Ready for launch, but to where? An examination of locational attainment during the transition to adulthood

Adam M. Lippert, Ph.D.
Harvard University

What factors coincide with remaining in (non)poor neighborhoods or moving into or out of them? The importance of this question is rooted in longstanding sociological interest in how neighborhoods buttress social hierarchies and stratification, organize human interactions into social networks and collective action, and facilitate (or reflect) socioeconomic attainment and status (Fischer 1977, Logan and Molotch 1987, Park and Burgess 1925, Semyonov and Kraus 1982, Shaw and McKay 1942). Spurred by William Julius Wilson's groundbreaking treatise on urban poverty, *The Truly Disadvantaged* (1987), a number of studies have reintroduced the neighborhood as a site for the production and reproduction of social inequalities. Negative consequences of residing in poor neighborhoods include lower educational attainment (Brooks-Gunn, Duncan and Aber 1997, Rubinowitz and Rosenbaum 2000), diminished earnings across the life course (Sharkey 2013), higher incidence of physical and mental health problems (Entwisle 2007, Robert 1999, Sampson, Morenoff and Gannon-Rowley 2002), and premature mortality (Yao and Robert 2011).

For these reasons, locational attainment—the process by which individuals achieve residence in neighborhoods of higher, lesser, or equal socioeconomic status as their origins—is a fundamental dimension of social mobility in America. Much work has been devoted to identifying factors that lead adults into, out of, or to be trapped in poor neighborhoods (e.g., (Logan et al. 1996, South and Crowder 1997). Conversely, very little research has examined locational attainment during the transition to adulthood (see Sharkey (2012) and Swisher et al. (2013) for exceptions). This constitutes an important omission from the literature, as the transition to adulthood is a potential turning point for individuals' lives and their neighborhood

surroundings. One reason for this is that the transition to adulthood marks a stage in the life course where residential mobility is particularly common (Fischer 2002), which is typically the source of neighborhood poverty change for most individuals and especially young people (Jackson and Mare 2007). Furthermore, as they enter adulthood young people experience a range of interlocking transitions that can change their life trajectories—including their residential fortunes—for better or worse (Laub and Sampson 2003). An array of factors are likely to influence locational attainment during the transition to adulthood including several common transitions such as moving from home, finishing school, entering the labor force, and initiating relationships and families (Amato et al. 2008, Osgood et al. 2005). Such transitions precipitate new residential needs—especially in the case of relationship and family formation—and shape one's ability to purchase residence in better neighborhoods.

As a set, life transitions could bear on the locational attainment process for young people in ways that are not apparent when such transitions are viewed separately. This logic is consistent with life course theory, which holds that consequences from specific transitions often depend upon the presence or absence of other transitions (Macmillan and Copher 2005). Further, because life transitions cluster together differently for young women and men, the link between sets of life transitions and locational attainment may be gendered. For instance, marriage and parenthood co-occur less commonly for young women than men (Eggebeen 2002), and mothers are more likely to live with their children than fathers (Hofferth and Goldscheider 2010). The distinctive paths young women and men take into adulthood could have consequences for their locational attainments by affecting other relevant factors such as individual income and the physical distance moved between adolescence and young adulthood.

The current study examines how sets of life transitions coincide with young women's and men's locational attainment during the transition to adulthood. It addresses three important questions: (1) How are different sets of life transitions associated with the locational attainment of young adult women and men? (2) Does living in a poor or nonpoor neighborhood in young adulthood constitute a change or continuation of earlier neighborhood disadvantage for women and men who experience different transition sets? (3) Do individual income or the distance between neighborhood locations in adolescence and young adulthood explain divergent locational outcomes? To answer these questions I use data from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health and latent class analysis to first identify common sets of transitions that adolescents experience as they enter adulthood. I then estimate multivariable statistical models that evaluate how different transition sets contribute to young women's and men's locational attainment as they become adults. By demonstrating how sets of transitions align with residential outcomes, this study broadens current understanding of how life course factors are implicated in the locational attainment process.

LIFE TRANSITIONS AND THE LOCATIONAL ATTAINMENT PROCESS

Locational attainment is central to the broader system of stratification. Neighborhoods act as both a cause and consequence of one's position within a social hierarchy (Sampson 2012), and thus serve important roles in the reproduction of social inequalities. On the cause side, neighborhoods organize access to opportunities that facilitate—or impede—social mobility and economic stability. Neighborhoods are closely aligned with schooling opportunities and low-income neighborhoods are notoriously located in underperforming school districts, leading to diminished cognitive development and poor educational outcomes (Aaronson 1998, Brooksgunn et al. 1993, Harding 2003, Jackson and Mare 2007, Wodtke, Harding and Elwert 2011).

Employment opportunities are similarly lacking in poor neighborhoods, especially for low-skilled workers (Kain 2004, Wilson 1996). This deficit has long-term consequences in the form of diminished earnings over the life course (Sharkey 2013).

Viewing locational attainment as a consequence of stratification is often interpreted through two theoretical frames. Spatial assimilation theory emphasizes the roles of income and human capital in the locational attainment process (Iceland and Wilkes 2006, Massey 1985, South and Crowder 1997). Under this view, diverging locational attainments between households simply reflect inter-household differences in income and human capital (e.g., education, English-language skills). However, economic and human capital alone do not fully explain divergent locational attainments, especially with respect to black-white differences in neighborhood quality. An alternative view, the place stratification perspective, holds that due to systematic discrimination in the housing market, marginalized groups across all economic strata are less likely to achieve residence in nonpoor neighborhoods (Logan and Alba 1993). This view gains traction from studies showing that across all levels of income, blacks are more likely than economically-comparable whites to reside in low-income neighborhoods (Charles 2003, Logan, Stults and Farley 2004).

Though predominant theoretical frames guiding locational attainment research tend to emphasize the roles of income and race/ethnicity, major life transitions have also been shown to matter (Clark, Deurloo and Dieleman 2003, Rosenbaum and Friedman 2007). In particular, occupational changes, marriage, and family formation impact locational attainment by shifting the residential needs of households as well as the capacity to fulfill such needs. Joining the labor force or experiencing some form of occupational change (e.g., promotion; job loss) alters the abilities of households to afford new housing in better neighborhoods. In their study of single

mothers' locational attainments, South and Crowder (1998) found that beginning a job was associated with a higher probability of moving from a poor to a nonpoor neighborhood (relative to remaining in a poor neighborhood). Conversely, in an earlier study of adult women and men, the same authors show that job loss is associated with a higher risk for moving from nonpoor to poor neighborhoods above and beyond the effect of income lost (South and Crowder 1997).

Transitioning from singlehood to marriage is also associated with improvements in residential circumstances (South and Crowder 1998; Swisher, Kuhl, and Chavez 2013). Marriage can facilitate upward locational attainment by increasing household income through the addition of a wage earner, which may benefit women in particular (Holden and Smock 1991). Further, married householders enjoy an "economies-of-scale" benefit by sharing financial burdens such as utilities and housing payments. This benefit releases extra income that can be used to secure housing in higher-quality neighborhoods. Cohabitation may operate on residential outcomes in ways similar to marriage, though its role in the locational attainment process has not been extensively investigated.

