# Living with Parents in Young Adulthood and Parent-Adult Child Closeness and Conflict: The Influence of Social Class and Parenting Strategies

Vanessa Wanner Lang

Monica A. Longmore

Wendy D. Manning

Peggy C. Giordano

Department of Sociology, Bowling Green State University

## ABSTRACT

Although growing shares of young adults live with their parents, little is known about the nature of relationships between parents and young adult children. Using data from the Toledo Adolescent Relationships Study (TARS) (n=878), we explored both closeness and conflict between parents and young adult children. Our primary goals were to examine whether: (1) returning to or never leaving the parental home as a young adult influenced parent-child relationships; and (2) social class and parenting strategies (support and monitoring) influenced parent-child relationships. Compared to living independently, returning to and never leaving the parental home were associated with greater conflict. Young adults from more economically advantaged backgrounds reported greater parental closeness. Parental support in adolescence was related to greater closeness and lower conflict with parents. This study provides insights into some of the consequences of an increasingly common pathway to adulthood for a contemporary cohort of young adults.

# INTRODUCTION

In the U.S., 36% of young adults live with their parents (U.S. Census, 2012). This is the highest percentage of young adults coresiding with parents in the last four decades (Pew Research Center, 2014). Examining parental coresidence and corresponding levels of parent-child closeness and conflict is important to consider in light of recent trends, such as delayed marriage, rising college enrollment, student debt, and the difficulty of permanent job placement (Painter, 2010). When adult children do leave the parental home, it is not always permanent (Copp, Giordano, Longmore, Manning, 2015; Mitchell, 2006). Moreover, the transition to adulthood, indexed in part by independent living, varies by social class, leading to different trajectories for young adults (Furstenberg, 2010).

Although the patterns of coresidence have been well established, to date few studies have considered parent-adult child relationship quality. Our primary goals in this study were to examine how coresidence is associated with parental closeness and conflict in young adulthood and to assess how family of origin factors (social class and parenting strategies) influence parental closeness and conflict. The Toledo Adolescent Relationships Study (TARS) is a longitudinal study of individuals who have transitioned from adolescence to young adulthood and offers a unique lens into parent-adult child relationships. We moved beyond prior work on parent adult-child relationship quality by: (1) using data that captures the most recent cohort of young adults (i.e., the Millennial Generation) in the United States, (2) focusing on coresidence as a possible determinant of parent-adult child relationship quality, and (3) examining aspects of family of origin (i.e., social class and parenting strategies) and how they are associated with parent-adult child relationship quality.

# BACKGROUND

## *Coresidence with Parents in Young Adulthood and Parent-Adult Child Relationship Quality*

Prior studies on parent-adult child relationship quality have focused on the correlates and implications, but has largely ignored coresidence. Research on parent and adult-child relationship quality is limited. Among the existing literature there are two major foci: (1) major transitions in the life course and parent-adult child relations (e.g., Aquilino 1997; Kaufman & Uhlenberg 1998; Sobolewski & Amato, 2007); and (2) the quality of parent-adult child relationships and effects on psychological well-being (e.g., Amato, 1994; Knoester, 2003; Umberson, 1992). While these are important, they do not address how these relationships differ by early adolescent experiences in the family of origin or young adult coresidence.

According to the life course principle of *linked lives* (Elder, Johnson, and Crosnoe 2003) interconnections between individuals in shared social networks (e.g., the family) affect key events and the timing of transitions in individuals' lives. We examined this theoretical framework from a reverse causal standpoint. In other words, we explored how the experience of coresidence (i.e., the transition of returning to parental home and never having left the parental home) influenced parent adult-child relationship quality. We also explored how adolescence interconnections with parents (i.e., parental support and monitoring) affected closeness and conflict with parents in young adulthood.

In the U.S., nearly two-fifths of young adults, ages 18-31, live with their parents, and there is growing public concern that these individuals may not become financially and, subsequently, residentially independent (Pew Research Center, 2014). Although young adults, ages 18-24, are more likely than young adults, ages 25-31, to live with parents, overall, these percentages demonstrate that a growing share of young adults coreside with parents. Both age

groups have seen increases since the recession in 2007-2009 (Pew Research Center, 2014). Declining employment prospects, debt, rising college enrollment, relationship dissolution, and declining marriage rates are some reasons for the increase in the rates of young adults coresiding with parents.

