

University of Groningen

## Family living arrangements in young adulthood

Schwanitz, Katrin

**IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.**

*Document Version*

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

*Publication date:*

2017

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Schwanitz, K. (2017). *Family living arrangements in young adulthood: Cross-national comparative analyses*. University of Groningen.

### Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

### Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

*Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.*

# **1** INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW OF STUDIES

## 1.1 Background

Since the 1980s, demographic and sociological research on family living arrangements of young adults in Europe has expanded and revealed striking and persisting variation in family living arrangements and the transition to adulthood (Aassve et al. 2002; Billari et al. 2001; Billari and Liefbroer 2010; Fokkema and Liefbroer 2008; Iacovou 2001, 2002; Iacovou and Skew 2011; Kiernan 1986; Mandic 2008; Saraceno 2008; Tomassini et al. 2004). Cases in point are differences in household size (nuclear vs. multigenerational households) and composition (family vs. non-family living arrangements), timing (early vs. latest-late leaving home) and destinations of leaving home (leaving for education vs. leaving for partnership and family formation), and the sequencing of the transition to adulthood (synchronization vs. de-synchronization of leaving home with other life course events) (Billari et al. 2001; Billari and Liefbroer 2010; Elzinga and Liefbroer 2007; Fokkema and Liefbroer 2008). Despite the scholarly recognition of Europe as an extremely interesting setting for studying cross-national differences in family living arrangements – given not only its diversity in family living arrangements but also its cultural, institutional and socio-economic diversity – systematic comparative studies using nationally representative samples among multiple European countries are rare (Billari 2004; Buchmann and Kriesi 2011; Swartz 2009). What we know so far about family living arrangements in Europe is based on single-country studies or comparisons of a small number of mainly Western European countries. This is true although the inception of larger, cross-nationally comparative datasets in the late 1990s, such as the ECHP (The European Community Household Panel), its successor the EU-SILC (Statistics on Income and Living Conditions), the FFS (Fertility and Family Survey), or the ESS (European Social Survey) has made the investigation of a broader range of countries possible. The relative under-coverage of Central and Eastern European countries in comparative research is equally important to note. Mandic (2008, p. 616), referred to this part of Europe as “terra incognita”, because it has

not yet been systematically included in comparative research on family living arrangements and the transition to adulthood – mainly due to a lack of comparable data. The more recent availability of the GGS (Generations and Gender Survey) data from several Central and Eastern European countries, thus, has created new and exciting possibilities in cross-national comparative research and warrants the inclusion of Central and Eastern Europe in European comparisons.

Family demographers traditionally study population phenomena across time and space. Relative to other demographic phenomena – for example, population aging, the rise in single-headed households, or the large-scale movement of people across international borders – young adult's living arrangements, however, remain a relatively understudied issue. A cross-national comparative analysis of young adults' family living arrangements can tell us something about critical interdependencies between young adults themselves and the country they live in. These interdependencies should not be taken for granted, as it is often done, but the ways in which cultural, institutional and socio-economic settings constitute differential opportunities and constraints for young men and women and across countries should be explicitly addressed. While this book neither claims nor aspires to develop an all-encompassing analysis of the cross-national differences in family living arrangements, the four studies presented here seek to illuminate some of the thus far understudied aspects. This is done by adopting a multilevel framework that takes into account young adults' characteristics and the institutional, economic and cultural context in which their life courses are embedded. The research focus is furthermore deliberately extended to Central and Eastern Europe, which contribute to the European Union in its diversity but have rarely been included in comparative studies on family living arrangements and the transition to adulthood.