While entering employment or marriage appear to have positive impacts on residential outcomes, the role of childrearing is less clear. On the one hand, having children precipitates needs for additional space and amenities like childcare centers more often found in less densely-populated suburban areas (Small and McDermott 2006). Because migration to suburban neighborhoods generally lowers neighborhood poverty exposure (Keels et al. 2005), having children may facilitate upward locational attainments. On the other hand, having children could keep individuals anchored to their neighborhoods by raising the costs of moving, including financial costs as well as losses in family social capital (Briggs 1997). This view receives support from (Crowder, South and Chavez 2006), who find that households with children present

at a baseline observation were less likely to leave their neighborhoods over successive observations. While this study does not examine how *changing* from childlessness to parenting roles influences residential mobility and, by extension, locational attainment, it does suggest evidence of immobility among households with children. For single young adult women this may be especially true. Young adult women are more likely to be single parents than men (Sandefur, Eggerling-Boeck and Park 2005), and the economic perils, localized forms of support, and public assistance that come with single parent status may keep single mothers anchored to their neighborhoods for better or worse.

Other transitions are likely to bear on locational attainment during the transition to adulthood. Leaving the parental home, a common event during this stage in the life course, inherently involves changing residences if not neighborhoods. At least one study has shown that minority adolescents leaving their parents' homes to form independent households experience decreases in neighborhood poverty exposure than those who stay put (Sharkey 2012). Conversely, white adolescents exiting the parental home experience slight increases in neighborhood poverty exposure, a finding partially explained by current college enrollment. It is unclear whether these patterns are consistent for young women and men or whether the physical distance separating one's neighborhoods in adolescence and young adulthood explains part or all of the association between residential independence and locational outcomes. Because longer-distance moves typically confer greater change in the neighborhood environment than local moves (Coulton, Theodos and Turner 2012), move distance could constitute a mediating factor between life transitions and locational attainment.

Studies of individual transitions provide important insights into the way that life events influence locational attainment, but it cannot be assumed that these transitions have similar

implications for locational attainment when experienced in tandem. For example, leaving the parental home may reduce neighborhood poverty exposure, but leaving home while raising a child without a job could operate differently. Accounting for these interdependencies deepens current understanding of the contingent relationship between certain life transitions and locational attainment. Conceptually, principles from life course theory (Elder 1985, Elder 1998) may be usefully augmented to traditional perspective on locational attainment to better understand how clusters of interdependent life transitions coincide with residential outcomes. The life course perspective describes several components related to the current inquiry: roles, role configurations, and transitions. Roles are socially-defined positions that people assume across institutional settings such as student, employee, spouse, and parent (Macmillan and Copher 2005). Social roles are imbued with social meaning, expectations for behavior, sanctions against insubordination, and resources as well as strains endemic to particular roles (Hochschild 1997, Sieber 1974, Stryker 1968). Role configurations refer to clusters of social roles that individuals occupy at any given point in their lives (MacMillan and Eliason 2003). Much work has been devoted to the consequences of role configurations, especially in sociological research on the family (e.g., (Frisco and Williams 2003, Moen 2003). Finally, life transitions represent shifts into and out of particular roles. Because of the properties of social roles, role transitions have implications for changes to one's social status, behavioral expectations, and access to socially-delineated resources. Like roles and role configurations, it is difficult to fully understand the significance of life transitions without viewing them within the broader set of transitions which they occur.

The interdependency of role transitions is especially pronounced during the transition to adulthood. This stage in the life course is now more protracted than it was during the mid-

twentieth century (Settersten Jr. and Ray 2010, Stevens 1990) and has become more individualized, with young people taking a variety of transition sets into their adult years (Rindfuss, Swicegood and Rosenfeld 1987, Shanahan 2000). How life transitions cluster together may provide turning points for young people to improve upon their neighborhoods of origin. Conversely, a series of destabilizing transitions such as relationship dissolution, single parenthood, and unemployment may serve to anchor young people to poorer neighborhoods.

Several recent studies have sought to identify how the transitions that young people experience as they enter adulthood are clustered together (Amato et al. 2008, Oesterle et al. 2010, Osgood et al. 2005, Sandefur, Eggerling-Boeck and Park 2005). Findings from these studies suggest that the transition to adulthood is often made via pathways featuring varied engagements with marriage and family, and education and employment. Recent evidence also indicates how family background characteristics, especially socioeconomic status, are correlated with transition sets (Oesterle et al. 2010; Sandefur, Eggerling-Boeck, and Park 2005).

I build upon these studies by substantively considering and testing how transition sets shape the economic composition of the neighborhoods in which young women and men find themselves as they enter adulthood. Drawing from past studies examining common transition sets and their sociodemographic correlates (Amato et al. 2008; Oesterle et al. 2010; Osgood et al. 2005; Sandefur, Eggerling-Boeck, and Park 2005), as well as research on adults' locational attainment, I make several hypotheses.

First, I expect that individuals making sets of transitions consistent with an orientation towards early family formation are likely to experience prolonged residence in poor neighborhoods relative to their counterparts who delay family formation. Based on prior research, early family formation is expected to be accompanied by limited postsecondary

schooling and lower wages. The additional costs of raising children are also expected to limit the ability of households with children to achieve residence in more economically advantaged neighborhoods by limiting discretionary income and raising the costs associated with longer-distance moves. These obstacles are expected to be even greater for single parents, particularly women, who must provide for their families without the support of a wage-earning partner. These expectations gain support from prior research showing higher poverty rates and shorter move distances among young people whose transitions to adulthood involve family-oriented experiences (Coulton, Theodos and Turner 2012, Mouw 2005).

Conversely, individuals who are single and pursuing or have completed college degrees are less likely to experience neighborhood poverty because they lack co-residential dependents and have access to forms of instrumental support. Without children in the home, 'educated singles' enjoy more discretionary financial resources that can be directed towards housing in better neighborhoods. Further, by pursuing or completing higher educational credentials they have had or continue to have access to assets related to their residence. One form of support, financial assistance from parents, is likely to be more substantial among this group as past research shows women and men who delay marriage and childbearing for college degrees have parents of higher socioeconomic standing than those taking family-oriented routes (Sandefur, Eggerling-Boeck, and Park 2005). Other forms of support unique to this group include university-based financial aid, access to higher quality neighborhoods near educational institutions they attend, and better-paying jobs upon completing their degrees.

Similarly, those who bypass marriage and childrearing for occupational experience and independent living are likely to experience less neighborhood poverty exposure than family-oriented individuals. This is due in part to the financial resources available for locational

improvements to childfree households. Even among childfree workers without college degrees, it is likely that the lack of co-residential dependents better enables them to obtain housing in less economically distressed neighborhoods. How they fare relative to educated singles is unclear. On the one hand, they may face greater exposure to neighborhood poverty because their lower educational attainments reduce earnings. On the other hand, their lengthier involvement in the labor force could raise their earnings relative to educated singles and facilitate better residential outcomes.

As past research shows (e.g., Osgood et al. 2005), some young women and men struggle to transition to any adult roles. Typifying the 'failure to launch' syndrome, they continue to live with their parents throughout the transition to adulthood, seldom attend or complete college degrees, and are typically single. On occasion they are also raising children. Because of their co-residence with parents, they may have access to some parental support but it isn't clear the parents of these individuals command many resources to provide (Osgood et al. 2005). These 'singles in the nest' are oftentimes employed, but with limited schooling their jobs are unlikely to confer sufficient wages for upward locational outcomes. Thus, it is expected that singles in the nest are likely to experience prolonged exposure to neighborhood poverty relative to educated singles and residentially-independent workers because they have lower incomes and by definition are less likely to move farther from their neighborhoods of origin.