Prior literature has examined the experiences of coresidence between parents and adult children. Aquilino and Supple (1991), using the 1987-1988 NSFH, found that when adult children coresided with parents and were financially dependent on them, parent-child conflict increased. However, the majority of parents reported feeling satisfied with their adult child living at home and indicated positive relationships with their children. Further analyses of the NSFH by Ward and Spitze (2007) indicated that the quality of relationships from the young adult child perspective decreased when young adults were coresiding with parents. More recent research by Copp et al. (2015) found that returning to the parental home increased depressive symptoms for young adults who were experiencing employment problems. South and Lei (2015), used data from the PSID-TA module, to examine contemporary determinants of why young adults leave and return to the parental home. They found that young adults who felt emotionally close to mothers were less likely to leave home and were more likely to return.

This body of work is limited in three key ways. First, much of the work is dated by relying on data collected nearly 30 years ago. A new analysis of a contemporary cohort will provide insights that reflect the current economic and social climate. Second, prior analyses did not distinguish between young adults who *returned* home and those who *never left*. This is important because returning home and having never left are different experiences for young adults and their parents. The transition of nest-leaving and then returning home implies a failure to launch and maintain independence from parents, whereas, having never left does not involve

any transitions in living arrangement. Third, research has ignored the adolescent experience and has not accounted for earlier life course factors (i.e., social class and parenting strategies).

### *Social Class Differences in Emerging Adulthood*

Emerging adulthood spans the years 18-25 (Arnett, 2000). During this stage in the life course individuals focus on identity exploration, seek out intimate relationships, further educational and employment experiences and establish their residence (Arnett, 2003). Furstenberg (2010) noted several social class similarities and differences among young adults. Although young adults from all social class backgrounds are remaining in school longer and delaying marriage, less-advantaged young adults have a harder time adhering to the expected timeline of education, full-time employment, leaving the parental home, cohabitation/marriage and parenthood (Payne, 2011). Thus, less economically advantaged young adults likely rely on their families for emotional and financial help for longer periods of time (Schoeni & Ross, 2005). Financial independence is related to major demographic transitions for young adults including, but not limited to, establishing residences that are independent of parents.

Given the recent recession, it is important to assess coresidence among a contemporary sample of young adults from varied social class backgrounds. Economic disadvantage experienced in childhood leads to poorer well-being outcomes for adults, which exacerbates difficulties in transitioning to independent adulthood and perhaps the quality of relationships between parent and adult children (Umberson, Williams, Thomas, Liu & Thomeer, 2014). Thus, variations in social class position and opportunities afforded to young adults may influence parent adult-child relationship quality and coresidence may potentially act as a mediating mechanism in the relationship between social class position and parent adult-child relationships.

### *Parenting Strategies*

Early on Baumrind (1971) defined three types of parenting strategies, “authoritarian,” “authoritative” and “permissive.” Parents who engage in authoritarian parenting rely on more punitive engagement with children, authoritative parenting style emphasizes parent-child communication, supporting and helping the child to become self-reliant, and, permissive parenting lacks clear rules and regulation for children. Supportive parenting is defined by open parent-child communication and feelings of closeness. In a review of literature on parenting and adolescent development, Devore and Ginsberg (2005) concluded that parental monitoring and higher levels of closeness (i.e., authoritative parenting) between parents and children led to the best outcomes for adolescents. In addition, Dehart, Pelham and Murray (2004) found that young adults who felt nurtured by their parents in adolescence reported higher self-esteem in young adulthood. Among young adults, acceptance and involved parenting positively influenced self-esteem (Zakeri & Karimpour, 2011). Seiffge-Krenke (2006) found that young adults who experienced high monitoring as teens were more likely to be financially independent as young adults. Overall, these findings reflect how high levels of parental support and monitoring in adolescence influenced positive young adult outcomes.

We extended this prior research by focusing on how parenting strategies in adolescence influenced parent-adult child relationship quality during emerging adulthood. From a life course perspective (Elder, Johnson, and Crosnoe 2003) these early family interconnections would appear to be foundational for parent adult-child relationship quality. In the next steps of this paper, we plan to consider whether coresidence may mediate the association between parenting strategies and parent-adult child relationships.

## CURRENT STUDY

Expanding on prior literature, this study used longitudinal data to examine parent-adult child relationships when children are young adults between the ages of 22-29. In light of the current recession in 2007-09 as well as delays in young adults launching from the parental home and returns (boomerang) of young adults to the parental home, we addressed the following two research questions: (1) how does residential status (i.e., returned to parental home, stayed at parental home, living independently) influence young adults' perceptions of parental closeness and conflict; and 2) given differentials in coresidence we examine whether and how family of origin factors, social class and parenting strategies may affect parental closeness and conflict and how coresidence may act as a mediating mechanism in the relationship between family of origin factors and parent-adult child relationships.