### **1.1.1 A Conceptualization of Young Adults**

In family demography, there is no clear-cut definition of the young adult in terms of a specific age range. Instead it is linked to the idea of the transition to adulthood, the “demographically dense” stage of the life course where multiple important transitions occur (Rindfuss 1991). These transitions include, but are not limited to, leaving the parental home, completing one’s education, finding a job, forming a marital or cohabiting union, and having children (Giele and Elder 1998; Settersten et al. 2005). From a comparative perspective, it is important to note that the transition to adulthood takes place at different chronological ages in different countries. Thus, defining the groups of people we consider as “young adults” is a non-trivial part of the work of this book. In the European contemporary context, there are countries where transitions start early and almost uniformly around age 19 or 20 (i.e., Northern European countries), and then there are countries where transitions start late and are highly de-standardized by age, but very standardized vis-à-vis the relationship with union formation (i.e., Southern European countries). An extreme example of late leaving home is Italy, where the median age for leaving home is almost 30 for men. Other European societies may be considered to be in between such extreme cases, with particularly the Southern European countries coming closer to “latest-late” (Billari 2004). Clearly, a definition of “young adults” which ends at the mid-twenties fails to include large numbers of people who have completed many (or, indeed, any) of the transitions to adulthood in Europe. For the purposes of this book I thus broadly define young adults to be in the age range from 16 to 35.

### **1.1.2 A Conceptualization of Family Living Arrangements: Static vs. Dynamic**

There are two approaches to family living arrangements: A static and a dynamic approach. The *static* approach looks, for example, at the national proportion of people living in multigenerational households or at the propensity of young adults to live in a multigenerational

household. Family demographers often take the household as their unit of analysis and thus focus on quite limited conceptions of family, disregarding ties beyond those of intimate partners and of dependent children and their parents. Multiple family generations, and divorce and remarriage make it imperative not to equate families with households. Cases in point are “reconstituted” families, involving co-residence between members of the older and younger generations who are not related by blood, “new” living arrangements such as living-apart-together, involving separate residences for partners, and “non-family” arrangements, involving especially young people sharing residences (Hantrais et al. 2006). In this book, I take the perspective of “looking beyond the nuclear family”. Family living arrangements pertain not only to living alone and co-residence of adult children and their parents (either young adults living with their parents or older adults living with their elderly parents), but also to single-parent families, extended families (i.e., living together with relatives other than children or parents and non-relatives), and living with nonrelatives (e.g., house mates sharing accommodation). The static approach is followed in Chapters 2 and 3.

The *dynamic* approach, in contrast, looks at either (1) discrete transitions (e.g., the transition out of the parental home) or (2) holistic life course trajectories (e.g., the sequencing of different events across the life course). First, and for the analysis of life course transitions, event history analysis has been the method of choice and the research literature mainly discussed the timing of life course events both in Europe and the US (e.g., Billari et al. 2001; Goldscheider and DaVanzo 1989; Mulder and Hooimeijer 2002). Within the wider topic of young adults’ living arrangements, the timing of leaving home is of particular interest to family demographers. After all, moving out of the parental home is the main step in an independent adult life for many. Young adults’ decisions about where (and with whom) to live are an important prerequisite for other decisions regarding partnership and family

formation. Moreover, co-residence serves as an important mechanism through which parents transfer resources to their adult children. These resources are fundamental in enabling young adults to complete their education, enter the labor market, and establish families of their own. For these reasons, researchers increasingly see the decision to leave home as fundamental to understanding the life course, intergenerational relationships and the structure of the family (Goldscheider et al. 1993). The timing of leaving home differs greatly when observed in cross-national perspective (Aassve et al. 2002; Breen and Buchmann 2002; Iacovou 2001, 2002).

More recently researchers have emphasized that a better understanding of the leaving home process also crucially depends on the different destinations taken from the parental home (e.g., leaving home to live alone vs. leaving home to live with a partner), the alternatives having substantial impact on the timing (Aassve et al. 2002; Iacovou 2010; Mulder and Clark 2002). Furthermore, for the analysis of trajectories in life course research, researchers have increasingly used sequence analysis to capture the interconnections of life course events. Life course theory conceptualizes people's lives as a series of transitions. A life course is thus characterized by a sequence and combination of transitions, such as leaving the parental home, starting the first job, finding a partner and becoming a parent – and these life course events should be understood in their continuity (Elder 1994; Giele and Elder 1998). Although most comparative research adopts a theoretical life course approach when studying the transition to adulthood in Europe, insights thus far are based on the analysis of the timing and comparison of single transitions. A small but growing body of research focuses explicitly on holistic life course trajectories, so as to close the gap between theory and empirical research (Koelet et al. 2015; Pailhé et al. 2013; Robette 2010; Sironi et al. 2015). The dynamic approach is followed in Chapters 4 and 5, where Chapter 4 looks at

holistic life course trajectories and Chapter 5 is focused on the transition out of the parental home.

