

Online Resource 1

Temporary Integration, Resilient Inequality: Race and Neighborhood Change in the Transition to Adulthood

By Patrick Sharkey

Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods (PHDCN)

Definition of Home-Leavers

As noted in the article, “home-leavers” are defined at each wave of the PHDCN survey as young adults who live in households with no potential caregivers from an older generation. As an example, if a young adult lived with his mother at Wave 1 of the PHDCN, lived with a girlfriend at Wave 2, and then lived with a grandparent at Wave 3, the young adult would be classified as a “stayer” at Wave 1, a home-leaver at Wave 2, and again as a “stayer” at Wave 3. The analysis thus focuses on neighborhood change between the stayer state and the leaver state. This operationalization differs from other analyses of home-leaving that have focused on *permanent* residential independence or a combination of residential and financial independence. For instance, young adults who leave home to attend college or enter the military are often not classified as having left the family home because they may return during leave, during the summer months, or upon graduation. This state in the life course is described as “semi-autonomy,” and young adults in such a state are sometimes classified as having not left the parental home (Goldscheider and DaVanzo 1989). The focus of this study is on changes in geography and in the conditions in the young adult’s neighborhood context across young adulthood; therefore, permanence of residential independence is less important, and all young adults who live away from caregivers, whether at school or in the military, are included among the group of home-leavers. Although this classification has the advantage of conceptual

clarity at each wave of the survey, it has the disadvantage of obscuring any differences in the trajectories of young adults who experience more complex sequences of home-leaving and returning.

Definitions of Control Variables

Although variables were created using both the 15-year-old and 18-year-old cohorts of the PHDCN, the primary analysis focuses on the 18-year-old cohort. This section describes the variables used in this analysis. The young adult's socioeconomic status is measured in several ways. First, the young adult's *educational status* is measured with indicator variables for less than a high school diploma, a high school diploma or GED (the reference group in regression models), and some college or professional school. (None of the sample members had completed their college degree at the time of the survey.) The young adult's *total household income* is measured with six dummy variables indicating whether total household income is below \$10,000; \$10,000–\$19,999; \$20,000–\$29,999; \$30,000–\$39,999 (the reference group in regression models); \$40,000–49,999; or \$50,000 and above. The young adult's *marital status* is measured with three dummy variables indicating whether the caregiver is single (the reference group in regression models), cohabiting, or married. Other covariates include basic demographic measures, such as the young adult's *gender*, *age*, and the *subject's race/ethnicity*, which is coded with several dummy variables indicating whether the subject is *African American*, *Hispanic/Latino*, or *white* (the reference group in regression models). Members of other racial and ethnic groups are excluded from the analyses because of their small numbers. The young adult's *immigrant generation* is measured with three dummy variables indicating whether he/she is a first-generation immigrant (i.e., born outside the United

States), second generation (i.e., at least one birth parent was born outside the United States), or third generation or higher (the reference group).

Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID)

Definition of Home-Leavers

In the PSID, home-leaving is defined as a change in status from a dependent “child” in the PSID sample household to the status of “head of household” or the “spouse” of a head of household. “Stayers” are classified as young adults who are defined as “children” in the PSID survey for the given survey year. PSID “children” are the biological or adoptive children of sample members who are classified as the head of household for a given family unit (that is, the individual who answers survey questions on behalf of the family), or the “spouse” of the head of household. “Home-leavers” are defined as sample members who began as children in PSID sample families and then, in a subsequent year, were identified as the household head or spouse of the household head. In other words, home-leavers are children who have split off from the original PSID family and who have formed their own households. Home-leaving in the PSID can thus be defined as the transition from living as a dependent in a caregiver’s household to living in an independent household. As with the PHDCN, it is possible that individuals move back and forth between the status of child and head of household (or spouse). In survey years when the individual is identified as a child, the individual would be classified as a stayer; in survey years when the individual is identified as a head of household (or spouse), the individual would be classified as a home-leaver. Average trajectories of change combine information from individuals with a range of different sequences of transitions.

Definitions of Control Variables

The analyses drawing on the PSID use various time-varying and fixed variables measured over the period of young adulthood. The first set of measures are allowed to vary for individuals at each interview wave of the survey; these measures include young adult's *age*, the *number of children*, and *number of adults* in the household; the marital status of the young adult (whether *single* or *married* in the interview year); the log of total *family income*, which represents income from all sources in the family and is adjusted to represent year 2000 dollars; the log of *occupational status*, which is based on the socioeconomic index (Stevens and Featherman 1981); and the log of total *annual hours worked* for the individual if employed. Several “fixed,” or time-invariant, characteristics of young adults are also included, such as *race* (that is, whether black or white, with all other groups excluded from the analyses); *gender*; and the young adult's educational attainment, measured as the *total years of schooling*.