## DATA AND METHODS

We used the first, fourth, and fifth interviews from the Toledo Adolescent Relationships Study (TARS), a stratified random sample of adolescents from Lucas County, Ohio, to test our hypotheses. The initial sample (n=1,321), devised by the National Opinion Research Center, was drawn from 62 school districts, and over-sampled Hispanic and Black students. The data were first collected in 2001 using structured in-home interviews. In 2001, in addition to adolescent interviews, parents (primarily mothers) or caregivers were interviewed separately from adolescents. The original adolescent sample was re-interviewed in 2002, 2004, 2006, and 2010. At the time of the fourth interview (2006), respondents ranged in age from 18-24. At the fifth interview (2010), respondents ranged in age from 22-29. We examined respondents who *returned to the parental home, never left the parental home* and those who *lived independently*. A distinctive feature of TARS is that it includes data on changes in young adults' residential

status. We examined young adults leaving home as reported in the fourth interview and young adults returning home as reported in the fifth interview. Additionally, TARS is based on a contemporary sample of young adults who experienced the recession of 2007-09.

The analytic sample consisted of all respondents between the ages of 22-29 at the fifth interview (n=1,021). We excluded 143 respondents who did not report either living with parents or living independently at the fourth and fifth interviews (e.g., group quarters, such as dorm, barrack, prison, etc). The final analytic sample consisted of 394 men and 484 women (n=878). To account for missing data we used mean and mode imputation. At the bivariate level we used one-way ANOVAS and t-tests to examine differences for all covariates by young adults' residential status. For the multivariate analyses we used ordinary least squares regression (OLS). This study drew on data from the parent and adolescent interviews (2001), and the fourth (2006) and fifth interviews (2010).

*Dependent Variables*

*Parental closeness,* measured as the mean of six items assessed at the fifth interview, asked respondents how much they agreed with the following: (1) "My parents often ask about what I am doing (e.g., in schoo1, at work, with my friends, etc.)"; (2) "My parents give me the right amount of affection"; (3) "My parents trust me"; (4) "I am closer to my parents than a lot of people my age"; (5) "I feel close to my parents"; and (6) "I rely on my parents for advice." The scale ranged from 1-5 with a mean of 3.98, indicating relatively high parental closeness (alpha = .85).

*Parental conflict,* measured as the mean of four items assessed at the fifth interview, asked, "In general, how often do you and your parents:" (1) "Have disagreements"; (2) "Yell or shout at each other because you are mad"; (3) "Give each other the silent treatment"; and (4)

"Call each other names or insult each other?" The scale ranged from 1-5 with a mean of 1.75, indicating relatively low parental conflict (alpha = .85).

*Focal Independent Variables*

*Residence type*, measured using data from the fourth and fifth interviews. We created three dichotomous variables indicating three types of residence: *returned to parental home* (reference category), in which respondents were living independently at the fourth interview and living at home in the fifth interview (6.20%), *stayed at parental home*[1] in which respondents were living with parents at both the fourth and fifth interviews (17.89%) and *living independently* in which respondents were either living at home or otherwise at the fourth interview and not living at home at the fifth interview (75.91%)[2].

*Family Background Factors*

*Social class* was operationalized by using mothers' education from the parent interview (2001). Because women primarily completed the parent survey (90.2%), we assessed *mothers' education* using the question, "How far did you go in school?" If the interview was completed by men (9.8%), the fathers' report of mothers' education was used, which asked, "How far did your spouse or partner go in school?" Response categories included (1st-8th grade, less than 12 years, 12 year (obtained GED), went to business, trade or vocational school after high school, 1-3 years of college, graduated from college or university, professional training beyond 4-year). We created three dichotomous variables: *High school or less* (1st-8th grade, less than 12 years, 12 year (or obtained GED), (reference category) (40.98%), *some college* (or trade or vocational

[1] Reference category in supplemental analyses which are available upon request.
[2] Copp et al., (2015) used the 4th interview of TARS. They found 45.67% lived independently, 34.84% stayed and 19.49% returned.

school after high school, 1-3 years of college)(34.49%), and *college or more* (graduated from college or university, professional training beyond 4-year) (23.31%).

*Parental support*, measured using a five item mean scale from the adolescent interview (2001), asked respondents their extent of agreement with the following statements: (1) "my parents often ask about how I am doing in school"; (2) "my parents give me the right amount of affection"; (3) "my parents trust me"; (4) "I'm closer to my parents that a lot if kids my age"; and (5) "I feel close to my parents." Responses included 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The scale ranged from 5-25 with a mean of 19.85 indicating relatively high levels of support (alpha = .77).