### **1.1.3 Family Living Arrangements in Europe: The Persistent North-South Divide**

Demographic research has documented marked cross-national differences in family living arrangements across Europe. These arrangements are differentiated in terms of who lives with whom and when, as well as in terms of the timing and sequence of life course events (e.g., exit from the parental home, cohabitation, marriage, and having a first child). This diversity in family living arrangements is almost a commonplace in the scientific literature, but nevertheless important to note, because it has proved remarkably stable over time, despite similar demographic changes across almost all European countries (Fokkema and Liefbroer 2008; Kuijsten 1996). Among these changes are the postponement of union formation and parenthood, fertility decline, increases in union dissolution, population ageing – to name but a few (Pailhé et al. 2014; Sobotka 2008; Sobotka and Toulemon 2008). European families have become more varied and complex, and individual life courses increasingly diverse. The sequence of events and the pace at which they occur, for example, have become less standardized than before (Elzinga and Liefbroer 2007; Fussell et al. 2007). Still, there is no indication that these changes have led to a general convergence of family living arrangements across European countries, underscoring the importance of the country context and comparative research.

The cross-national differences in family living arrangements in Europe typically follow a North-South gradient (Billari et al. 2001; Iacovou 2001, 2002, 2004). Western and Northern Europe, for example, are generally characterized by small households, non-family arrangements (particularly living alone and shared arrangements), and non-residential relationships (Iacovou and Skew 2011). Intergenerational co-residence

rates are low and young adults leave the parental home relatively early, often in relation with the end of secondary education or the first permanent job. Conversely, Southern Europe is generally characterized by larger and more complex households where young adults live with their parents well into their 20s – even after finishing their education and being established on the labor market – and are likely to leave home to marry rather than to live in cohabitation or as singles.

The living arrangements in Central and Eastern Europe are in many respects similar to Southern Europe, with large households, late leaving home, and a high frequency of multi-generational households (Ahmed and Emigh 2005; Iacovou and Skew 2011). But there is also some indication that the Central and Eastern European countries cannot be treated as one homogenous region. Billari et al. (2001) very extensively investigated reasons for leaving home across Europe and claim heterogeneity within Eastern Europe. Their results indicate that co-residence patterns are similar to Southern European countries when it comes to the sequencing between leaving the parental home and finishing education and/ or union formation. The majority of young adults exit the parental home neither before finishing the educational career nor before union formation. Yet, the results also display a strong variation of patterns. The timing of leaving home, for example, varies considerably between the different countries. It is late and non-generalized in the Czech Republic, Hungary, Latvia, and Poland; and in that way similar to Southern European countries. For Latvia, Lithuania, and Slovenia a polarized pattern seems to hold true; young adults either leave very early or stay very long in the parental home (Billari et al. 2001). There is still much more we need to know about how family living arrangements can be charted here.

#### **1.1.4 Explaining Cross-National Differences in Family Living Arrangements**

Comparative studies so far addressed these cross-national differences in Europe mainly from two theoretical perspectives: (1) A *contextual*

*perspective* where welfare regimes and policies, economic circumstances, housing availability or the normative climate of a country influence living arrangements of the young and old (e.g., Esping-Andersen 1990; Ferrera 1996; Hajnal 1965; Höllinger and Haller 1990; Reher 1998), or (2) a *compositional perspective* where the particular distribution of individual characteristics across countries (e.g. educational and occupational status, income, receipt of welfare transfers, health, individual norms and values) accounts for the prevalence of specific family living arrangements (Billari and Liefbroer 2007; Hank 2007; Iacovou 2001, 2002, 2010; Le Blanc and Wolff 2006). Only in recent research has it been highlighted that we need to be sensitive to *cross-level interactions* between individual level characteristics and the macro-context (Aassve et al. 2002; Billari 2004; Buchmann and Kriesi 2011). The impact on family living arrangements of an individual level characteristic can differ, depending on the cultural, socioeconomic or policy context.

