a spouse, is a strong deterrent to returning to the nest. However, if one has a child, but no spouse, one is much more likely to return--in some models, almost as likely to return as person with no family of their own.

Unlike nestleaving, race has no significant effects on returning to the nest.

Finally, as shown earlier, the likelihood of returning to the nest is much higher during the first year away than during subsequent years.

CONCLUSIONS

We have shown that the SIPP survey can be used to measure changes in household composition for young Americans and that useful information can be obtained from examining household change from the prospective of the individual. However care must be exercised in this analysis. The treatment of attrition can affect the results. Those included in every wave of SIPP are not a random sample and tend to have fewer household changes than other sample individuals.

The particular focus of this report is the rate of leaving the household. The propensity to leave home steadily increases after age 15, with the peak number of moves at ages 20 to 21. The propensity to leave home is higher for women than men and men are more likely to return home if they have left. The rate of return movement to rejoin parents is sufficiently high that a simple count of out movement will distort the process.

Nestleaving represents a relatively small proportion of all household changes experienced by young Americans. Many of these changes involve movement of siblings, one of the parents or other persons in the households. Extrapolating the rates of household change to annual rates yields estimates that between one-third and one-half of all young adults experience a household change within a year, depending upon their age and sex. Although nestleaving is a small part of this total change, it does explain much of the peak in household changes at ages 20-21.

In examining the determinants of nest leaving and returning, we have generally supported the findings of previous studies about the importance of the parents' income, the young person's employment and income, their education and their marital status. However, the data from the SIPP have provided better measures of income and of the timing of events than previous studies. For example, we have seen that in the case of net returning that low income persons receiving welfare income are less likely to return to their parents than those with low income from employment or other sources.

Perhaps the most significant finding of this study is the frequency of short duration moves into and out of the parents' household. In a study which follows respondents every one or two years

and fails to collect intermediate residence data, most of these moves would not be observed. We do not know the extent to which these were planned absences and returns for specific ,,purposes and the extent to which they represent trial ventures out in the world which have failed. However, it would be possible to make some inferences from the detailed monthly data on income and employment available in SIPP. It would also be possible to look at experiences with marriage or cohabitation among the young people in the SIPP sample.

Further research should focus on some of the other forms of household change experienced by young adults and the relationship of one type of household change to other forms of change. The methodology which has been developed in this report, which focuses on changes in persons in the household who have specific relationships to the respondent, should facilitate this research. In addition, the detailed data on income and receipt of benefits which the SIPP provides at each wave will be useful in studying the changes in economic situation which relate to specific types of changes in household composition.

Further work with the SIPP would best be done with the 1985 or 1986 panels when the migration and marital history modules were asked at an earlier point in the panel. This would avoid the problem of missing duration of residence (or duration of marriage) for a significant part of the sample.

REFERENCES

BERK, Richard (1983), "An Introduction to Sample Selection Bias in Sociological Data," **American Sociological Review** 48, 386-397.

CITRO, Constance F. and H. W. Watts (1985), "Patterns of Household Composition and Family Status Change," SIPP Working Paper No. 8609, U.S. Bureau of the Census.

CITRO, Constance F., Donald J. Hernandez and Roger Herriot (1986), "Longitudinal Household Concepts in SIPP: Preliminary Results,". SIPP Working Paper No. 8611, U.S. Bureau of the Census.

CLARK, Rebecca and Alden Speare, Jr. (1988), "Measuring Geographical Mobility Using Panel Data from the SIPP," Proceedings of the Business and Economic Statistics Section, American Statistical Association, 376-381.

DAVANZO, Julie and Frances Goldscheider (1989), "Coming Home Again: Returns to the Nest in Young Adulthood," **Population Studies**, forthcoming.

DAVID, Martin H. (1988), "Changes in Marital Status and Well-Being: Transitions Measured in SIPP," Proceedings of the Social Statistics Section, American Statistical Association.

ELDER, Glenn (1975), "Age Differentiation in the Life Course," **Annual Review of Sociology** 1, 210-234.

ERNST, L. R. and D. W. Gillman (1988), "Excluding Sample That Misses Some Interviews from SIPP Longitudinal Estimates," Proceeding of the Section on Survey Research Methods, American Statistical Association, 348-353.

GLICK, P. and S. L. Lin (1986) "More Young Adults are Living with Their Parents: Who are They?" **Journal of Marriage and the Family** 48:1, 107-112.

GOLDSCHEIDER, Frances and Julie DaVanzo (1985), "Living Arrangements and the Transition to Adulthood," **Demography**, 22, 545-564.

GOLDSCHEIDER, Frances and Linda Waite (1987) "Nestleaving patterns and the transition to marriage for young men and women," **Journal of Marriage and the Family** 49, 507-516.

HECKMAN, J. (1979), "Sample Selection Bias as a Specification Error," **Econometrica**, 47, 153-161.

HERRIOT, R. A. and D. Kasprzyk (1986), "Some Aspects of SIPP." SIPP Working Paper No. 8601, U.S. Bureau of the Census.

HILL, M (1986), "Adolescent years with parents divorced or separated: effects on the social and economic attainments of children as adults," Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan. Final report for DHHS, Grant No. 94A-83.

HOGAN, D. (1978), "The Variable Order of 'Events in the Life Course," **American Sociological Review**, 43, 573-586.

JEAN, A. C. and E. K. McArthur (1984), "Some Data Collection Issues for Panel Surveys with Application to the Survey of Income and Program Participation," Proceeding of the Section on Survey Research Methods, American Statistical Association, 745-750.

JEAN, Anne C. and Edith K. McArthur (1987) , "Tracking Persons Over Time," SIPP Working Paper No. 8701, U.S. Bureau of the Census.

KOBRIN, Frances and Linda Waite (1984), "Effects of Family Stability on the Transition to Marriage," **Journal of Marriage and the Family**, 46, 807-816.

KOO, Helen (1985), "Short Term Change in Household and Family Structure," Proceedings of the Social Statistics Section, American Statistical Association, 333-338.

MCARTHUR, E. and K. S. Short (1985), "Characteristics of Sample Attrition in the Survey of Income and Program Participation," in Bureau of the Census, Proceedings of the Section on Survey Research Methods, American Statistical Association, 366-369.