In the current study, I test these general hypotheses and address three questions: (1) How are different sets of life transitions related to the likelihood of living in a poor neighborhood as a young adult? (2) Does living in a poor or nonpoor neighborhood in young adulthood constitute a change or continuation of earlier neighborhood disadvantage for women and men who experience different transition sets? (3) Are these patterns partially explained by individual

income or the distance between neighborhood locations in adolescence and young adulthood? This study attempts to link traditional perspectives on locational attainment with the prominent life course perspective, and builds on previous research in several important ways. The literature on locational attainment to date has not thoroughly explored how sets of transitions matter to residential outcomes, and has mostly ignored the transition to adulthood. This study begins to address these gaps and as a result bridges research on the sets of transitions young people make (Amato et al. 2008; Oesterle, Hawkins, Hill, and Bailey 2010; Osgood et al. 2005; Sandefur, Eggerling-Boeck, and Park 2005) and scholarship on locational attainment during the transition to adulthood (Sharkey 2012; Swisher, Kuhl, and Chavez 2013).

METHODS

Sample

This study draws on data from two sources—the restricted-use version of The National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health), and US Census data. Add Health is an ongoing, nationally representative, school-based survey of adolescents in seventh through twelfth grade from 132 high schools and middle schools (Harris 2011). In 1994 Add Health administered a brief in-school questionnaire to students selected through a stratified random sample of all high schools in the United States (n = 90,118). A nationally representative subsample of these respondents also participated in a more extensive in-home interview between 1994 and 1995 (n = 20,745). All students except for graduating high school seniors were then re-interviewed in a second wave of data collection in 1996 (n = 14,738). In 2001-02 a third wave of data was collected from all participants, including graduating seniors from Wave 1. A fourth wave of interviews was fielded in 2008 when most Add Health participants were in their late

twenties or early thirties. Because I am specifically interested in the transition to adulthood I use data from Waves 1 and 3 only. At Wave 1 Add Health respondents were between the ages of 12 and 19; by Wave 3 they were between 18 and 28 years old.

Add Health is an excellent data source for the current study because it includes information on a wide variety of transitions youth undertake as they enter young adulthood. These measures are needed to construct sets of transitions that constitute the transition to adulthood.

Census data from 1990 and 2000 and other contextual data have been appended to individual-level data from Waves 1 and 3 of the Add Health study (Billy, Wenzlow and Grady 1997, Swisher 2009). I use measures from the 1990 Census to construct indicators of poverty and other neighborhood-level characteristics of respondents at Wave 1 (1994-95). Data from the 2000 Census are used to construct Wave 3 (2001-02) neighborhood-level measures.

The census data available in Add Health were collected at multiple geographic levels including the county, tract, and block group. The current study uses block groups to approximate neighborhood boundaries. A block group is a cluster of census blocks sharing a common state, county, and census tract. The average block group is populated by around 1,500 residents, with a range of between 600 and 3,000 people. One quality that allows block groups to approximate neighborhoods is that the area typically comprised by a block group aligns with resident perceptions of the territory encompassing their neighborhoods. This has been confirmed by empirical research that finds that most individuals' drawings of neighborhood boundaries closely aligned with a single block or block group (Elliott et al. 2006).

Several sample restrictions are made. First, only respondents who participated in both the Waves 1 and 3 interviews, have valid sample weights, and are between the ages of 24 and 28

by their Wave 3 interview are included (N = 3,226). Respondents without acceptable geographic identifiers (i.e., GPS-based residential matches or matched physical addresses) at Wave 1 are omitted (N = 273). This includes respondents who were assigned geographic identifiers based on their zip codes, a boundary that is too imprecise for the purpose of this study. Also omitted are respondents who were in prison (N = 3) or in the active military (N = 8) at the time of their Wave 3 interview. These omissions yield a final analytic sample of 2,892 young men and women.

I do not exclude cases with missing data, which is minimal for most of the key study variables associated with locational attainment. The exception to this is the substantial missing data on family poverty measures in adolescence (24.3 percent of cases). Thus, Stata's ICE program is used to multiply impute missing values for control variables (Royston 2004). This results in five sets of complete data, which are combined in the analyses adjusting for the variance within and between imputed samples to calculate standard errors and coefficients (Acock 2005). Missing values on the singular transitions used in the latent class analysis are imputed via full-information maximum likelihood methods as part of the PROC LCA command in SAS (Collins and Lanza 2010). This is described in more detail below.

Measures

Locational attainment

The poverty rate in a respondent's home neighborhood during both adolescence and young adulthood is used to construct a composite measure of locational attainment between Waves 1 and 3. This involves several steps. I first calculate the neighborhood poverty rate for all neighborhoods in which sample members reside at Wave 1 and 3 as the percent of individuals within a respondent's neighborhood whose income falls below the federal poverty line.

Following conventions in the literature (Jargowsky and Bane 1991, South and Crowder 1997, Timberlake 2009), I then define poor neighborhoods at Waves 1 and 3 as neighborhoods where 20 percent or more of residents have incomes that fall below the federal poverty line.

I then construct a measure of locational attainment combining these two binary indicators of neighborhood poverty. The resulting four-category variable classifies respondents as consistently living in nonpoor neighborhoods at Waves 1 and 3 (reference), consistently living in poor neighborhoods at Wave 1 and 3 (= 1), living in a nonpoor neighborhood at Wave 1 but a poor neighborhood at Wave 3 (= 2), or moving from a poor neighborhood at Wave 1 to a nonpoor neighborhood at Wave 3 (= 3). For simplicity, I refer to the latter two categories as entering and exiting poor neighborhoods for the remainder of the text.

One caveat about the Add Health design is that the Wave 1 and 3 observations are separated by six to eight years, a window within which adolescents may switch residences multiple times before settling at their Wave 3 address. Contextual data are not available for the neighborhoods individuals enter and exit between their Wave 1 and 3 observations. Thus, the measure of neighborhood poverty change used here captures residential conditions at only two discrete time points. Length of residence in one's home neighborhood at the time of the adolescent and young adult interviews is controlled in fully-adjusted models.

Transition sets

The primary independent variable indicates different common sets of transitions that young women and men experience between adolescence and young adulthood including residential independence, educational attainment, employment, relationships, and parenthood. Each measure is derived from Wave 3 data. *Residential independence* is a binary variable measuring whether or not the respondent lives with one or more of his/her biological or 'social'

parents. *Educational attainment* is a three-category measure including the following: completed less than a high school diploma or equivalent, completed high school or equivalent, and completed a four-year college degree or higher. *Employment* is a dichotomous variable based on two questions about whether or not the respondent reported working a job for pay during their Wave 3 interview, and whether they worked 35 hours a week or more on average. *Relationship status* is a four-category item which includes the following statuses: never cohabited or married, currently cohabiting, currently married, and previously cohabited or married.

Finally, *parenthood* is a binary variable indicating whether the respondent co-resides with at least one dependent child, including biologically- and socially-related (e.g., foster, step) children. Co-residence with a child dependent is used instead of birth histories because the presence of either biological or 'social' children (e.g., step, adopted) create demands upon household resources and shifts household needs that impact locational attainment.[1]

Using the five constructed variables, Latent Class Analysis (LCA) is applied to identify the most common combinations of transitions and classify them into transition sets. LCA is akin to factor analysis, though it uses categorical rather than continuous items to identify underlying discrete groups (i.e., classes) of respondents (Collins and Lanza 2010). Resultant parameters from LCA are generated via the maximum-likelihood criterion. A multi-group analysis indicated the need to separate the LCA by gender; thus, separate models were estimated for women and men. I identify the number of latent classes in each group using several criteria across an iteration of twelve different models. For the sake of parsimony I present results from only those

[1] An alternative measure of parenthood including a category for non-residential children was also tested in supplementary analyses. In general, non-residential parenting was rare per young men's self-reports and extremely uncommon for young women. In LCA models this category not only had large standard errors but also did little to distinguish the different latent classes. Thus, the more parsimonious parenthood measure indicating either the presence or absence of one or more co-residential child dependents is used in the main analyses.

models that were reasonably well-identified (i.e., models one through seven). See Appendix A for a detailed summary of fit statistics for each model.