## **1.2 Research Objectives and Approach**

This book has three objectives. It aims to describe and examine young adults' family living arrangements:

- (1) *In multiple social contexts* (e.g., policy regimes, socio-economic circumstances, and normative climate);
- (2) *from the perspective of different social groups* (e.g., women vs. men; young birth cohorts vs. older birth cohorts; low level of education vs. high level of education); and
- (3) *by comparing and explaining differences in living arrangements across several European countries* – including Eastern Europe.

It investigates to what extent family living arrangements are a function of structural opportunities of the context, people's individual characteristics, and the modifying influence of the context people are living in which hamper or promote the prevalence of specific living

arrangements. For each chapter in the book these general objectives are further translated into specific research questions.

### **1.2.1 A Multilevel Framework for Understanding Family Living Arrangements**

A multilevel framework forms the theoretically guiding and integrative concept for understanding family living arrangements and their diversity across European countries in this book. Though there is no overarching demographic “multilevel theory”, comparative researchers have put forward explanations at different levels to account for cross-national differences – most typically the individual and the country – and loosely following James Coleman's work (Billari 2004; Coleman 1986, 1994). In a comparative research perspective explaining diversity across countries means recognizing the fact that individual behavior is embedded in a macro level context. The macro level context represents the different opportunities and constraints – embodied in welfare and policy regimes, socio-economic circumstances, and normative climate, for example – that (1) shape young adults’ life courses directly, but may also (2) channel the impact of micro-level characteristics on family living arrangements. Micro-level characteristics such as gender, education, income, employment status, and values and attitudes, for example, are nevertheless important predictors of family living arrangements. Within a multilevel framework, the specific distribution of micro-level characteristics across countries (i.e., population composition) may also account for cross-national differences in family living arrangements.

### **1.2.2 Data Sources: Censuses and Survey Data**

This book aims at giving a static and dynamic account of young adults’ family living arrangements across contemporary Europe, while at the same time paying attention to macro-micro linkages that explain cross-national differences. To achieve the research objectives high quality data are required that (1) cover Europe in its entirety (or at least a broad range of European countries) and are thus particularly suited for a comparative analysis of family living arrangements in Europe; (2)

contain sufficient sample sizes, and (3) contain detailed information about education, work and fertility histories of both partners. Since there is not a single dataset that fulfills these requirements, the four empirical chapters use two distinct data sources. All are large-scale, publicly available datasets that are collected employing strict quality controls.

Family living arrangements are described in all population censuses. This traditional demographic data source allows charting family constellations and is indispensable for the portrayal of general trends and overall comparisons: How many generations surround young adults in different phases of life? How complex are today's families? How common are single-person households? How do patterns differ across contexts? For many countries census data are easily available thanks to the Integrated Public Use Microdata Series, international (IPUMSi) project. IPUMSi currently disseminates data for 16 European countries (53 censuses) spanning from 1970 to 2000 (Minnesota Population Center 2011). The IPUMSi data also add information on countries that are not available in the survey data used in this book – namely on Greece, Ireland, Portugal, and Switzerland. This is important because a comprehensive comparative research perspective – a distinctive feature of this book – should try to incorporate as many countries as possible.

The Generations and Gender Survey (GGS) is an internally comparable and harmonized set of survey data containing detailed demographic information on a representative sample of residents aged 18 to 79 years in each of the 19 participating countries and provides information on the individual, partnership, and household level (Vikat et al. 2007). The GGS does not look at partnerships or parent-child relationships in isolation, but rather as embedded in a generational structure. As a result, researchers not only have information on an individual's marital and parenthood history, but also that of his/ her parents and, where relevant, that of his/ her children. GGS data are unique in that they

make it possible to identify — at the level of lives and families — the implications of demographic trends that are specific to particular groups of countries (Billari et al. 2001; Choroszewicz and Wolff 2010). The GGS is also uniquely valuable in its provision of comparable micro data not only for Western but also for Eastern European countries. A more detailed description of each dataset can be found in the separate chapters.

### **1.2.3 Analytical Strategy**

A key challenge of the analytical strategy – given its complex linkages across analytical levels and time – lies in the empirical application of the multilevel framework. The most intuitive and logical methodological application, naturally, is to employ multilevel models. In terms of statistical multilevel modeling, the number of countries with available GGS data is hardly sufficient. In general, one would require at least 20 units of the relevant level in order to derive safe statistical inference. However, I do not restrict analyses to individual level and country-level determinants. Where possible and feasible, regional or community levels are also taken into consideration. Furthermore, it is possible to include several countries in the same regression analysis, making comparisons by including country fixed effects, and their interactions with relevant other variables.