MCLANAHAN, S. (1985), "Family structure and the reproduction of poverty," **American Journal of Sociology**, 90, 873-901.

MARINI, Margaret (1984), "Age and Sequencing Norms in the Transition to Adulthood," **Social Forces**, 63, 229-244.

MARINI, Margaret (1987), "Measuring the Process of Role Change During the Transition to Adulthood," **Social Science Research** 16, 1-38.

RICHARDS, T., M. J. White, and A. 0. Tsui (1987) "Changing Living Arrangements: A Hazard Model of Transitions Among Household Types," **Demography** 24, 77-97.

RINDFUSS, R., C. Swicegood, and R. Rosenfeld (1987), "Disorder in the Life Course: How Common and Does it Matter?" **American Sociological Review**, 52, 785-801.

RUGGLES, Patricia (1987), "Transitions In and Out of Poverty: New Data from the Survey of Income and Program Participation," SIPP Working Paper No. 8716, U.S. Bureau of the Census.

SHAW, L. (1982), "High school completion of young women," **Journal of Family Issues**, 3(2), 147-163.

SWEET, James, Larry Bumpass and Virginia Call (1988), “The Design and Content of the National Survey of Families NSFH Working Paper No. 1, Center for Demography University of Wisconsin, Madison.

U.S. Bureau of the Census (1987), "Money Income and Status of Families and Persons in the United States, 1986,” **Current Population Reports Series** P-60, no.157.

WATTS, Harold (1987), "The Dynamics of Children’s Home Environments," Proceedings of the Social Statistics Section, American Statistical Association, 10-16

WHITE, Michael and A. O. Tsui (1986), :A Panel Study of Family-Level Structural Change,” **Journal of Marriage and the Family**, 48 (May), 435-446

WILSON, W. J. and K. Neckerman (1985), "Poverty and Family Structure: The Widening Gap Between Evidence and Public Policy Issues,” Revised version of a paper presented at the Institute for Research on Poverty Conference, “Poverty and Policy: Retrospect and Prospects,” Williamsburg, VA.

TABLE 1

Counts of Household Changes During Year One for Persons 15 to 29 Who Were Interviewed in all Waves* (unweighted)

A. Changes in Living with Parents

	Joined Parents	Left Parents of	Number Cases	Entry Rate	Exit Rate
Net change wave 1 to wave 4	174	689	11084	1.57%	6.22%
All changes between waves	305	820	11084	2.75%	7.40%

B. Changes in Living with Spouse**

	Joined Spouse	Left Spouse of	Number Cases	Entry Rate	Exit Rate
Net change wave 1 to wave 4	423	164	11084	3.82%	1.48%
All changes between waves	474	215	11084	4.28%	1.94%

* For those in rotation group 4, these are waves 1, 3, 4 and 5.
** Includes both marriages and returns from temporary absences.

Table 2
Comparison of Rates of Household Change for Persons 15 to 29
By Interview Status, all 9 Waves (unweiglited)

A. Changes in Living with Parents

Interview Status	Joined Parents	Left Parents	Number of Cases#	Entry Rate	Exit Rate
Interviewed in all waves	548	1,265	57,295	0.96%	2.21%
Planned attrition*	74	174	6,486	1.14%	2.68%
Missing some, but interviewed in wave 9	75	147	5,527	1.36%	2.66%
Missing waves, incl. 9	123	214	7,326	1.68%	2.91%
Left interviewed house-hold, not interviewed**	67	381	915	7.32%	41.64%
Total	887	2,181	77,549	1.14%	2.81%

B. Changes in Living with Spouse

Interview Status	Joined Parents	Left Parents	Number of Cases#	Entry Rate	Exit Rate
Interviewed in all waves	860	368	57,295	1.50%	0.64%
Planned attrition*	87	49	6,486	1.34%	0.76%
Missing some, but Interviewed in wave 9	97	59	5,527	1.76%	1.07%
Missing waves, incl. 9	104	66	7,326	1.42%	0.90%
Left interviewed house-hold, not interviewed**	38	84	915	4.15%	9.18%
Total	1,186	626	77,549	1.53%	0.81%

C. Changes in Household Size

Interview Status	Size Increased	Size Decreased	Number of Cases #	Entry Rate**	Exit Rate
Interviewed in all waves	3,837	3,903	57,295	6.70%	6.81%
Planned attrition*	514	621	6,486	7.92%	9.57%
Missing some, but interviewed in wave 9	472	442	5,527	8.54%	8.00%
Missing waves, incl. 9	590	686	7,326	8.05%	9.36%
Left interviewed house-hold, not interviewed**	137	631	915	14.97%	68.96%
Total	5,550	6,283	77,549	7.16%	8.10%

Source: Tabulations from the 1984 Panel of SIPP, all persons aged 15 to 29 at beginning of interval and with a nonzero weight in wave 1.

* Persons included in the 17 percent sample reduction in waves 5 and 6 .

** Includes persons with SIPP ACCESS presence code of 5 to 8 in either the beginning wave or the end wave.

\# Number of cases is inflated to represent the number of 4 month periods of observation for those with missing waves, up to a maximum of 3.

Table 3
Rates of Household Change by Panel Year for Persons 17 to 29
(Rates per four month interval, weighted

	Panel Year			
	First	Second	Third	Total
Change in Household Size				
Percent with increase	7.7	7.8	6.3	7.5
Percent with decrease	9.7	8.2	7.0	8.6
Change in Living with Parents				
Joined Parents	1.3	1.4	1.0	1.3
Left Parents	3.4	3.2	2.7	3.2
Change in Living with Spouse				
Joined Spouse (or married)	1.7	1.9	1.5	1.8
Left Spouse	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.9
Periods of Observation:				
Unweighted Number	32,539	23,786		10,63866,963
Weighted Number	164,569	154,364	74,024	392,957

Source: Tabulations of SIPP 1984 Panel.

Note: The first year includes the intervals between waves 1 and 4 (or 1 and 5 for rotation group 4). The second year includes the next three intervals. The sample has been adjusted to include only persons aged 17 to 29 during the year.