*Monitoring*, measured with a six item scale, provided respondents with the following prompt, "Tell me how often your parents let you make your own decisions about..." (1) "the time you must be home on weekend nights"; (2) "the people you hang out with"; (3) "what you wear"; (4) "your social life"; (5) "who you can date" ; and (6) "how often you can date." Responses included 1 (never) to 5 (very often), and the scale ranged from 6-30 with a mean of 22.42 indicating high levels of monitoring during adolescence (alpha = .83).

From the first interview (2001) *family structure* was measured as a series of dichotomous variables including two biological parents (reference) (54.75%), step-family (13.57%), single-parent (21.51 %), and other (10.17 %).

*Young Adult Factors*

*Gainful activity* was a dichotomous indicator of whether the respondent was currently in school or employed (63.97%) or not currently in school or employed (37.29%). *Relationship status* was a series of dichotomous variables including single (reference) (7.16%), dating

(39.79%), cohabiting (31.75%) and married (21.30%). *Presence of children* was a dichotomous variable with 0 indicating no children (60.88%) and 1 indicating one or more (39.12%).

*Sociodemographic Factors*

From the fifth interview *gender* was coded 1 for women (50.80%) and 0 for men (49.20%). From the fifth interview *age* (22-29) had a mean of 25.36. *Race/ethnicity* was coded as a series of dichotomous variables including non-Hispanic White (reference) (67.25%), non-Hispanic Black (23.72%), Hispanic (6.63%) and other (1.99%).

## PRELIMNARY RESULTS

### *Bivariate Analysis*

Table 1 included weighted descriptive statistics for all covariates by residence status. Approximately 6% of young adults returned to the parental home between the fourth and fifth interviews. About 18% of the sample remained in the parental home and 76% were living independently. Thus, approximately 24% of young adults were living at home (both returned and stayed) in 2010.

Reports of parental closeness were not significantly different by residential status. At the bivariate level, all young adults reported relatively high levels of parental closeness (i.e., mean of 4 [range 1-5]). Regarding parental conflict by residential status, we observed significant differences. Both those who stayed in the parental home (1.91) and those who returned to the parental home (1.90) reported significantly higher levels of conflict compared with those who were living independently (1.69). The experience of living at home in young adulthood is associated with more conflict, even though returning home may be a different experience than never leaving the parental home.

The family background indicators differed according to residential status. Young adults who returned to the parental home were more advantaged (mother had college degree) than young adults who stayed at home or lived independently. With regard to parenting strategies, parental support did not differ by residential status. Monitoring, however, was significantly different. Young adults who stayed in the parenting home, compared with living independently, reported significantly lower levels of monitoring in adolescence. Young adults who lived with their parents more often had two biological married parents (69%) than young adults who lived independently (51%).

Many of the other covariates also showed significant differences across residential status (e.g., gender, gainful activity, presence of children). For example, among young adults with children, there were significantly fewer young adults who stayed in the parental home (18%) compared with having returned to parental home (36.5%). In addition, there were significantly fewer young adults who were gainfully active (i.e., in school or employed) who stayed in the parental home (54%) or returned to the parental home (48%) compared with those living independently (68%). These percentages are consistent with previous research, which found that lack of employment is often a reason for young adults returning to the parental home (Pew Research Center, 2014).

### *Multivariate Analyses*

Table 2 included the ordinary least squares regression models predicting parental closeness. Model 1, the zero-order model, included residential status. Residential status was not significantly associated with parental closeness. Young adults who stayed in the parental residence, as well as those who live independently, compared with those who returned home, were not significantly different in reports of parental closeness. In the supplemental analysis, no

significant differences were observed when comparing young adults who stayed in the parental home compared with those living independently.

Model 2 included the adolescent factors (mothers' education, parental support, monitoring, and family structure). Young adults' whose mothers' were more highly educated (college or more and some college), compared with high school or less, reported greater parental closeness. Monitoring and family structure were not associated with parental closeness. In Model 3, sociodemographic factors including gender, age, and race/ethnicity were added in the analysis. The adolescent factors operated in a similar manner as Model 2. Compared with men, women experienced greater closeness with parents in young adulthood. Black, compared with White, young adults reported lower levels of parental conflict in young adulthood. In the full model (Model 4) young adult factors including gainful activity, relationship status, and presence of children were added. Parental support remained significantly associated with closeness and mothers' education was marginally significant. The two young adult correlates associated with parental closeness were gainful activity and presence of children. Being gainfully activity was positively related to parental closeness and having children was related to feeling less close with parents. The decline in significance for mothers' education when gainful activity was included in the analysis demonstrates how young adult experiences in the workplace and educational system are fundamental when understanding determinants of parent adult-child closeness. In other words, young adults who have transitioned into the workplace and/or who are currently in school appear to have better relationship parent adult-child quality due to having met traditional markers of adulthood (Arnett, 2003). In support of the life-course tenant of *linked lives* (Elder, Johnson, and Crosnoe 2003) parental support in adolescence remained a salient predictor of closeness with parents in young adulthood.