More specifically, the methods used in this book include log-linear models (Chapter 2); multilevel logistic regression models with random intercepts and random coefficients (Chapter 3); sequence analysis, cluster analysis, and multinomial logistic regression models with country fixed effects (Chapter 4); and discrete-time event history models (multinomial logistic regressions of person-years) with country fixed effects (Chapter 5). Each chapter provides more detailed information and outlines the methodological advantages and disadvantages of the various techniques used.

### **1.3 Overview of the Four Studies**

This section introduces the four empirical studies in this book in more detail. The four studies were designed to provide a comprehensive examination of young adults' family living arrangements Europe – guided by the three formulated research objectives. The four studies (Chapters 2 – 5) were written in the form of journal articles, they are thus meant to be read individually, so that some degree of overlap (e.g., in the description of theoretical concepts) was inevitable. Because some of the chapters were co-authored “we” instead of “I” is used. Furthermore, each chapter also covers aspects that are not extensively discussed in this introduction, but which make each of the articles more complete.

#### **1.3.1 Chapter 2: Living Arrangements of Young Adults in Europe**

The second chapter examines the cross-national and cross-temporal variety of young adults' family living arrangements in Europe using IPUMS data available for eight European countries. It provides a first descriptive overview of how young adults live in Europe. We specifically addressed the following research questions: (1) How much diversity in living arrangements is observable across European countries? (2) How have the living arrangements of young adults changed between 1980 and 2000? This chapter builds on existing conceptualizations of family living arrangements but also extends them by using a broader and more comprehensive categorization (including extended and non-family living arrangements), so as to capture a wide variety of young adults' living arrangements in different stages of their life course. It covers countries from all parts of Europe.

#### **1.3.2 Chapter 3: Intergenerational Co-residence of Young Adults with their Parents across European Regions**

The third chapter examines the regional differences in intergenerational co-residence with parents across Europe, which have rarely been studied in comparative research. The analysis is based on data from the GGS (Wave 1) and we specifically addressed the following

research questions: (1) To what extent do the individual characteristics (individual resources and preferences) and the regional context (i.e. housing market and sociocultural climate) explain regional differences in intergenerational co-residence across Europe? (2) How does the regional context modify the relationship between resources and preferences and intergenerational co-residence? As such this chapter represents the most stringent empirical application of a theoretical multilevel framework in this book. It is also noteworthy that regional rather than cross-national differences in intergenerational co-residence across both West and East European countries are examined. This is because, as argued earlier, it is also important to look at regional contexts.

### **1.3.3 Chapter 4: The Transition to Adulthood and Pathways out of the Parental Home: A Cross-national Analysis**

The fourth chapter takes a dynamic perspective and presents a comparative analysis of the transition to adulthood in Western and Eastern Europe based on life course data from the GGS. It focuses on the whole life course rather than on single events of the transition to adulthood. I specifically addressed the following research questions: (1) How do life course trajectories differ between educational groups and men and women? (2) How do life course trajectories differ across countries? (3) And how do the educational gradients for life course trajectories differ across Europe and over time? By drawing on both a holistic and a comparative perspective, this chapter addresses an important gap in the research literature – so far studies that examine the transition to adulthood more comprehensively (i.e., from a holistic perspective) and make broader cross-national comparisons are rare.

### **1.3.4 Chapter 5: Differences in Leaving Home by Individual and Parental Education among Women in Europe**

The fifth chapter also takes a dynamic perspective and examines the transition to leave the parental home. It uses a competing risks approach and distinguishes between two pathways out of the parental

home: Leaving home to live without a partner and leaving home to live with a partner. Unlike the other chapters in this book, this chapter concentrates on women's pathways out of the parental home. We specifically addressed the following research questions: (1) To what extent does the timing of young women's leaving home – and the different pathways out of the parental home – vary by education and parental education in Europe? (2) How do education and parental education interact with national context across Europe? This chapter thus addresses how overall leaving home timing and patterns are related to education and class differences.