Table 4
Rates for Leaving and Joining Households Containing Parents for Persons
17 to 29 by Age and Sex (based on four month intervals, weighted).

Changes Calculated as Percentage of All Persons

	Age Group					
	15 - 17	18 - 19	20 - 21	22 - 24	25 - 29	All ages
			Percentage Joining Parents			
Males	0.3	1.3	1.9	1.6	1.1	1.2
Females	0.4	1.4	2.0	1.6	0.9	1.2
Both	0.3	1.3	1.9	1.6	1.0	1.2
			Percentage Leaving Parents			
Males	0.9	4.2	5.2	4.3	2.0	2.9
Females	1.6	4.5	5.0	3.6	1.6	2.8
Both	1.2	4.3	5.1	3.9	1.8	2.9

Changes Calculated as Percentage of Eligible Persons

			Percentage Joining Parents			
Males	7.2	10.4	6.8	3.0	1.4	2.6
Females	6.7	7.2	4.9	2.3	1.0	2.1
Both	6.9	8.4	5.6	2.6	1.2	2.3
			Percentage Leaving Parents			
Males	1.0	4.8	7.2	9.4	9.9	5.3
Females	1.7	5.5	8.4	11.6	12.5	6.2
Both	1.3	5.2	7.7	10.3	11.0	5.7

Source Tabulations of SIPP 1984 Panel. See Table Al for base numbers.
Note: Persons eligible for joining parents are all persons who were not living with a parent in the previous wave. Persons eligible for leaving parents were living with a parent in the previous wave.

Table 5
Rates for Leaving and Joining Households Containing Spouse for 15 to 29 by Age and Sex (based on four month intervals, weighted).

	Age Group					
	15 - 17	18 - 19	20 - 21	22 -24	25 - 29	All Ages
Changes Calculated as Percentage of All Persons						
Percentage Joining Spouse *						
Males	0.1	0.9	1.5	2.2	1.8	1.4
Females	0.6	1.9	2.3	2.4	1.6	1.7
Both	0.3	1.4	1.9	2.3	1.7	1.5
Percentage Leaving Spouse						
Males	0.0	0.1	0.5	0.7	1.1	0.6
Females	0.1	0.4	0.8	1.1	1.4	0.9
Both	0.1	0.3	0.7	0.9	1.2	0.7
Changes Calculated as Percentage of Eligible Persons						
Percentage Joining Spouse*						
Males	0.1	0.9	1.7	3.0	3.7	1.8
Females	0.6	2.1	2.9	4.2	3.9	2.6
Both	0.3	1.5	2.3	3.5	3.8	2.2
Percentage Leaving Spouse						
Males	**	4.8	4.4	2.7	2.0	2.4
Females	4.0	3.8	3.7	2.5	2.3	2.5
Both	4.9	4.0	3.9	2.6	2.2	2.5

Source: Tabulations of SIPP 1984 Panel. See Table A1 for base numbers.
Note: Persons eligible for joining parent are all persons who were not living with a parent in the previous wave. Persons eligible for leaving parents were living with a parent in the previous wave.
* While most of these are new marriages, they also include those married, spouse absent who return to living with their spouse.
** Fewer than 50 unweighted cases in denominator.

Table 6

Percentages Experiencing a Change in Household Size Among Persons 15 to 29 by Age and Sex (based on four month intervals, weighted).

	Age Group					
	15 - 17	18 - 19	20 - 21	22 - 24	25 - 29	All ages
Males	12.5	16.8	18.5	19.1	14.7	15.9
Females	14.3	18.1	19.2	17.8	12.4	15.5
Both	13.4	17.5	18.9	18.4	13.5	15.7

Source: Tabulations of SIPP 1984 Panel. See Table Al for base numbers.

Table 7
Proportion of Nestleavers Within Four Months, by Age, Sex, Race, Education, Duration, Income, and Employment, SIPP 1984 Panel.

	Males				Females			
Age	18-19	20-21	22-24	25-29	18-19	20-21	22-24	25-29
All Cases	.048	.072	.094	.099	.055	.084	.116	.125
Race/Hispanic								
White not Hispanic	.048	.074	.101	.103	.059	.090	.127	.126
Black not Hispanic	.049	.078	.072	.082	.037	.064	.088	.132
Hispanic	.064	.055	(.108)	(.137)	.075	.081	.109	(.086)
Other	(.000)	(.023)	(.036)	(.064)	(.030)	(.044)	(.074)	(.161)
Education								
< High School	.058	.086	.084	.100	.084	.124	.166	.088
High School Grad.	.067	.083	.106	.082	.070	.116	.113	.137
Some College	.024	.060	.085	.102	.036	.067	.094	.126
College Graduate	(-)	(-)	.105	.137	(-)	(-)	.152	.124
College Attendance								
No College	.063	.086	.104	.097	.082	.123	.125	.126
To College	.056	(.107)	-0.083	(.173)	.04	(.092	(.120)	(.081)
From College	.052	.117	.175	(.137)	.090	.137	.197	(.171)
In College entire time	.017	.036	.041	.072	.020	.036	.060	.109
Duration with Parents (Based on waves 4 to 8 only)								
< 1 Year	(.154)	.213)	(.173)	(.199)	(.282)	(.321)	(.238)	(.187)
1 or more Years	.036	.054	.083	.076	.046	.068	.092	.099
Employment and Income								
Not emp., welfare inc.	(.056)	(.067)	(.043)	(.074)	.049	.133	.119	.113
Other not employed	.037	.056	.080	.066	.039	.061	.096	.115
Emp., inc. < $500/mo.	.048	.065	.079	.099	.052	.067	.145	.172
Emp., inc. $500-800	.057	.068	.084	.102	.086	.102	.090	.118
Emp., inc. $800-1200	.050	.106	.108	.111	.068	.104	.125	.115
Emp., inc. > $1200	(.048)	.070	.123	.102	(-)	(.117)	.132	.121
Other Household Income								
< $800 per mo.	.061	.090	.108	.090	.061	.090	.108	.090
$800-1600 per mo.	.066	.069	.086	.083	.051	.113	.119	.128
$1600-2400 per mo.	.047	.080	.085	.117	.070	.089	.090	.138
> $2400 per mo.	.036	.061	.092	.097	.043	.067	.114	.119
> $2400 per mo.	.043	.067	.114	.119				

Based on all those living with parents at the beginning of Wave
All Waves, Weighted,, See Notes to Table 3.
(-) Not computed, fewer than 50 cases, (.000) fewer than 200 cases.