Interpretation of Coefficients From PHDCN Models

As described in the article, trajectories of change among young adults in the PHDCN can be described with a two-level model in which individuals are nested within time points, as in Eqs. (S1) and (S2):

$$Y_{it} = \pi_{0i} + \pi_{1i}(\text{time})_{it} + \pi_{2i}(\text{leaver})_{it} + \pi_{3i}(\text{time} \times \text{leaver})_{it} + \pi_{4i}(\text{outside_Chicago})_{it} + \pi_{5i}(\text{time} \times \text{outside_Chicago})_{it} + e_{it} \quad (\text{S1})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{0i} &= \beta_{00} + \beta_{01}(\text{black})_i + \beta_{02}(\text{Latino})_i + \beta_{03}(\text{other})_i + r_{0i} \\ \pi_{1i} &= \beta_{10} + \beta_{11}(\text{black})_i + \beta_{12}(\text{Latino})_i + \beta_{13}(\text{other})_i \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S2})$$

Because of space considerations, the interpretation of specific coefficients was not described in detail in the article.

First considering the set of Level 1 coefficients, π_{0i} , the overall intercept, represents the initial level of neighborhood poverty for those who do not leave the family

home; π_{1i} is the linear change in neighborhood poverty at each wave of the survey for “stayers”; π_{2i} provides an estimate of the difference between the initial level of neighborhood poverty for home-leavers who remain in Chicago as compared with stayers; π_{3i} represents the difference in the slope of linear change in neighborhood conditions for home-leavers who remain in Chicago as compared with stayers; π_{4i} represents the difference between the initial level of neighborhood poverty for home-leavers who leave Chicago as compared with those who remain within Chicago; and π_{5i} represents the difference in the slope of linear change in neighborhood conditions for home-leavers who leave the city as compared with those who remain within the city.

At Level 2, β_{00} represents the initial neighborhood poverty rate for stayers who are white, the reference group; β_{01} is the difference in the initial neighborhood poverty rate for African American stayers as compared with white stayers; β_{02} is the difference in the initial neighborhood poverty rate for Latino stayers as compared with white stayers; and β_{03} is the difference in the initial neighborhood poverty rate for stayers who are members of all other racial and ethnic groups as compared with white stayers. Similarly, β_{10} represents the change in neighborhood conditions for white stayers, while β_{11} , β_{12} , and β_{13} represent differences in the slope of linear change among African American, Latino, and other stayers as compared with whites. The same interpretations apply to the coefficients in the Level 2 models describing the initial status and change for home-leavers who remain within the city and for those who leave the city. By interacting all Level 1 coefficients with the indicators for race and ethnicity, it is possible to model complete trajectories of neighborhood conditions over the course of the PHDCN study for different groups of stayers and leavers among young adults from different racial and

ethnic backgrounds. All models incorporate the full set of covariates described previously. The main impact of adjusting for the set of covariates is on the intercepts in the models. That is, gaps between the different groups of leavers and stayers from different racial/ethnic backgrounds are larger in the unadjusted models, and they narrow in the adjusted models. However, trajectories of change are not altered by adjusting for the set of covariates, in either the PHDCN results or the PSID results. Because the focus is on change in neighborhood characteristics over young adulthood, I show results from only the adjusted models; unadjusted results are available from the author.

Table S1 Descriptive statistics

	Mean	SD	Min.	Max.
PHDCN Cohort 18 Sample				
Level 1 (time-varying) outcomes ($n = 1,480$ person-periods)				
Neighborhood characteristics				
Poverty rate	0.20	0.12	0.00	0.80
Percentage black	0.35	0.39	0.00	1.00
Level 2 (fixed) variables ($n = 629$ young adults)				
Household income				
Below \$10,000	0.43	0.50	0.00	1.00
\$10,000–\$19,999	0.15	0.36	0.00	1.00
\$20,000–\$29,999	0.11	0.32	0.00	1.00
\$40,000–\$49,999	0.08	0.28	0.00	1.00
\$50,000 or more	0.15	0.36	0.00	1.00
Education (represents current status)				
Less than high school	0.64	0.48	0.00	1.00
Some college	0.17	0.38	0.00	1.00
College degree or more	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Marital status				
Married	0.01	0.11	0.00	1.00
Cohabiting	0.03	0.16	0.00	1.00
Race/ethnicity				
White	0.18	0.39	0.00	1.00
Black	0.39	0.49	0.00	1.00
Other	0.04	0.21	0.00	1.00
Gender (1 = male)	0.49	0.50	0.00	1.00
Age	18.14	0.34	16.52	19.76
Immigrant generation				
First generation	0.23	0.42	0.00	1.00
Second generation	0.22	0.42	0.00	1.00
PSID Young Adult Sample				
Level 1 (time-varying) variables ($n = 72,481$ person-periods)				
Neighborhood characteristics				
Percentage black	13	24	0	100
Poverty rate	11	10	0	94
Age	26	5	17	35
Number of adults in household	2.10	0.98	0	10
Number of children in household	1.05	1.25	0	13
Married	0.65	0.48	0	1
Single	0.22	0.41	0	1
Household income (log)	10.62	1.02	–0.04	14.50
Occupational status (log)	8.15	0.53	7.01	9.09
Annual hours worked (log)	7.55	0.54	–2.30	8.67
Level 2 (fixed) variables ($n = 6,614$ young adults)				
Race (1 = black)	0.13	0.34	0	1
Gender (1 = male)	0.50	0.50	0	1
Moved to different county	0.16	0.37	0	1
Moved to different MSA	0.28	0.45	0	1
Years of schooling	13.32	2.01	3	17