## References

- Aassve, A., Billari, F. C., Mazzucco, S., & Ongaro, F. (2002). Leaving home: a comparative analysis of ECHP data. *Journal of European Social Policy, 12*(4), 259–275.
- Ahmed, P., & Emigh, R. J. (2005). Household composition in post-socialist Eastern Europe. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy, 25*(3), 9–41.
- Billari, F. C. (2004). Becoming an adult in Europe: a macro(/micro)-demographic perspective. *Demographic Research, 3*, 15–44.
- Billari, F. C., & Liefbroer, A. C. (2007). Should I stay or should I go? The impact of age norms on leaving home. *Demography, 44*(1), 181–198.
- Billari, F. C., & Liefbroer, A. C. (2010). Towards a new pattern of transition to adulthood? *Advances in Life Course Research, 15*(2–3), 59–75.
- Billari, F. C., Philipov, D., & Baizán, P. (2001). Leaving Home in Europe: The Experience of Cohorts Born Around 1960. *International Journal of Population Geography, 7*(5), 339–356.
- Breen, R., & Buchmann, M. (2002). Institutional Variation and the Position of Young People: A Comparative Perspective. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 580*(1), 288–305.
- Buchmann, M. C., & Kriesi, I. (2011). Transition to Adulthood in Europe. *Annual Review of Sociology, 37*(1), 481–503.
- Choroszewicz, M., & Wolff, P. (2010). *51 million young EU adults lived their parent(s) in 2008* (No. 50/2010) (pp. 1–12). European Commission: Eurostat.
- Coleman, J. S. (1986). Social Theory, Social Research, and a Theory of Action. *American Journal of Sociology, 91*(6), 1309–1335.
- Coleman, J. S. (1994). *Foundations of Social Theory*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Elder, G. H. (1994). Time, Human Agency, and Social Change: Perspectives on the Life Course. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 57*(1), 4–15.

- Elzinga, C. H., & Liefbroer, A. C. (2007). De-standardization of Family-Life Trajectories of Young Adults: A Cross-National Comparison Using Sequence Analysis. *European Journal of Population*, 23(3-4), 225–250.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1990). *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Ferrera, M. (1996). The “Southern Model” of Welfare in Social Europe. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 6(1), 17–37.
- Fokkema, T., & Liefbroer, A. C. (2008). Trends in living arrangements in Europe: Convergence or divergence? *Demographic Research*, 19, 1351–1418.
- Fussell, E., Gauthier, A. H., & Evans, A. (2007). Heterogeneity in the Transition to Adulthood: The Cases of Australia, Canada, and the United States. *European Journal of Population*, 23(3-4), 389–414.
- Giele, J. Z., & Elder, G. H. (1998). *Methods of Life Course Research: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Goldscheider, F., & DaVanzo, J. (1989). Pathways to Independent Living in Early Adulthood: Marriage, Semiautonomy, and Premarital Residential Independence. *Demography*, 26(4), 597–614.
- Goldscheider, F., Thornton, A., & Young-DeMarco, L. (1993). A portrait of the nest-leaving process in early adulthood. *Demography*, 30(4), 683–699.
- Hajnal, J. (1965). European Marriage Patterns in Perspective. In D. E. C. Eversley & D. V. Glass (Eds.), *Population in history*. (pp. 101–143). London: Arnold.
- Hank, K. (2007). Proximity and Contacts Between Older Parents and Their Children: A European Comparison. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 69(1), 157–173.
- Hantrais, L., Philipov, D., & Billari, F. C. (2006). *Policy implications of changing family formation*. Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe.
- Höllinger, F., & Haller, M. (1990). Kinship and social networks in modern societies: a cross-cultural comparison among seven nations. *European Sociological Review*, 6(2), 103–124.
- Iacovou, M. (2001). *Leaving home in the European Union*. (Working Paper No. 2001-18) (pp. 1–47). Colchester: University of Essex.
- Iacovou, M. (2002). Regional Differences in the Transition to Adulthood. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 580(1), 40–69.
- Iacovou, M. (2004). Patterns of Family Living. In R. Berthoud & M. Iacovou (Eds.), *Social Europe. Living Standards and Welfare States*. (pp. 21–45). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Iacovou, M. (2010). Leaving home: Independence, togetherness and income. *Advances in Life Course Research*, 15(4), 147–160.
- Iacovou, M., & Skew, A. J. (2011). Household composition across the new Europe: Where do the new Member States fit in? *Demographic Research*, 25, 465–490.
- Kiernan, K. (1986). Leaving home: Living arrangements of young people in six west-European countries. *European Journal of Population*, 2(2), 177–184.
- Koelet, S., Valk, H. A. G. de, Glorieux, I., Laurijssen, I., & Willaert, D. (2015). The timing of family commitments in the early work career: Work-family trajectories of young adults in Flanders. *Demographic Research*, 32, 657–690.