The likelihood-ratio statistic G^2 is the first criterion I use to assess absolute model fit. In LCA models with relatively few degrees of freedom—such as those estimated here—the G^2 statistic approximates a chi-square distribution. Comparing the G^2 statistic across all models indicated that the best fitting models for women and men contained either five or six classes.

Second, I use the adjusted Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) to determine relative model fit. The model with the lowest BIC value, which indicates the best fitting model, was the five class solution for both women and men.

Finally, a substantive interpretation of the models identified by evaluating both absolute and relative model fit suggests a correspondence between my findings and past research. Other studies employing similar methods and data drawn from adolescents entering young adulthood have generally found between four and six classes of transition combinations (e.g., Osgood et al. 2005; Sandefur et al. 2005). This correspondence and evidence from objective fit statistics lend support for the five class solution. To ensure solutions were not reached via a local solution, the LCA was repeated with 20 different starting values 100 times following recommendations by Collins and Lanza (2010). This resulted in nearly identical model fit statistics.

Probabilities of class membership are produced by LCA. These indicate the probability that a respondent belongs to latent class *C* based on their statuses across residential independence, educational attainment, employment, relationships, and parenthood. Following conventions in the literature (Collins and Lanza 2010, Goodman 2007), I assign individuals the class to which their probability of membership met or exceeded 70%. A number of cases—about 29% of the sample—had less than a 70% probability of membership in any class, although most

such cases came close to the 70% mark.[2] I assign such individuals the class to which they had the highest probability of membership. A binary indicator of poor fit was constructed, where cases with less than a 70% probability of membership to their assigned class were coded as '1' and '0' otherwise. This binary indicator is controlled in supplementary analyses (available upon request), producing results that are nearly identical to the main findings presented here. A description of the transition sets for women and men is provided in the following section.

In addition to transition sets I also evaluate factors that are hypothesized to influence locational attainment according to the spatial assimilation and place stratification perspectives. *Race and ethnicity* is based on self-reports of race and Hispanic origin, yielding categories for non-Hispanic white (reference), non-Hispanic black, Hispanic/Latin, and other race. *Nativity* is a binary indicator of whether the respondent was born in the United States. *Individual income* is based on respondent self-reports of total income in quintiles received from any source in the past year, including earnings, cash assistance from family or friends, public assistance, interest and dividends, and child support. *Move distance* is the distance in miles separating a respondent's Wave 1 and Wave 3 addresses. Moves of less than one-quarter mile are bottom coded to 0, while long-distance moves are top coded at 1,000 miles, the approximate driving distance from Boston to Chicago.

In addition to transition sets, multivariate models control for a range of potential confounders measured at the time of the Wave 1 interview. *Primary language* is assessed with a question asking respondents which language is typically spoken at home. Categories include English (reference), Spanish, or a different language. *Family structure* includes indicators for biological two-parent families (reference), single-parent households, or other family types.

[2] Among those with less than a 70% probability of belonging to any class, the average probability of membership to the assigned class is 60% for women and 59% for men.

Parental education is a continuous variable ranging from 1 (no formal schooling) to 8 (graduate or professional school). *Family poverty* is measured with a linear specification of the income-to-poverty ratio, which is the ratio of the family's income to the U.S. Census Bureau's official 1994 poverty threshold adjusted by household size and age structure. *Age* in years at Wave 1 is also controlled.

Because not all respondents lived at their Wave 1 residence in 1990 when census data were collected, a control for whether the respondent lived at the same address in 1995 as their 1990 address (= 0 if not). Similarly, a dichotomous indicator of whether the respondent has lived at their Wave 3 address for one year or more (= 1 if so, = 0 otherwise) is also included as a control.

Data analysis

The analytic strategy follows three steps. First, descriptive statistics are presented in Table 1 for the total sample. Next, logistic regression is used to analyze the relationship between transition sets and the odds of living in a poor neighborhood in young adulthood. I present two models for each gender-age group, with results for women shown in Table 2 and results for men shown in Table 3. Model 1 is an unadjusted model regressing Wave 3 neighborhood poverty on transition sets only. Model 2 adds all control variables. Estimates in Table 2 use family-oriented women as the referent transition set, while estimates in Table 3 omit fast starters. In supplementary models (available upon request), I use the other transition sets as the reference category to compare how all transition sets relative to the others are associated with living in a poor neighborhood at Wave 3. Superscripted letters are used in Tables 2 and 3 to denote all statistically significant comparisons.

Finally, multinomial logistic regression is used to predict neighborhood poverty change net of all controls. Two fully-adjusted models are presented: one treating 'never lived in a poor neighborhood' as the omitted outcome category, and one treating 'consistently lived in a poor neighborhood' as the omitted category. Results from these models are presented separately for women (Table 4) and men (Table 5). Again, supplementary models rotate the reference category for transition sets.

Because of the complex design of Add Health, there is clustering of observations that may downwardly bias standard errors. To correct for this all analyses are cluster-adjusted at the level of the Wave 1 school district and weighted to account for the probability of selection.

Results

Descriptive statistics are shown in Table 1. Results indicate a general tendency for young women and men to avoid neighborhood poverty during their transition to adulthood, with 62.4% of the sample having never lived in a poor neighborhood. Conversely, 13.8% of the sample consistently lived in poor neighborhoods. Nearly a quarter of the sample experienced neighborhood poverty at some point, with 11.6% entering poor neighborhoods by young adulthood and 12.2% exiting poor neighborhoods.

The sample is roughly split by sex (47.9% female) and is predominately native-born non-Hispanic white. Average individual income in young adulthood is near the third quintile, or approximately $19,000 a year. The average distance separating a respondent's Wave 1 and Wave 3 addresses is 84.757 miles, but this statistic is influenced by the high degree of right skew for this variable. The median reflects a more modest distance between adolescent and young adult neighborhood locations, at 3.727 miles. Most respondents were raised in two-biological

parent families (53.7%) and had parents with an average maximum education of 4.272, or slightly more than a high school diploma. Mean income-to-poverty ratio is 3.105, which can be interpreted as an average household income during adolescence roughly three times the federal poverty line ($47,041), approximately the average income for a family of four in 1995.[3]

A comparison of similar characteristics of the study sample and 18-29 year olds in the 2006 Current Population Survey (CPS; Rumbaut and Komaie 2007) suggests that the study sample may over-represent whites (65.6% vs. 60.8% in the CPS) and native-born persons (92.4% vs. 82.6% in the CPS), and underrepresent Hispanics (12.4% vs. 18.4% in the CPS).

I now provide a description of each transition set identified through the LCA. Descriptions are shown separately for women and men. See Figure 1 for a graphical presentation of conditional item probabilities by latent class assignment.

Women's transition sets

The modal transition for women is typified by an orientation towards post-secondary schooling, employment, and delayed relationship and family formation. I refer to this group as *educated singles*. Women in this group had comparatively high probabilities of completing college degrees (48.9%) and the second-highest probability of full-time employment among all transition sets (65.6%). Educated singles are mostly residentially independent, though compared to other groups present a high probability of cohabitation with parents (42.6%). The overwhelming majority have never cohabited or married a romantic partner (87.8%) and nearly all are childfree (98.4%).