Table 3 showed the ordinary least squares estimates for parental conflict. In Model 1 residential status was examined. Staying in the parental home, compared with returning to the parental home, was not significantly associated with parental conflict. Conversely, living independently, compared with returning to the parental home, was significantly associated with parental conflict. Compared with young adults who returned to the parental home, living independently, on average, was associated with less parental conflict. In the supplemental analyses of parental conflict compared with having stayed in the parental home, living independently was associated with less conflict.

Living independently remained significantly associated with lower conflict with the inclusion of the adolescent factors (Model 2). Young adults whose mothers were more highly educated (college or more), compared with high school or less, reported less conflict. Higher levels of parental support in adolescence were associated with less parental conflict in young adulthood. In addition, higher parental monitoring in adolescence was marginally significant and associated with less parental conflict in young adulthood. Model 3 included the sociodemographic indicators and living independently remained associated with lower levels of conflict. The education and monitoring indicators lost significance. Compared to men, women reported higher levels of parental conflict. In addition, Black, compared to White young adults experienced higher levels of parental conflict.

Model 4 included young adult factors including gainful activity, relationship status, and presence of children. Independent living versus returning home was no longer associated parental conflict. However, young adults living independently compared with those who stayed in the parental home experienced less conflict. Parental support remained significant, such that higher levels of parental support was related to less conflict with parents. Monitoring and family

structure were not significantly associated with conflict. It appears that gainful activity and presence of children predicted young adults' experience of conflict with their parents. Young adults who were gainfully active (either in school or working) reported less parental conflict compared with young adults who were not in either school or employed. Finally being a parent, compared with those without children, was associated with greater conflict. Age, race/ethnicity, and relationship types were not associated with conflict. In this model women, experienced more parental conflict in young adulthood. Black, compared with White, young adults reported higher levels of parental conflict in young adulthood.

## DISCUSSION

This study contributed to the literature in two ways. This research showed how the transition of returning to the parental home as well as staying in the parental home influenced parent-adult child relationship quality. Despite the fact that coresidence was not related to parental closeness, we did find that conflict was greater for those living with parents. Specifically, compared with young adults living independently, returning to the parental home and staying in the parental home were associated with more conflict. This finding was especially salient for those who stayed and never left the parental home. Second, dimensions of family background (social class and parenting strategies) influenced parent and adult-child relationships.

Family background factors including mothers' education and parental support were predictors of parental closeness. Specifically, young adults' whose mothers' were more highly educated (college or more and some college), compared with high school or less, reported greater parental closeness. In addition, young adults with greater parental support during adolescence experienced higher levels of parental closeness. In the analysis of parental conflict, supportive

parenting was the only family background characteristic to remain significant in the final model. Specifically, young adults with greater parental support during adolescence experienced lower levels of parental conflict. Parental support was a salient predictor of both parental closeness and conflict. This is central to understanding how parenting experienced in adolescence manifests across the life course and into young adulthood.

Young adult factors including gainful activity and presence of children were associated with parent adult-child relationship quality. Young adults who were gainfully active (i.e., either currently employed or in school) reported greater closeness and less conflict with parents. In addition, young adults who had children experienced more conflict and less closeness with parents. We argue that parenthood in young adulthood may be a stressful life transition and may have the possibility to either disrupt relationships with parents or exacerbate previously strenuous relationships between parents and adult-children.

Limitations of this research included not using a nationally representative sample. Future research should analyze whether these conclusions hold for nationally representative samples. In addition, it would be helpful to understand how parents are viewing their relationships with young adult-children and the reciprocal nature of parent adult-child relationships. This would help to further understand family dynamics and perhaps further unravel what is causing parental closeness and conflict for contemporary families. For example, how do parents change their parenting strategy when their children are young adults? Would this depend on the adult-child coresiding with them? Future research should explore these dynamics not only from the young adults' perceptions, but also from the parents' perceptions. In the next steps of this paper, we plan to explore if coresidence acts as a mediating mechanism in the relationship between family

of origin factors (i.e., social class and parenting strategies) and parent-adult child relationship quality.