## Chapter 1

- Kuijsten, A. C. (1996). Changing family patterns in Europe: A case of divergence? *European Journal of Population*, 12(2), 115–143.
- Le Blanc, D., & Wolff, F.-C. (2006). Leaving Home in Europe: The Role of Parents' and Children's Incomes. *Review of Economics of the Household*, 4(1), 53–73.
- Mandic, S. (2008). Home-Leaving and its Structural Determinants in Western and Eastern Europe: An Exploratory Study. *Housing Studies*, 23(4), 615–637.
- Minnesota Population Center. (2011). *Integrated Public Use Microdata Series, International: Version 6.1 [Machine-readable database]*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.  
<https://international.ipums.org/international/citation.shtml>. Accessed 25 February 2013
- Mulder, C. H., & Clark, W. A. V. (2002). Leaving Home for College and Gaining Independence. *Environment and Planning A*, 34(6), 981–999.
- Mulder, C. H., & Hooimeijer, P. (2002). Leaving home in the Netherlands: Timing and first housing. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 17(3), 237–268.
- Pailhé, A., Mortelmans, D., Castro, T., Cortina Trilla, C., Digoix, M., Festy, P., et al. (2014). *Changes in the life course* (Families and Societies Working Paper Series No. 6) (pp. 1–67).
- Pailhé, A., Robette, N., & Solaz, A. (2013). Work and family over the life-course. A typology of French long-lasting couples using optimal matching. *Longitudinal and Life Course Studies*, 4(3), 196–217.
- Reher, D. S. (1998). Family Ties in Western Europe: Persistent Contrasts. *Population and Development Review*, 24(2), 203–234.
- Rindfuss, R. R. (1991). The Young Adult Years: Diversity, Structural Change, and Fertility. *Demography*, 28(4), 493–512.
- Robette, N. (2010). The diversity of pathways to adulthood in France: Evidence from a holistic approach. *Advances in Life Course Research*, 15(2–3), 89–96.
- Saraceno, C. (2008). Patterns of Family Living in the Enlarged EU. In J. Alber, T. Fahey, & C. Saraceno (Eds.), *Handbook of quality of life in the enlarged European Union* (pp. 47–72). London; New York: Routledge.
- Settersten, R. A., Furstenberg, F. F., & Rumbaut, R. G. (Eds.). (2005). *On the Frontier of Adulthood: Theory, Research, and Public Policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sironi, M., Barban, N., & Impicciatore, R. (2015). Parental social class and the transition to adulthood in Italy and the United States. *Advances in Life Course Research*, 26, 89–104.
- Sobotka, T. (2008). Overview Chapter 6: The diverse faces of the Second Demographic Transition in Europe. *Demographic Research*, 19, 171–224.
- Sobotka, T., & Toulemon, L. (2008). Overview Chapter 4: Changing family and partnership behaviour: Common trends and persistent diversity across Europe. *Demographic Research*, 19, 85–138.
- Swartz, T. T. (2009). Intergenerational Family Relations in Adulthood: Patterns, Variations, and Implications in the Contemporary United States. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 35(1), 191–212.

- Tomassini, C., Glaser, K., Wolf, D. A., Broese van Groenou, M., & Grundy, E. (2004). Living Arrangements among Older People: An Overview of Trends in Europe and the USA. *Population Trends*, 115, 24–34.
- Vikat, A., Spéder, Z., Beets, G., Billari, F., Bühler, C., Desesquelles, A., et al. (2007). Generations and Gender Survey (GGS). *Demographic Research*, 17, 389–440.