The second most common transition set for women is a group I call *fast starters*, so labelled because of their tendency to have completed a number of transitions by young adulthood. By young adulthood almost all fast starters had achieved residential independence

[3] Based on the federal poverty threshold for a family of four in 1995 ($15,150).

(97.4%) and finished their schooling with high school diplomas (92.5%). The probability of working a full-time job is 60.4% for this group, while the probability of living with a child dependent is 87.6%, indicating the presence of many working mothers in this group. Few fast starting women had no experience with cohabitation or marriage (5.4%), with the majority either currently cohabiting with or married to a romantic partner (26.2% and 57.7%, respectively).

Compared to fast starters, the third most common group—*working partners*—are much less likely to be raising children (2.2%). Working partners are also residentially independent (99.4%) and are typically either cohabiting (35.7%) or married (38.8%). Of all groups, working partners are the most likely to be engaged in full-time work (77.9%), and while most ended their educational careers with high school diplomas (53.1%) a sizeable minority completed college degrees (38.1%).

While the tendency for most groups is to live independently by young adulthood, women in the group I call *singles in the nest* stand out for their tendency to live with their parents. Among this group, the probability of living with parents is 78.9%. Aside from their propensity to live at home, women in this group present a pattern of potentially destabilizing transitions. For example, childrearing is common among this group (50%) but romantic partnerships are not, with most women either having no experience with cohabitation or marriage (35.6%) or prior experiences that have since dissolved (52.3%). This group is also the least likely to be employed full-time (60.1%) and typically have only high school educations (88.7%) or less (9.5%).

The final group is one I term *family-oriented* women. Several features are prominent among women in this group. First, family-oriented women have over a 98% probability of raising a child at home. Second, most family-oriented women have transitioned to cohabiting (18.7%) or married relationships (48.9%), though many have experienced cohabitation or marital

dissolutions and are now single (34.1%). Most family-oriented women live independently from their parents (80.9%), but few are employed full-time (14.7%). Given the modest educational attainments of women in this group—64.2% and 35% probability of having finished schooling with a high school diploma or less, respectively—the mobility prospects for this group appear bleak.

Men's transition sets

The majority of young men are classified as *singles in the nest*. As the name implies, men in this group are relatively likely to live with parents (77.2%) and have no experience with cohabitation or marriage (90.2%). Some—9.7%—have prior relationship experience, but are otherwise single. Compared to all other groups, male singles in the nest are least likely to be working full-time (60.7%). A sizeable minority has completed a college degree (21.3%), but high school diplomas are more typical (68.9%). Virtually all male singles in the nest are childfree, a feature that distinguishes them from their female counterparts.

The second most common transition set for young men is the *fast starters*. Like their female peers, fast starting men have accomplished a range of transitions by young adulthood. The broad majority have moved from home (93.1%), completed their schooling with high school diplomas (80.2%) or less (16.6%), and have entered full-time employment (88.1%). Most fast starting men share their homes with one or more child dependents (78.3%) and a cohabiting partner (17.8%) or spouse (82%).

Next to fast starters is a group I label the *educated workers*. Men from this group are residentially independent (99.9%), often working full-time jobs (78.8%), and are better educated than men from all other transition sets. Most men in this group are single with either no prior

cohabitation or marriage experience (50.7%) or experiences that have since ended (12.3%). The probability of raising children for men in this group is nearly zero.

The fourth transition set among men is a group noteworthy for their relationship histories. Men from this group, which I dub *former partners*, have high probabilities of past cohabitations or marriages that have ended by young adulthood (73.1%). Given their likelihood of relationship disruptions, it is unsurprising that former partners also have a high probability of cohabiting with their parents (48.3%). Temporary stays with parents may constitute strategic responses to disruptions in living arrangements with former partners. Most men in this group ended their educations with a high school diploma (90.6%) and the majority work full-time (76.3%). The probability of co-residing with a child dependent is fairly low for this group (8.2%).

Nearly all men in the final transition set—*cohabiting partners*—live with a romantic companion (94.3%). These men are sometimes also caring children in the household (24.7%) and juggling full-time jobs (64.2%), though their probability of full-time work is lower than most other groups. Male cohabiting partners are generally more poorly educated than other men, reflected in their relatively high probability of high school dropout (18.4%). While the tendency for male cohabiting partners is to live away from parents, a number remain under their parents' roofs (18.4%).

I now examine how transition sets and sociodemographic factors are associated with living in a poor neighborhood in young adulthood. Table 2 presents results from two logistic regression models for young women only. Model 1 regresses the log odds of living in a poor neighborhood in young adulthood on transition sets only, while Model 2 adds race/ethnicity and controls. Results from models omitting educated singles are shown in the table and significant differences are marked with traditional notation. Supplemental models rotate the reference

transition sets to obtain comparisons among all transition sets. Significant ($p < .05$) differences relative to fast starters, working partners, and singles in the nest are denoted with daggers (†), double daggers (‡), and the Greek letter lambda (λ), respectively.

Results from Model 1 show that only family-oriented women significantly differ from educated singles in their odds of living in poor neighborhoods as young adults. In supplemental models I also find that family-oriented women are more likely to live in poor neighborhoods as young adults compared to fast starters ($b = 0.775$, $p < .01$), working partners ($b = 1.132$, $p < .001$), and singles in the nest ($b = 0.795$, $p < .05$). When controls are added to Model 2 these associations are attenuated and no longer statistically significant, with the exception of the latter contrast: net of controls family-oriented women are more likely to live in poor neighborhoods as young adults than singles in the nest ($b = 1.013$, $p < .05$). Coefficients for non-Hispanic black and Hispanic indicate that these groups are more likely than non-Hispanic whites to live in poor neighborhoods in young adulthood net of parental education and family poverty.

[Table 2 here]

Table 3 displays results based on analyses for young men. Singles in the nest are omitted in the results shown, but supplemental models rotate the referent transition sets and notation is provided to indicate significant associations. Results from Model 1 indicate that, compared to singles in the nest, men from other transition sets fair about equally regarding their odds of living in poor neighborhoods as young adults. However, cohabiting partners face higher odds of living in poor neighborhoods compared to fast starters ($b = 0.615$, $p < .05$), educated workers ($b = 0.894$, $p < .01$), and former partners ($b = 0.615$, $p < .05$). Results from Model 2 show that these

associations are robust after controls are added. Like their female counterparts, non-Hispanic black males are more likely than whites to live in poor neighborhoods as young adults. Hispanic males have comparable odds of living in poor neighborhoods as young adults compared to white males, a finding that stands in contrast to patterns among young women.

[Table 3 here]

Next, I address the second research question: does living in a poor neighborhood in young adulthood constitute a change or continuation of earlier neighborhood disadvantage for women and men? Table 4 presents results from multinomial logistic regression models predicting the locational attainments of young women. Two models are estimated: Model 1 omits 'consistently lived in a nonpoor neighborhood' as the base outcome, and Model 2 omits 'consistently lived in a poor neighborhood'. The patterns revealed in Panel A suggest that women from all transition sets are about as likely to enter a poor neighborhood than consistently live in a nonpoor neighborhood, with the exception of working partners who are more likely to enter poor neighborhoods than singles in the nest ($b = 0.950$, $p < .05$). In terms of neighborhood poverty exits, results in Panel B show no significant differences in the odds of exiting poor neighborhoods versus consistently living in nonpoor neighborhoods among women from different transition sets.