Table 8
Proportion of Nestleavers Within Four Months by Age, Sex, and Family Structure, SIPP 1984 Panel.

	Males					Females			
Age	18-19	20-21	22-24	25-29		18-19	20-21	22-24	25-29
All Cases	.048	.072	.094	.099		.055	.084	.116	.128
Number of Parents									
-One	.059	.095	.107	.094		.070	.101	.128	.130
-Two	.044	.064	.090	.102		.050	.078	.112	.123
Number of Siblings									
- None	.056	.073	.103	.119		.080	.098	.138	.132
- One	.042	.080	.091	.065		.051	.078	.101	.104
- Two or More	.049	.063	.088	.104		.048	.080	.111	.133
Presence of Own Family									
Neither Child nor Spouse	.046	.067	.090	.088		.049	.070	.101	.102
Child - Only	-	-	-	-		.071	.144	.170	.152
Both Child and Spouse	(-)	(.245)	(.241)	(.219)		(.237)	(.303)	(.217)	.156
Change in Spouse ?									
No Spouse in Period	.042	.059	.058	.072		.038	.056	.085	.086
Join Spouse in Period (-)	(-)	(.864)	(.858)		(.822)	(.873)	(.904)	(.937)	
Spouse Beginning & End	(-)	(.264)	(. 306)	(.201)		(.307)	(.270)	(.224)	.138
Others in Household #									
None	.047	.072	.095	.098		.050	.080	.120	.114
One or More	.057	.068	.090	.104		.087	.108	.102	.186

Based on all those living with parents at the beginning of Wave
All Waves, Weighted.
(-) Not computed, fewer than 50 cases; (.000) fewer than 200 cases.

Table 9
Proportion of Nestleavers Within Four Months, by Presence of Own Family, Age, Sex, Race, Education, and Household Structure, SIPP 1984 Panel.

	Males				Females			
Age	18-19	20-21	22-24	25-29	18-19	20-21	22-24	25-29
All Cases	.048	.072	.094	.099	.055	.08	.116	.125
Without Own Family	.046	.067	.090	.088	.049	.070	.101	.102
With Own Family	(-)	(.263)	(.276)	(.218)	.120	.182	.183	.163
Without Own Family								
Race/Hispanic								
White not Hispanic	.046	.070	.097	.091	.052	.080	.0114	.105
Black not Hispanic	.047	.073	.070	.082	.030	.032	.060	.114
Hispanic	.060	.056	.095	.092	.075	(.051)	(.091)	.056
Other Races not Hispanic	(.000)	(.024)	(.027)	(.034)	(.009)	(.025)	(.029)	(.075)
Education								
Less than High School .054	.084	.072	.072	.074	.091	.081	.050	
High School Graduate .064	.074	.101	.073	.063	.092	.089	.092	
Some College	.023	.059	.083	.091	.033	.063	.090	.097
College Graduate	(-)	(-)	.101	.128	(-)	(-)	.145	.132
Sibs Present								
- None	.049	.063	.093	.099	.066	.073	.124	.114
- One	.041	.078	.088	.059	.046	.072	.083	.088
- Two or More	.048	.061	.088	.105	.044	.068	.099	.100
Others in Household								
None	.046	.068	.091	.089	.046	.071	.105	.095
One or More	.047	.063	.080	.078	.069	.064	.079	(.166)

Based on all those living with parents at the beginning of wave.
All Waves, weighted.
(-) Not computed, fewer than 50 cases; (.000) Fewer than 200 cases.

Table 9 (Cont'd)

With Own Family

	Males					Females		
Age	18-19	20-21	22-24	25-29	18-19	20-21	22-24	25-29
Race/Hispanic								
White not Hispanic	*	*	*	*	(.201)	.223	.214	.177
Black not Hispanic	*	*	*	*	(.055)	(.132)	(.144)	.143
Hispanic	*	*	*	*	(-)	(-)	(.168)	(.108)
Education								
Less than High School *	*	*	*	.102	.141	.230	.108	
High School Graduate *	*	*	*	(.156)	(.225)	(.165)	.187	
Some College	*	*	*	*	(.103)	(.199)	(.134)	(.180)
Sibs Present								
- None	*	*	*	*	(.182)	(.196)	(.190)	.151
- One	*	*	*	*	(.155)	(.157)	(.213)	(.152)
- Two or More	*	*	*	*	(.079)	(.181)	(.150)	(.215)
Others in Household								
None	*	*	*	*	.108	.175	.206	.151
One or More	*	*	*	*	(.137)	(.196)	.139	.198

Based on all those living with parents at the beginning of Wave
All Waves, Weighted.
Footnotes; * not computed, (-) less than 50 cases,
(.000) less than 200 cases, # Not Parent, Sib, Spouse or Child.

Table 10
Proportion of Those Returning to Parents Within Four Months, by Age, Sex, Race, Duration, Income, and Employment, SIPP 1984 Panel.