Young adulthood is marked by several key transitions (Arnett, 2003) including, but not limited to, residential independence. Differences exist across social classes, such that less advantaged young adults experience more difficulty adhering to the traditional timeline of education, employment, home leaving, marriage and parenthood (Furstenberg, 2010). This study investigated how coresidence affects parent adult-child relationship quality. In addition, this study further explored how social class background and parenting strategies influenced parent and adult-child relationships. As young adults are delaying exits from the parental home and more often returning home has implications for levels of conflict and potential implications for young adult and parental well-being.

# REFERENCES


Amato, P. R. (1994). Father-child relations, mother-child relations, and offspring psychological well-being in early adulthood. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *55,* 1031-1042.

Arnett, J. J. (2000). Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American Psychologist*, *55*, 469– 480.

Arnett, J. J. (2003). Conceptions of the transition to adulthood among emerging adults in American ethnic groups. *New directions for child and adolescent development*, *2003*(100), 63-76.

Aquilino, W. S. (1997). From adolescent to young adult: A prospective study of parent- child relations during the transition to adulthood. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *59,* 670-686.

Aquilino, W. S., & Supple, K. R. (1991). Parent-child relations and parent's satisfaction with living arrangements when adult children live at home. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *53*, 13-27.

Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology*, *4*(1p2), 1.

Copp, J. E., Giordano, P. C., Longmore, M. A. & Manning, W. D. (2015). Living with parents and emerging adults' depressive symptoms. *Journal of Family Issues*.

DeHart, T., Pelham, B., & Murray, S. (2004). Implicit dependency regulation: Self-esteem, relationship closeness, and implicit evaluations of close others. *Social Cognition*, *22*, 126–146.

DeVore, E. R., & Ginsburg, K. R. (2005). The protective effects of good parenting on adolescents. *Current Opinion in Pediatrics*, *17*(4), 460-465.

DiPrete, T. A., & Eirich, G. M. (2006). Cumulative advantage as a mechanism for inequality: A review of theoretical and empirical developments. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *32*, 271-297.

Elder Jr, G. H., Johnson, M. K., & Crosnoe, R. (2003). The emergence and development of life course theory. In *Handbook of the life course* (pp. 3-19). Springer US.

Furstenberg Jr, F. F. (2010). On a new schedule: Transitions to adulthood and family change. *The Future of Children*, *20*(1), 67-87.

Kaufman, G., & Uhlenberg, P. (1998). Effects of life course transitions on the quality of relationships between adult children and their parents. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *66*, 924-938.

Knoester, C. (2003). Transitions in young adulthood and the relationship between parent and offspring well-being. *Social Forces*, *81*(4), 1431-1458.

Mitchell, B. A. (2006). *The Boomerang Age: Transition to Adulthood in Families*. New Jersey Aldine-Transaction.

Painter, G. (2010). What happens to household formation in a recession? *Available at SSRN 1586487*.

Payne, K. K. (2011). On the road to adulthood: Sequencing of family experiences. Bowling Green, OH: National Center for Marriage and Family Research.

Pew Research Center. (2014). A rising share of young adults live in their parents' home. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center Social and Demographic Trends project, May. Website: http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2013/08/01/a-rising-share-of-young-adults-live-in-their-parents-home/.

Schoeni, R. F., & Ross, K. E. (2005). *Material Assistance from Families during the Transition to Adulthood*. University of Chicago Press.

Seiffe-Krenke, I. (2006). Leaving home or still in the nest? Parent-child relationships and psychological health as predictors of different leaving home patterns. *Developmental Psychology*, *42*(5), 864-876.

Sobolewski, J. M., & Amato, P. R. (2007). Parents' discord and divorce, parent-child relationships and subjective well-being in early adulthood: Is feeling close to two parents always better than feeling close to one? *Social Forces*, *85*(3), 1105-1124.

South, S. J., & Lei, L. (2015). Failures-to-launch and boomerang kids: Contemporary determinants of leaving and returning to the parental home.*Social Forces*, *94*(2), 863-890.

Umberson, D., Williams, K., Thomas, P. A., Liu, H., & Thomeer, M. B. (2014). Race, gender, and chains of disadvantage childhood adversity, social relationships, and health. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, *55*(1), 20-38.

Umberson, D. (1992) Relationships between adult children and their parents: psychological consequences for both generations. *Journal of Marriage and the Family 54*,664-674.

U.S Census Bureau (2012). Young adults living at home: 1960 to present. Website: www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/hh-fam.html#cps.