In Panel C of Model 1 the poor locational outcomes of family-oriented women are made more apparent. Compared to educated singles, family-oriented women are more likely to consistently live in poor neighborhoods than consistently live in nonpoor neighborhoods. This difference translates to an odds ratio of 2.775 (OR = $exp(1.021) = 2.775$), or nearly three times

the odds of consistently living in poor neighborhoods versus nonpoor neighborhoods. Family-oriented women are also more likely to consistently live in poor neighborhoods than fast starters ($b = 0.782$, $p < .05$), working partners ($b = 1.074$, $p < .05$), and singles in the nest ($b = 1.293$, $p < .05$).

Turning to Model 2 where the omitted outcome is consistently living in a poor neighborhood, the results in Panel A show little variation in the odds of entering poor neighborhoods among women from different transition sets. Likewise, in Panel B there are no significant differences among the transition sets. One way to interpret this null finding is that, among women who lived in poor neighborhoods as adolescents, no transition set is any more likely to facilitate neighborhood poverty exits by young adulthood than any other transition set. For women from poor neighborhoods, neighborhood poverty appears to be a fairly durable circumstance throughout the transition to adulthood, especially for non-Hispanic black and Hispanic females.

Racial/ethnic differences in locational attainment shown in Table 4 present a clear pattern of disadvantage for racial minorities, especially black women. Compared to white women, Hispanic and black women are overwhelmingly more likely to consistently live in poor neighborhoods. Black women are also more likely to enter poor neighborhoods than consistently live in nonpoor neighborhoods, suggesting that black women originating in nonpoor neighborhoods are more likely to lose this advantage by young adulthood than white women. Conversely, Hispanic and black women from poor neighborhoods are also less likely to exit them than consistently live in them compared to white women.

[Table 4 here]

Table 5 presents two models predicting young men's locational attainments. In Panel A from Model 1, the results indicate that cohabiting partners are more likely than singles in the nest to enter poor neighborhoods versus consistently live in poor neighborhoods. Further, cohabiting partners are more likely to enter poor neighborhoods than fast starters ($b = 0.952$, $p < .01$), educated workers ($b = 0.797$, $p < .05$), and former partners ($b = 1.001$, $p < .01$). Results from Panel B show that, relative to singles in the nest, fast starters are significantly more likely to exit poor neighborhoods than consistently live in nonpoor neighborhoods. This finding suggests that fast starters are more likely to originate from poor neighborhoods as adolescents than singles in the nest. The odds of consistently living in poor neighborhoods versus nonpoor neighborhoods are not differentiated by transition sets, as shown in Panel C of Model 1.

Findings from Model 2 suggest that the odds of entering a poor neighborhood versus consistently living in poor neighborhoods do not vary across men's transition sets. Conversely, the odds of exiting poor neighborhoods do vary. Compared to singles in the nest, both fast starters and educated workers are more likely to exit poor neighborhoods than consistently live in them. These findings offer evidence that escaping neighborhood poverty is more common among men taking the fast starter or educated workers paths into adulthood than the single-in-the-nest path. Additionally, Panel B of Model 2 is suggestive of gender differences in upward locational attainments: no transition sets among women appeared to be linked to neighborhood poverty exits, while for men two transition sets are associated with upward attainments.

Again, racial/ethnic differences in locational attainment reveal a pattern of disadvantage for African American males. Compared to whites, black males are more likely to enter, exit, and consistently live in poor neighborhoods than consistently live in nonpoor neighborhoods. This pattern shows that throughout the transition to adulthood, black males face a strong likelihood of

living in poor neighborhoods during adolescence, young adulthood, or both. Contrary to findings for young women, Panel B of Model 2 shows no significant racial/ethnic differences regarding neighborhood poverty exits.

[Table 5 here]

The final set of analyses adds individual income and the distance between neighborhood locations in adolescence and young adulthood to determine what role these factors play in explaining the patterns shown previously. Results from multinomial regression models adding these covariates are shown in Table 6 for young women, while results for men are presented in Table 7. Standard errors are not shown for parsimony. Results from Panel A of Model 1 in Table 6 are comparable to those presented earlier without income and move distance controlled. Even after adjustments, the working partners group remains more likely to enter poor neighborhoods than singles in the nest, and the coefficient for non-Hispanic black is largely unchanged (from 1.611 to 1.646). Neither individual income nor move distance is associated with neighborhood poverty entries.

Results shown in Panel B of Model 1 are also mostly unchanged after controlling for individual income and move distance. However, with income and move distance controlled, the results in Panel C show noteworthy changes. Previous models indicate that family-oriented women are more likely to consistently live in poor neighborhoods than all other groups, a contrast that is attenuated to non-significance when controlling for income and move distance. The effect of income itself has a positive effect on women's locational attainments by reducing the odds of consistently living in poor neighborhoods than nonpoor neighborhoods. The addition

of income to the model does not yield a significant change in the magnitude of the coefficients for non-Hispanic black or Hispanic. It does, however, attenuate the coefficients for parental education and income-to-poverty, suggesting that a family's socioeconomic status may bear on their daughter's locational attainment by influencing her personal income. Results shown in Model 2 are similar to those presented earlier omitting individual income and move distance.

[Table 6 here]

Turning to young men, results from Table 7 suggest that individual income plays less of a role in explaining different locational attainments across men's transition sets. As in prior models, cohabiting partners remain more likely than all other groups to enter poor neighborhoods than consistently live in nonpoor neighborhoods (Panel A in Model 1). Adding income does, however, attenuate the difference between educated workers and singles in the nest regarding neighborhood poverty exits (Panel B in Model 2). Direct effects from individual income on locational attainment are consistent with expectations: at higher levels of income the odds of entering or consistently living in poor neighborhoods are lower (Panels A and C in Model 1). With respect to race/ethnicity, adding individual income and move distance to Model 1 has little effect on the size of the coefficients for non-Hispanic black. Though the race/ethnicity coefficients in Panel C are reduced in size, these differences are not statistically significant compared to coefficients from Table 5 based on models excluding income and move distance.

[Table 7 here]

Discussion

Locational attainment is a fundamental aspect of social mobility in America, yet the residential outcomes of adolescents entering young adulthood have received only minor attention. The current study aims to address this gap by augmenting traditional models of locational attainment with elements of life course theory to explain residential outcomes during the transition to adulthood. To understand the utility of this approach it is useful to first compare the current study to existing research. Recent studies by Sharkey (2012) and Swisher and colleagues (2013) are the first to address these issues by merging classical perspectives on locational attainment—the theories of spatial assimilation and place stratification—with life course factors. Findings from these investigations are largely consistent with past work identifying a great degree of durability in residential inequality over the life course (e.g., (Jackson and Mare 2007, Sharkey 2008, Timberlake 2007). In general, family resources including income and parental education are associated with lower neighborhood poverty exposure between adolescence and young adulthood, whereas being a racial minority predisposes one to extended residence in poor, predominately minority neighborhoods. Results from the current inquiry were generally consistent with these patterns. Family income and parental education were associated with lower odds of consistently living in poor versus nonpoor neighborhoods, a finding that conforms to the spatial assimilation perspective. Yet the results also matched expectations of the place stratification model: black males and females and Hispanic females were more likely to consistently live in poor versus nonpoor neighborhoods throughout the transition to adulthood than whites. Further, compared to white females, black and Hispanic females were less likely to exit poor neighborhoods than consistently live in poor neighborhoods, and blacks were more likely to enter poor neighborhoods than consistently live

in nonpoor places. The latter finding also applied when black males were compared to white males. In other words, racial minorities were generally more likely to face persistent residential disadvantages, or lose earlier advantages by moving from nonpoor to poor places. These patterns effectively reproduce in young adulthood the racial residential inequalities evident in adolescence, sorting whites and minorities (and poor and nonpoor individuals) into neighborhoods differentiated by poverty status at a life course stage when the foundations of one's long-term socioeconomic trajectories are forming.