	Males				Females		
Age	20-21	22-24	25-29		20-21	22-24	25-29
All Cases	.068	.030	.014		.049	.023	.010
Race/Hispanic							
White not Hispanic	.077	.031	.012		.053	.020	.008
Black not Hispanic	.059	.032	.025		.027	.045	.018
Hispanic	(.024)	.027	.015		(.043)	.027	.012
Other Races not Hispanic	(-)	(-)	.008		(-)	(.019)	.028
Education							
Less than High School .092	.037	.022		.046	.026	.010	
High School Graduate .066	.028	.012		.036	.016	.012	
Some College	.064	.029	.014		.066	.031	.011
College Graduate	(-)	.028	.012		(-)	.022	.004
College Attendance							
None	.071	.030	.013		.042	.019	.009
To College	(.038)	(.036)	.019		(.043)	.050	.024
From College	(.094)	.032	.025		(.087)	.034	.015
College Beginning and End	.058	.023	.017		.075	.043	.014
Duration Away from Parents (Based on waves 4 to 8 Only)							
< 1 Year	.113	.077	.061		.105	.070	.059
1 or more years	.036	.016	.008		.031	.013	.008
Employment and Income							
Not emp., welfare inc. (.055)	(. 036)	.042		(.036)	(. 031)	(.016)	
Other not employed	(.072)	(.030)	.057		.043	.015	.011
Emp., income < $500/mo.	.103	.050	.037		.053	.016	.014
Emp., income $500-800	.079	.041	.021		.049	.024	.008
Emp., income $800-1200	.078	.031	.015		.064	.017	.014
Emp., income > $1200	.041	.025	.009		(-)	.028	.006
Other Household Income							
Living Alone	.116	.051	.025		.095	.064	.013
< $800 per mo.	.051	.025	.012		.042	.028	.015
$800-1600 per mo.	.097	.027	.012		.035	.015	.009
$1600-2400 per mo.	(.076)	.040	.008		.055	.013	.011
> $2400 per mo.	(.048)	.030	.038		(.054)	.018	.006

Based on all those not living with parents at beginning of Wave.
All Waves, Weighted, (-) not computed, fewer than 50 cases. (.000) fewer than 200 cases

Table 11
Proportion of Those Returning to Parents Within Four Months, by Age, Sex, and Family Structure, SIPP 1984 Panel.

	Males				Females			
Age	18-19	20-21	22-24	25-29	18-19	20-21	22-24	25-29
All Cases	.104	.068	.03	.014	.072	.049	.023	.010
Presence of Own Family								
Neither Child nor Spouse	.108	.079	.044	.023	.096	.083	.051	.014
Spouse Only	(-)	.037	.009	.004	.043	.019	.008	.006
Child Only	(-)	(-)	(-)	(.040)	(.065)	.050	.025	.016
Both Child & Spouse	(.095)	.055	.016	.010	.056	.031	.011	.008
Change of Spouse ?								
No Spouse in Period	.110	.082	.046	.024	.090	.076	.046	.015
Join Spouse in Period (-)	(-)	(.010)	(.014)	(-)	(-)	(.000)	(.014)	
Leave Spouse in Period	(-)	(-)	(.181)	(.123)	(-)	(-)	(.144)	(.131)
Spouse Beginning & End	(.062)	.030	.008	.006	.040	.016	.006	.004
Others in Household #								
None	.144	.066	.024	.011	.066	.037	.019	.009
One or More	.083	.070	.041	.025	.082	.076	.037	.016

Based on all those not living with parents at beginning of Wave.
All Waves, Weighted.
Notes: (-) not computed, fewer than 50 cases. (.000) fewer than 200 cases.
Others in addition to parent, sibling, spouse or child.

Table 12
Proportion of Those Returning to Parents Within Four Months, Family and Age, Sex, Race and Education, SIPP.

	Males				Females			
Age	18-19	20-21	22-24	25-29	18-19	20-21	2-24	25-29
All Cases	.104	.068	.030	.014	.072	.049	.023	.010
Without Own Family	.108	.079	.044	.023	.096	.083	.051	.014
With Own Family	(.085)	.048	.013	.008	.053	.030	.012	.609
Without Own Family								
Race/Hispanic								
White not Hispanic	.142	.099	.048	.021	.089	.092	.043	.012
Black not Hispanic	(.057)	.047	.039	.032	(.081)	(.041)	(.090)	.030
Hispanic	(.056)	(.010)	(.027)	(.025)	(-)	(-)	(.099)	(.019)
Education								
Less than High School (.132)	(.112)	.056	.040	(.141)	(.046)	(.099)	(.021)	
High School Graduate .094)	.070	.048	.020	(.083)	.074	.044	.023	
Some College	(.107)	.078	.044	.025	(.090)	.096	.063	.018
College Graduate	(-)	(-)	.034	.018	(-)	(-)	.036	.001
Others in Household #								
None	(.184)	.109	.049	.020	(.184)	.109	.049	.020
One or More	.086	.064	.042	.026	.086	.064	.042	.026
With Own Family								
Race/Hispanic								
White not Hispanic	.063	.042	.013	.008	.050	.031	.011	.007
Black not Hispanic	(-)	(-)	(.011)	.015	(.016)	(.021)	.027	(.015)
Hispanic	(-)	(-)	(.026)	.011	(.097)	(.032)	.012	.011
Education								
Less than High School (-)	(.055)	.020	.016	.065	.046	.020	.010	
High School Graduate (061)	.061	.014	.009	.039	.022	.009	.010	
Some College	(-)	(.018)	.008	.007	(.007)	.030	.015	.009
College Grad	(-)	(-)	.011	.001	(-)	(-)	.004	.005
Others in Household								
None	.096	.037	.012	.008	.051	.024	.012	.009
One or More	(-)	(-)	.033	.016	(.071)	(.75)	.012	.013

Based on all those not living with parents at beginning of Wave.
All Waves, Weighted.
Notes; (-) not computed, fewer than 50 cases, (.000) fewer than 200 cases.
Not Parent, Sibling, Spouse or Child.