Ward, R. A., & Spitze, G. D. (2007). Nestleaving and Coresidence by Young Adult Children The Role of Family Relations. *Research on Aging*, *29*(3), 257-277.

Zakeri, H., & Karimpour, M. (2011). Parenting styles and self-esteem. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 29,* 758-76.

*Table 1. Descriptive Statistics, by Parent Residential Type (n=878)*

| | | Full Sample* | | | Stayed in Parental home (n=150) | Returned to Parental home (n=52) | Living Independently (n=697) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Dependent Variables | Percent | Mean | SD | Range | | | |
| Parental Closeness | | 3.98 | 2.83 | 1-5 | 3.97 | 3.98 | 3.99 |
| Parental Conflict | | 1.75 | 2.62 | 1-5 | 1.91[b] | 1.90[c] | 1.69 |
| Focal Independent Variables | | | | | | | |
| *Residential Type* | | | | | | | |
| Living Independently | 75.91 | | | | ------- | ------- | ------- |
| Stayed in parental home | 17.89 | | | | ------- | ------- | ------- |
| Returned to parental home | 6.20 | | | | ------- | ------- | ------- |
| Family Background Factors | | | | | | | |
| *Mother's Education* | | | | | | | |
| HS or Less | 40.98 | | | | 41.33% | 40.38% | 42.16% |
| Some college | 34.49 | | | | 34.67% | 26.92% | 34.32% |
| College or more | 23.31 | | | | 23.33% | 32.69%[c] | 22.19% |
| *Parenting Strategies* | | | | | | | |
| Support | | 19.85 | 12.17 | 5-25 | 19.91 | 19.65 | 19.83 |
| Monitoring | | 22.42 | 21.27 | 6-30 | 20.98[ab] | 23.95 | 22.76 |
| *Family Structure* | | | | | | | |
| Two biological parents | 54.75 | | | | 68.67%[b] | 61.54% | 51.33% |
| Single-parent | 21.51 | | | | 18.00% | 19.23% | 22.49% |
| Step-parent | 13.57 | | | | 8.00%[b] | 15.38% | 14.64% |
| Other-family | 10.17 | | | | 5.33% | 3.85% | 11.54% |
| Young Adult Factors | | | | | | | |
| Gainfully Active[1] | 63.97 | | | | 54.00%[b] | 48.08%[c] | 68.34% |
| Not Gainfully Active | 36.03 | | | | 46.00% | 51.92% | 31.66% |
| *Relationship Type* | | | | | | | |
| Single | 7.16 | | | | 46.00%[b] | 44.23%[c] | 17.75% |
| Dating | 39.79 | | | | 70.67%[b] | 67.31%[c] | 30.82% |
| Cohabiting | 31.75 | | | | 7.33%[ab] | 19.23%[c] | 37.57% |
| Married | 21.30 | | | | 2.00%[b] | 3.85%[c] | 28.85% |
| Presence of children | 39.12 | | | | 18.00%[ab] | 36.54% | 44.97% |
| No Children | 60.88 | | | | 82.00% | 63.46% | 55.03% |
| Sociodemographic Factors | | | | | | | |
| Women | 50.80 | | | | 44.00%[b] | 48.08% | 58.14% |
| Men | 49.20 | | | | 56.00% | 51.92% | 41.86% |
| Age | | 25.36 | 6.91 | 22-29 | 24.35[ab] | 25.35 | 25.71 |
| *Race* | | | | | | | |
| White | 67.25 | | | | 72.00% | 63.46% | 65.53% |
| Black | 23.72 | | | | 19.33% | 28.85% | 20.27% |
| Hispanic | 6.63 | | | | 6.67%[b] | 7.69% | 11.54% |
| Other | 1.99 | | | | 1.33% | 1.07% | 2.37% |

*all means, percents and standard deviations are weighted, [1]Currently in school or employed, [a] Significant differences between stayed in the parental home and returned to the parental home, [b] Significant differences between stayed in the parental home and living independently, [c] Significant differences between returned to the parental home and living independently