Recent studies also shed light on how life course transitions relate to residential outcomes during the transition to adulthood. Sharkey (2012) finds that residential independence and moving farther from home are associated with reductions in neighborhood poverty. Swisher and colleagues (2013) find that, for residentially independent young adults, the odds of living in poor neighborhoods is lower for those with more education and who are married, and higher for those on public assistance. Where the current study departs from these inquiries is in its explicit attention to how life transitions co-occur and, as a set, coincide with young women's and men's locational attainment. This approach yields some noteworthy contrasts against previous findings. For instance, although residential independence is linked to positive locational outcomes especially for better-educated and married persons (Swisher et al. 2013), I find that the association is more complex. Family-oriented women—a group mostly comprised of residentially-independent, unmarried women raising children—are more likely to consistently live in poor than nonpoor neighborhoods compared to their similarly residentially-independent counterparts in the fast starter and working partners groups. Among men, the residentially-independent cohabiting partners are more likely to enter poor neighborhoods than consistently live in nonpoor neighborhoods compared to all other groups, including the almost exclusively

residentially-independent fast starters and educated workers. Similar patterns emerge with respect to neighborhood poverty exits: fast starters and educated workers are more likely to exit than remain in poor neighborhoods relative to the residentially-*de*pendent singles in the nest, whereas the cohabiting partners are not. Other nuances can be observed between the findings presented here and those found in prior work, but the focus on singular transitions obscures a broader point: that life transitions unfold within *sets* of other transitions, and that transition sets are consequential for locational outcomes.

The findings presented here also reveal important differences between young women and men in how factors related to locational attainment are linked to residential outcomes. Compared to whites, African American and Hispanic women are more likely to consistently live in poor neighborhoods and move from nonpoor to poor neighborhoods. Among young men, the racial contrasts are more limited: African Americans are more likely to consistently live in poor neighborhoods and move from nonpoor to poor neighborhoods than whites, while the residential outcomes of Hispanic men are comparable to those of whites. While gender differences in the locational attainment process have generally been neglected serious empirical attention, the results presented here offer some hints that this may be an important area of inquiry.

Insights from the current study must be balanced against several noteworthy limitations. First, the method used to define the transition sets is not without flaw. Groups resulting from the latent class analysis used here are dependent upon the variables entered in the model. Including other transitions in the analysis may yield different sets of life experiences, a possibility that future research should investigate. Further, it would be a mistake to consider the groups produced by the latent class analysis as clear-cut representations of naturally-occurring pathways into adulthood. Rather, the transition sets identified here are offered as heuristic summaries of

common passages into adulthood. Indeed, they are heuristic summaries that accord with prior studies employing similar methods (Osgood et al. 2005, Sandefur, Eggerling-Boeck and Park 2005) and theorizing on modern transitions to adulthood (Settersten Jr. and Ray 2010, Shanahan 2000), but the limits of latent class analysis in this respect should be acknowledged.

Second, the findings here could be influenced by omitted factors that are associated with both transition sets and locational outcomes. Personal income in particular may constitute such a confounder. I conducted sensitivity analyses replicating all models with an additional control for Wave 3 self-reported income. The results, which are available upon request, are nearly identical to the main findings. Third, Add Health is not representative of the experiences of adolescents who dropped out of school by Wave 1 or other groups that occasionally fall outside of the frame of school-based samples (Oropesa and Landale 2009). Finally, the Add Health data permit analysis of individuals within a narrow age range. It is unclear whether the patterns uncovered here persist deeper into formal adulthood. Future research should examine how transition sets coincide with long-range continuity and change in neighborhood poverty exposure.

Notwithstanding its limitations, the current study begins to unpack the complex link between life course factors and residential outcomes of adolescents entering young adulthood. While more work is needed to understand how the locational attainment process unfolds during this life course stage, several preliminary recommendations can be formed on the basis of the current study. Concentrated poverty is a stubborn issue in America and one that has consequences for the production and reproduction of inequality. In the context of the current economic climate urban poverty has become more concentrated, reflected in the increasing tendency towards the economic segregation of the impoverished from the affluent (Dwyer 2007, Dwyer 2010). Action is urgently needed and solutions with the potential for immediate impact

must be devised. Courses of action to reduce concentrated poverty often follow one of two strategies: make poor places less poor, or help move poor people from poor places. Progressive policies could potentially be leveraged to facilitate the former strategy. One such policy, the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC), enjoys more bipartisan support than many other redistributive programs and could be expanded to include young adults and childfree households—groups that typically fall outside of EITC eligibility. Expanding the terms of eligibility to include young adults could provide modest injections of capital to young householders in struggling neighborhoods. Regarding the latter goal, residential relocation programs such as the Moving to Opportunity and Gautreaux programs have shown mixed results, but problems with the design of these studies preclude any firm conclusions from being made. A recent residential relocation program in Mount Laurel, New Jersey has shown very promising early results on relocated householders' well-being, economic stability, and residential satisfaction (Massey et al. 2013). More research on residential relocation programs should be conducted, especially with respect to the largescale viability of such programs.

References

Aaronson, D. 1998. "Using Sibling Data to Estimate the Impact of Neighborhoods on Children's Educational Outcomes." *Journal of Human Resources* 33(4):915-46. doi: 10.2307/146403.

Acock, Alan C. 2005. "Working with Missing Values." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 67:1012-28.

Amato, P. R., N. S. Landale, T. C. Havasevich-Brooks, A. Booth, D. J. Eggebeen, R. Schoen and S. M. McHale. 2008. "Precursors of Young Women's Family Formation Pathways." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 70(5):1271-86. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2008.00565.x.

Billy, John, Audra Wenzlow and William Grady. 1997. "User Documentation for the Add Health Contextual Database." Vol. Seattle: Battelle.

Briggs, X. D. 1997. "Moving up Versus Moving Out: Neighborhood Effects in Housing Mobility Programs." *Housing Policy Debate* 8(1):195-234.