Table 13
Proportion of Nestleavers Within Four Months, by Age, Sex, Race, Education, Duration, Income. and Employment, SIPP 1984 Panel, Those Not in College

	Males				Females			
Age	18-19	20-21	22-24	25-29	18-19	20-21	22-24	25-29
All Cases	.061	.086	.099	.098	.073	.118	.123	.124
Race/Hispanic								
White not Hispanic	.064	.094	.110	.098	.082	.134	.136	.127
Black not Hispanic	.049	.078	.071	.089	.039	.082	.096	.128
Hispanic	(.081)	(.054)	(.113)	(.159)	(.100)	(.097)	(.106)	(.084)
Other Races not Hispanic	(.000)	(.029)	(.052)	(.048)	(.054)	(-)	(.087)	(.146)
Education								
Less than High School .057	.081	.082	.093	.080	.124	.158	.088	
High School Graduate .064	.081	.101	.080	.069	.113	.112	.137	
Some College	.037	.102	.100	.109	(.096)	.125	.092	.123
College Graduate	--	--	.126	.143	--	--	.164	.118
Employment and Income								
Not emp., welfare inc. .046	.058	.075	.068	.058	.119	.113	.117	
Other not employed	(.074)	(.072)	(.039)	(.65)	.064	(.153)	(.124)	(.118)
Emp., income < $500/mo.	.063	.093	.108	.101	.074	.102	.184	(.179)
Emp., income $500-800	.076	.084	.093	.102	.099	.120	.092	.104
Emp., income $800-1200	(.058)	.120	.103	.113	(.078)	(.111)	.123	.119
Emp., income > $1200	(.064)	.072	.127	.102	(-)	(.127)	(.119)	.121
Other Household Income								
< $800 per mo.	.066	.091	.102	.084	.094	.138	.185	.118
$800-1600 per mo.	.073	.075	.088	.086	.057	.122	.119	.131
$1600-2400 per mo.	.060	.089	.097	.116	.084	.104	.092	.129
> $2400 per mo.	.053	.088	.105	.102	.069	.116	.119	.119
> $2400 per mo.	.069	.116	.119	.119				

Based on all those living with parents at the beginning of Wave
All Waves, Weighted.
Not computed, fewer than 50 cases; (.000) fewer than 200 cases.

Table 14
Proportion of Nestleavers Within Four Months by Age, Sex, and Family Structure
SIPP 1984 Panel, Those Not in College

	Males				Females			
Age	18-19	20-21	22-24	25-29	18-19	20-21	22-24	25-29
All Cases	.061	.086	.099	.098	.073	.118	.123	.124
Number of Parents in HH								
One Parent	.059	.102	.105	.085	.078	.119	.139	.127
Two Parents	.061	.079	.097	.106	.072	.118	.116	.121
Number of Siblings in HH								
- None	.072	.084	.116	.119	.098	.136	.140	.133
- One	.054	.099	.094	.065	.069	.122	.116	.098
- Two	.063	.054	.105	.093	.062	.113	.118	.128
- Three or More	.057	.106	.070	.099	.072	.096	.112	.129
Presence of Own Family								
Neither Child nor Spouse	.056	.079	.094	.086	.066	.098	.102	.100
Child Only	*	*	*	*	.073	.149	.173	.142
Spouse Present	*	(.285)	(.282)	(.211)	(.279)	(.276)	(.228)	.180
Others in Household								
None	.059	.085	.101	.098	.070	.117	.128	.112
One or More	.069	.089	.092	.097	.092	.122	.104	.179

Based on all those living with parents at the beginning-of Wave.
All Waves, Weighted.
(-) Not computed, fewer than 50 cases; (.000) fewer than 200 cases.
Others in addition to parents, siblings, spouse of children.

Table 15
Proportion of Nestleavers Within Four Months, by Age, Race, Education, Duration, Income, and Employment, SIPP, In College at Beginning

	Males				Females		
Age	18-19	20-21	22-24	25-29	18-19	20-21	22-24
All Cases	.022	.047	.074	.090	.030	.051	.100
Race/Hispanic							
White not Hispanic	.022	.047	.078	.110	.031	.055	.109
Black not Hispanic	(.041)	(.070)	(.061)	(.028)	(.024)	(.034)	(.056)
Hispanic	(.011)	(.048)	--	--	(.032)	(.052)	(.116)
Other	(.000)	(.019)	--	--	(.000)	.007	--
Education							
Undergraduate	.022	.038	.062	.093	.029	.047	.076
Graduate	--	(.111)	.082	.087	--	.075	.125
Employment and Income							
Not emp., welfare inc. .023	.055	.086	(.061)	.020	.035	.081	
Emp., income < $500/mo.	.027	.046	.049	(.090)	.032	.049	.105
Emp., income $500-800	.010	.035	.063	(.097	.052	.074	(.085)
Emp., income $800-1200	(.024)	(.052)	(.136)	(.102)	--	(.086)	(.136)
Emp., income > $1200	--	--	(.094)	(.094)	--	--	--
Other Household Income							
< $800 per mo.	(.037)	(.086)	(.134)	--	(.030)	(.036)	(.066)
$800-1600 per mo.	(.046)	(.052)	(.074)	(.055)	.038	(.097)	(.118)
$1600-2400 per mo.	.020	.065	(.045)	(.125)	.049	.070	(.086)
>$2400 per mo.	.017	.038	.074	.079	.024	.041	.105

Based on all those living with parents at the beginning of Wave
All Waves, Weighted.
(--)Not computed, fewer than 50 cases; (.000) Fewer than 200 cases.

Table 16
Proportion of Nestleavers Within Four Months by Age, Sex, and Family Structure
Those In College at Beginning of Period

	Males				Females		
Age	18-19	20-21	22-24	25-29	18-19	20-21	22-24
All Cases	.022	.047	.074	.090	.030	.051	.100
Number of Parents in HH							
One Parent	.048	(.071)	(.100)	(.160)	.047	.075	(.081)
Two Parents	.017	.042	.070	.073	.025	.045	.104
Number of Siblings in HH							
- None	.025	.051	.058	(.101)	.054	.058	.129
- One	.023	.055	.080	(.056)	.031	.044	.070
- Two	.017	.036	(.095)	(.119)	.019	.056	(.118)
- Three or More	(.022)	(.035)	(.070)	-	.014	.052	(.080)
Others in Household							
None	.023	.050	.076	.084	.027	.049	.102
One or More	(.016)	(.013)	(.054)	--	(.057)	(.071)	(.076)

Based on all those living with parents at the beginning of Wave
All Waves, Weighted,
(--) Not computed, fewer than 50 cases; (.000) fewer than 200 cases.
Others in household in addition to parents, siblings, spouse and children.