*Table 2. OLS Regression of Parental Closeness*

| | Model 1 | | Model 2 | | | Model 3 | | | Model 4 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *b* | SE | *b* | SE | | *b* | SE | | *b* | SE | |
| *Residential Type* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Living Independently | 0.019 | 0.105 | 0.019 | 0.101 | | 0.001 | 0.101 | | 0.017 | 0.104 | |
| Stayed in parental home | -0.007 | 0.118 | -0.023 | 0.113 | | -0.040 | 0.114 | | -0.059 | 0.114 | |
| **Family Background Factors** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *Mother's Education* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Some college | | | 0.114 | 0.054 | * | 0.104 | 0.055 | † | 0.089 | 0.055 | † |
| College or more | | | 0.169 | 0.062 | ** | 0.138 | 0.063 | * | 0.111 | 0.065 | † |
| *Parenting Strategies* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Support | | | 0.068 | 0.007 | *** | 0.069 | 0.008 | *** | 0.068 | 0.007 | *** |
| Monitoring | | | 0.001 | 0.004 | | -0.001 | 0.005 | | -0.001 | 0.004 | |
| *Family Structure* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Single-parent | | | -0.109 | 0.060 | | -0.080 | 0.063 | | -0.068 | 0.063 | |
| Step-parent | | | -0.080 | 0.072 | | -0.070 | 0.073 | | -0.048 | 0.074 | |
| Other-family | | | 0.006 | 0.083 | | 0.027 | 0.084 | | 0.054 | 0.085 | |
| **Young Adult Factors** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gainfully Active[1] | | | | | | | | | 0.113 | 0.051 | * |
| *Relationship Type* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dating | | | | | | | | | 0.016 | 0.101 | |
| Cohabiting | | | | | | | | | 0.025 | 0.108 | |
| Married | | | | | | | | | 0.004 | 0.006 | |
| Presence of children | | | | | | | | | -0.111 | 0.055 | * |
| **Sociodemographic Factors** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Women | | | | | | 0.103 | 0.047 | * | 0.124 | 0.048 | * |
| Age | | | | | | -0.004 | 0.014 | | -0.003 | 0.014 | |
| Black | | | | | | -0.136 | 0.064 | * | -0.094 | 0.067 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | -0.128 | 0.081 | | -0.109 | 0.081 | |
| Other | | | | | | -0.097 | 0.167 | | -0.086 | 0.168 | |
| $R^2$ | .001 | | 0.104 | | | 0.115 | | | 0.125 | | |

† p < .10; * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001 (n=878)

[1]Currently in school or employed

*Table 2. OLS Regression of Parental Conflict*

| | Model 1 | | | Model 2 | | | Model 3 | | | Model 4 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *b* | SE | | *b* | SE | | *b* | SE | | *b* | SE | |
| *Residential Type* | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Living Independently | -0.210 | 0.097 | * | -0.220 | 0.096 | * | -0.213 | 0.096 | * | -0.145 | 0.098 | |
| Stayed in parental home | 0.006 | 0.108 | | 0.010 | 0.108 | | 0.016 | 0.108 | | 0.030 | 0.108 | |
| **Family Background Factors** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *Mothers' Education* | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Some college | | | | -0.065 | 0.052 | | -0.059 | 0.052 | | -0.046 | 0.052 | |
| College or more | | | | -0.098 | 0.059 | † | -0.074 | 0.060 | | -0.066 | 0.061 | |
| *Parenting Strategies* | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Support | | | | -0.021 | 0.007 | ** | -0.024 | 0.007 | ** | -0.022 | 0.007 | ** |
| Monitoring | | | | -0.008 | 0.004 | † | -0.005 | 0.004 | | -0.005 | 0.004 | |
| *Family Structure* | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Single-parent | | | | -0.020 | 0.058 | | -0.076 | 0.060 | | -0.093 | 0.060 | |
| Step-parent | | | | 0.093 | 0.069 | | 0.065 | 0.069 | | 0.040 | 0.070 | |
| Other-family | | | | 0.020 | 0.079 | | 0.026 | 0.080 | | 0.044 | 0.080 | |
| **Young Adult Factors** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gainfully Active[1] | | | | | | | | | | -0.006 | 0.080 | * |
| *Relationship Type* | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dating | | | | | | | | | | 0.069 | 0.096 | |
| Cohabiting | | | | | | | | | | -0.031 | 0.103 | |
| Married | | | | | | | | | | -0.095 | 0.110 | |
| Presence of children | | | | | | | | | | 0.100 | 0.052 | † |
| **Sociodemographic Factors** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Women | | | | | | | 0.155 | 0.045 | *** | 0.139 | 0.046 | ** |
| Age | | | | | | | -0.004 | 0.014 | | -0.002 | 0.137 | |
| Black | | | | | | | 0.169 | 0.061 | ** | 0.101 | 0.014 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | 0.043 | 0.077 | | 0.010 | 0.077 | |
| Other | | | | | | | 0.154 | 0.159 | | 0.011 | 0.016 | |
| $R^2$ | 0.018 | | | 0.040 | | | 0.062 | | | 0.077 | | |

† p < .10; * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001 (n=878)

[1]Currently in school or employed