Table 17
Proportion of All Nestleavers and Nestleavers who Become Married I)y Characteristics
Those Not in College and Not Married at Beginning of Four Month Interval

					Males			
		All					Married	
Age	18-19	20-2	22-24	25-29	18-19	20-21	22-24	25-29
All Cases	.058	.079	.093	.087	.005	.010	.026	.020
Race/Hispanic								
White not Hispanic	.060	.085	.103	.088	.007	.012	.033	.025
Black not Hispanic	.047	.071	.069	.088	.000	.007	.004	.006
Hispanic	(.076)	(.056)	(.098)	(.121)	(.005)	(.007)	(.041)	(.013)
Other Races not Hispanic	(.000)	(.030)	(.041)	(.000)	(.000)	(.000)	(.000)	(.000)
Education								
Less than High School .053	.080	.069	.072	.004	.004	.021	.013	
High School Graduate .061	.071	.096	.075	.005	.015	.028	.013	
Some College	(.034)	.097	.097	.093	(.010)	.002	.025	.027
College Graduate	--	--	.121	.135	--	--	.032	.039
Employment and Income								
Not emp., welfare inc. .045	.049	.069	.066	.001	.002	.005	.006	
Other not employed	(.074)	(.064)	(.030)	(.054)	(.009)	(.005)	(.006)	(.000)
Emp., income < $ 500/mo.	.060	.089	.102	.084	.004	.012	.018	(.000)
Emp., income $500-800	.068	.080	.086	.085	.006	.007	.020	0.016
Emp., income $800-1200	(.055)	.103	.099	.106	(.011)	.016	.038	.025
Emp., income > $1200	(.064)	.074	.120	.093	(.039)	.022	.045	.038
Other Household Income								
< $800 per mo.	.060	.077	.089	.072	.008	.011	.024	.002
$800-1600 per mo.	.072	.064	.080	.073	.003	.002	.026	.014
$1600-2400 per mo.	.057	.082	.095	.101	.006	.016	.027	.042
> $2400 per mo.	.050	.086	.100	.094	.004	.012	.027	.019

Table 17 (Cont'd)

Females

	Al 1				Married			
Age	18-19	20-21	22-24	25-29	18-19	20-21	22-24	25-29
All Cases	.067	.105	.114	.113	.017	.037	.033	.033
Race/Hispanic								
White not Hispanic	.073	.123	.124	.117	.020	.048	.038	.040
Black not Hispanic	.040	.066	.093	.131	.003	.010	.015	.005
Hispanic	(.107)	(.068)	(.098)	(.042)	(.040)	(.020)	(.041)	(.000)
Other Races not Hispanic	(.035)	--	--	--	(.000)	--	--	--
Education								
Less than High School .068	(.097)	(.131)	(.082)	.008	(.014)	(.013)	(.005)	
High School Graduate .064	.102	.107	.121	.019	.040	.034	.031	
Some College	(.092)	.114	.083	.103	(.034)	.046	.024	.026
College Graduate	--	--	.159	.126	--	--	.052	.058
Employment and Income								
Not emp., welfare inc. .051	(.088)	(.091)	(.104)	.010	(.018)	(.016)	(.056)	
Other not employed	(.052)	(.136)	(.116)	(.118)	(.006)	(.022)	(.030)	(.011)
Emp., income < $500/mo.	.067	.079	.163	(.149)	.014	.025	.032	(.032)
Emp., income $500-800	.098	.117	.084	.096	.039	.050	.027	.035
Emp., income $800-1200	(.060)	(.107)	.122	.111	(.012)	(.051)	.047	.030
Emp., income > $1200	--	(.136)	(.127)	.117	--	(.070)	(.039)	.038
Other Household Income								
.< $800 per mo.	.091	(.121)	(.178)	.110	.018	(.005)	(.047)	.013
$800-1600 per mo.	.052	.111	.106	.131	.015	.049	.017	.048
$1600-2400 per mo.	.079	.075	.090	.112	.021	.023	.032	.042
> $2400 per mo.	.060	.111	.109	.105	.017	.051	.035	.028

Based on all those living with parents at the beginning of Wave
All Waves, Weighted.
(--) Not computed, fewer than 50 cases; (.000) fewer thin 200 cases.

Table 18
Proportion of All Nestleavers and Nestleavers who Become Married by Family Structure, Those Not in College and Not Married at Beginning of Interval

Males

	All				Married			
Age	18-19	20-21	22-24	25-29	18-19	20-21	22-24	25-29
All Cases .058	.079	.093	.087	.005	.010	.026	.020	
Number of Parents in HH								
One Parent	.057	.092	.099	.070	*.002*	.010	.025	.010
Two Parents	.058	.073	.091	.097	.007	.010	.026	.025
Number of Siblings in HH								
- None	.059	.067	.102	.103	.003	.007	.030	.024
- One	.054	.096	.090	.060	.008	.019	.033	.012
- Two	.061	.048	.105	.095	.004	.009	.018	.030
- Three or More	.058	-.108	.067	(.093)	.004	.003	.017	(.016)
Others in Household								
None	.058	.078	.096	.089	.006	.010	.029	.021
One or More	.056	.082	.080	.079	.000	.010	.014	.012

Females

	All				Married			
Age	18-19	20-21	22-24	25-29	18-19	20-21	22-24	25-29
All Cases	.067	.105	.114	.113	.017	.037	.033	.033
Number of Parents in HH								
One Parent	.076	.107	.131	.116	.010	.031	.027	.011
Two Parents	.063	.104	.107	.112	.020	.040	.035	.044
Number of Siblings in HH								
- None	.080	.098	.127	.121	.017	.043	.047	.042
- One	.064	.123	.100	.100	.022	.030	.024	.025
- Two	.063	.103	.116	(.106)	.016	.046	.035	.035
- Three or More	.067	.087	.116	(.127)	.014	.034	.021	.015
Presence of Own Family Child	.016	.097	.103	.100	.018	.040	.030	.035
No Child	.076	.142	.162	.147	.012	.022	.044	.027
Others in Household #								
None	.066	.105	.117	.102	.018	.042	.038	.034
One or More	.074	.105	.103	.164	.012	.015	.008	.026

See notes to Table 17.

Table 19
Logistic Regression for Nestleaving, Ages 18-29

Independent Variables		Left Parents in 4 month interval: All Cases		Cases with Duration Measured: Model 1		Model 2	
Intercept		-1.953	***	-2.020	***	-1.792	***
Age:			***		***		***
18-19		-0.287		-0.286		-0.247	
20-21		0.069		0.094		0.109	
22-24		0.196		0.226		0.189	
25-29		0.022		-0.034		-0.051	
Sex:			*		***		**
Male		-0.052		-0.107		-0.102	
Female		0.052		0.107		0.102	
Education:			***		***		***
High School or less		-0.009		0.01		0.022	
Currently in college		-0.601		-0.602		-0.577	
Some College		0.065		0.024		0.007	
In college beyond 4 yrs		0.170		0.191		0.177	
College Grad.		0.375		0.370		0.371	
Employment and Income:			***		**		**
Not emp., welfare inc.	-0.164		-0.206		-0.199		
Other not employed		-0.194		-0.238		-0.212	
Emp., income < $ 500/mo.		0.049		-0.035		-0.028	
Emp., income $500-800		0.053		0.088		0.067	
Emp., income $800-1200		0.147		0.192		0.186	
Emp., income > $1200		0.109		0.199		0.186	
Other Household Income:			***		**		
no income	0.298		0.483		0.253		
< $ 800 per mo.		0.070		0.036		0.040	
$ 800-1600 per mo.		-0.106		-0.114		-0.074	
$ 1600-2400 per mo.		-0.054		-0.138		-0.070	
> $ 2400 per mo.		-0.208		-0.267		-0.149	
Own Family?			***		***		***
no		-0.648		-0.562		-0.421	
Spouse (may have child)		0.587		0.542		0.384	
Child(ren) only		0.061		0.020		0.037	

Table 19 (Con't)

Race / Ethnicity:		***		***		**
White	0.334		0.297		0.249	
Black	-0.038		0.003		0.025	
Other	-0.489		-0.423		-0.377	
Hispanic (any race)	0.193		0.123		0.103	
Duration with parents:					***	
Less than 1 year					0.523	
1+ years					-0.523	
Unweighted Number	24679		13936		13936	
Model Likelihood	640.9	***	332.8	***	454.2	***
Degrees of Freedom	23		23		24	

Notes: Based on observations from waves I to 9 of 1984 Panel of SIPP.
Cases with duration include only waves 4 to 9.
Weighted by wave 1 weights adjusted for attrition and scaled to equal the actual number of cases used in the analysis.
The number of cases is the number of 4 month periods of observation.
Significance is based on chi-square test for all categories of the variables: * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$.
These significance tests are based on the assumption of simple random sampling and do not take account of the complex sample design used in the SIPP.

Table 20
Logistic Regression for Nest Returning, Ages 18-29

Independent Variables	All Cases		Joined Parents in 4 month interval Cases with Duration Measured# Model I		Model 2	
Intercept	-3.477	***	-3.417	***	-3.176	***
Age:		***		***		***
18-19	0.651		0.814		0.445	
20-21	0.380		0.375		0.248	
22-24	-0.213		-0.254		-0.161	
25-29	-0.818		-0.935		0.074	
Sex:		**				
Male	0.111		0.086		0.074	
Female	-0.111		-0.086		-0.074	
Education:		*				*
High School or less	0.099		0.104		0.136	
Currently in college	0.077		0.049		0.141	
Some College	0.107		0.155		0.088	
In college beyond 4 yrs	0.077		0.125		0.147	
College Grad.	-0.360		-0.432		-0.512	
Employment and Income:		***				
Not emp., welfare inc. -0.061		-0.164		-0.122		
Other not employed	0.121		0.053		0.179	
Emp., income < $ 500/mo.	0.254		0.191		0.073	
Emp., income $500-800	0.080		0.105		0.047	
Emp., income $800-1200	-0.023		0.094		0.049	
Emp., income > $1200	-0.371		-0.279		-0.226	
Own Family?		***		***		***
no	0.481		0.397		0.282	
Spouse (may have child)	-0.630		-0.623		-0.532	
Child(ren) only	0.149		0.226		0.250	
Race / Ethnicity:						
White	0.063		0.030		-0.064	
Black	0.019		0.119		0.113	
Other	-0.192		-0.133		-0.010	
Hispanic (any race)	0.110		-0.016		-0.039	

Table 20 (Cont'd)

Duration with parents:			***
Less than 1 year			0.799
1+ years			-0.799
Unweighted Number	37191	20238	20238
Model Likelihood	676.7	332.8	595.7
Degrees of Freedom	19	19	20

Notes: Based on observations from waves 1 to 9 of 1984 Panel of SIPP.
Weighted by wave 1 weights adjusted for attrition and scaled to equal the actual number of cases used in the analysis.
The number of cases is the number of 4 month periods of observation.
Significance is based on chi-square test for all categories of the variables: * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001.
These significance tests are based on the assumption of simple random sampling and do not take account of the complex sample design used in the SIPP.
Restricted to intervals from waves 4 to 9.

Table Al
Numbers of Cases Used in Computing Rates (Each Case Represents one person observed for one wave (4 months))

	Age Group					
	15 - 17	18 - 19	20 - 21	22 - 24	25 -29	All ages
	Unweighted Number of Person Intervals					
Males	5,424	5,047	5,043	7,088	12,163	34,765
Females	5,169	4,985	5,300	8,073	14,173	37,700
Both	10,593	10,032	10,343	15,161	26,336	72,465
	Weighted Number of Person Intervals (in '000s)					
Males	44,141	27,412	28,363	45,552	77,379	222,847
Females	40,619	28,252	29,812	46,849	82,041	227,573
Both	84,760	55,664	58,175	92,401	159,420	450,420
	Percentage Living with Parents*					
Males	96.4	87.9	72.6	45.2	20.5	55.5
Females	93.6	80.6	59.2	30.6	12.5	45.3
Both	95.0	84.2	65.7	37.8	16.4	50.3
	Percentage Living with Spouse*					
Males	0.1	2.8	10.8	26.5	51.7	25.1
Females	1.9	10.0	22.9	43	59.9	35.1
Both	1.0	6.4	17.0	35.1	55.9	30.1

Source: Tabulations of SIPP 1984 Panel, Waves 1 to 9.
* Based on weighted results. See text for description of weighing.