Brooks-Gunn, Jeanne, Greg J. Duncan and J. Lawrence Aber. 1997. *Neighborhood Poverty: Context and Consequences for Children*, Vol. I. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Brooksgunn, J., G. J. Duncan, P. K. Klebanov and N. Sealand. 1993. "Do Neighborhoods Influence Child and Adolescent Development." *American Journal of Sociology* 99(2):353-95. doi: 10.1086/230268.
Charles, C. Z. 2003. "The Dynamics of Racial Residential Segregation." *Annual Review of Sociology* 29:167-207. doi: 10.1146/annurev.soc.29.010202.100002.
Clark, W. A. V., M. C. Deurloo and F. M. Dieleman. 2003. "Housing Careers in the United States, 1968-93: Modelling the Sequencing of Housing States." *Urban Studies* 40(1):143-60. doi: 10.1080/0042098032000035572.
Collins, Linda M. and Stephanie T. Lanza. 2010. *Latent Class and Latent Transition Analysis with Applications in the Social Behavioral, and Health Sciences*. Hoboken, N.J.: Wiley.
Coulton, Claudia J., Brett Theodos and Margery A. Turner. 2012. "Residential Mobility and Neighborhood Change: Real Neighborhoods under the Microscope." *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research* 14(3):55-90.
Crowder, K., S. J. South and E. Chavez. 2006. "Wealth, Race, and Inter-Neighborhood Migration." *American Sociological Review* 71(1):72-94.
Dwyer, R. E. 2007. "Expanding Homes and Increasing Inequalities: Us Housing Development and the Residential Segregation of the Affluent." *Social Problems* 54(1):23-46. doi: 10.1525/sp.2007.54.1.23.
Dwyer, R. E. 2010. "Poverty, Prosperity, and Place: The Shape of Class Segregation in the Age of Extremes." *Social Problems* 57(1):114-37. doi: 10.1525/sp.2010.57.1.114.
Eggebeen, D. J. 2002. "The Changing Course of Fatherhood - Men's Experiences with Children in Demographic Perspective." *Journal of Family Issues* 23(4):486-506. doi: 10.1177/0192513x02023004002.
Elder, Glen H. 1985. *Life Course Dynamics: Trajectories and Transitions, 1968-1980*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
Elder, Glen H. 1998. "The Life Course as Developmental Theory." *Child Development* 69:1-12.
Elliott, D. S., S. Menard, B. Rankin, A. Elliott, D. Huizinga and W. J. Wilson. 2006. *Good Kids from Bad Neighborhoods: Successful Development in Social Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ Press.
Entwisle, Barbara. 2007. "Putting People into Place." *Demography* 44(4):687-703.
Fischer, Claude S. 1977. *Networks and Places: Social Relations in the Urban Setting*. New York: Free Press.
Fischer, Claude S. 2002. "Ever-More Rooted Americans." *City & Community* 1(2):177-98. doi: 10.1111/1540-6040.00016.
Frisco, M. L. and K. Williams. 2003. "Perceived Housework Equity, Marital Happiness, and Divorce in Dual-Earner Households." *Journal of Family Issues* 24(1):51-73. doi: 10.1177/0192513x02238520.
Goodman, Leo A. 2007. "On the Assignment of Individuals to Latent Classes." Pp. 1-22 in *Sociological Methodology 2007, Vol 37*, Vol. 37, *Sociological Methodology*, edited by Y. Xie.
Harding, D. J. 2003. "Counterfactual Models of Neighborhood Effects: The Effect of Neighborhood Poverty on Dropping out and Teenage Pregnancy." *American Journal of Sociology* 109(3):676-719. doi: 10.1086/379217.
Harris, Kathleen M. 2011. "Design Features of Add Health." Vol. Retrieved February 11, 2013 (http://www.cpc.unc.edu/projects/addhealth/data/guides/).
Hochschild, Arlie R. 1997. *The Time Bind: When Work Becomes Home and Home Becomes Work*. New York: Metropolitan/Holt.
Hofferth, S. L. and F. Goldscheider. 2010. "Family Structure and the Transition to Early Parenthood." *Demography* 47(2):415-37.
Holden, K. C. and P. J. Smock. 1991. "The Economic Costs of Marital Dissolution - Why Do Women Bear a Disproportionate Cost." *Annual Review of Sociology* 17:51-78. doi: 10.1146/annurev.soc.17.1.51.

Iceland, J. and R. Wilkes. 2006. "Does Socioeconomic Status Matter? Race, Class, and Residential Segregation." *Social Problems* 53(2):248-73. doi: 10.1525/sp.2006.53.2.248.
Jackson, M. I. and R. D. Mare. 2007. "Cross-Sectional and Longitudinal Measurements of Neighborhood Experience and Their Effects on Children." *Social Science Research* 36(2):590-610. doi: 10.1016/j.ssresearch.2007.02.002.
Jargowsky, Paul and Mary Jo Bane. 1991. "Ghetto Poverty in the United States, 1970 to 1980." Pp. 235-73 in *The Urban Underclass*, edited by C. Jencks and P. E. Peterson. Washington DC: The Brookings Institution.
Kain, J. F. 2004. "A Pioneer's Perspective on the Spatial Mismatch Literature." *Urban Studies* 41(1):7-32. doi: 10.1080/0042098032000155669.
Keels, M., G. J. Duncan, S. Deluca, R. Mendenhall and J. Rosenbaum. 2005. "Fifteen Years Later: Can Residential Mobility Programs Provide a Long-Term Escape from Neighborhood Segregation, Crime, and Poverty?". *Demography* 42(1):51-73. doi: 10.1353/dem.2005.0005.
Laub, J and R. J. Sampson. 2003. *Shared Beginnings, Divergent Lives: Delinquent Boys to Age 70*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Logan, J. R. and R. D. Alba. 1993. "Locational Returns to Human-Capital - Minority Access to Suburban Community Resources." *Demography* 30(2):243-68. doi: 10.2307/2061840.
Logan, J. R., R. D. Alba, T. McNulty and B. Fisher. 1996. "Making a Place in the Metropolis: Locational Attainment in Cities and Suburbs." *Demography* 33(4):443-53. doi: 10.2307/2061779.
Logan, John R. and Harvey L. Molotch. 1987. *Urban Fortunes: The Political Economy of Place*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Logan, John R., Brian J. Stults and Reynolds Farley. 2004. "Segregation of Minorities in the Metropolis: Two Decades of Change." *Demography* 41:1-22.
Macmillan, R. and R. Copher. 2005. "Families in the Life Course: Interdependency of Roles, Role Configurations, and Pathways." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 67(4):858-79. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2005.00180.x.
MacMillan, Ross and Scott Eliason. 2003. "Characterizing the Life Course as Role Configurations and Pathways: A Latent Structure Approach." Pp. 529-54 in *Handbook of the Life Course*, edited by J. Mortimer and M. Shanahan. New York: Kluwer.
Massey, D. S. 1985. "Ethnic Residential Segregation: A Theoretical Synthesis and Empirical Review." *Sociology and Social Research* 69:315-50.
Moen, Phyllis. 2003. *It's About Time: Couples and Careers*. Ithaca, NY: ILR Press.
Mouw, Ted. 2005. "Sequences of Early Adult Transitions: A Look at Variability and Consequences." Pp. 256-91 in *On the Frontier of Adulthood: Theory, Research, and Public Policy*, edited by R. A. Settersten Jr., F. F. F. Jr. and R. G. Rumbaut. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Oesterle, S., J. D. Hawkins, K. G. Hill and J. A. Bailey. 2010. "Men's and Women's Pathways to Adulthood and Their Adolescent Precursors." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 72(5):1436-53. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00775.x.
Oropesa, R. S. and N. S. Landale. 2009. "Why Do Immigrant Youths Who Never Enroll in Us Schools Matter? School Enrollment among Mexicans and Non-Hispanic Whites." *Sociology of Education* 82(3):240-66.
Osgood, D. Wayne., Gretchen Ruth, Jacquelynne S. Eccles, Janis E. Jacobs and Bonnie L. Barber. 2005. "Six Paths to Adulthood: Fast Starters, Parents without Careers, Educated Partners, Educated Singles, Working Singles, and Slow Starters." Pp. 320-55 in *On the Frontier of Adulthood: Theory, Research, and Public Policy*, edited by R. A. Settersten Jr., F. F. F. Jr. and R. G. Rumbaut. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Park, Robert E. and Ernest W. Burgess. 1925. *The City*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
Rindfuss, R. R., C. G. Swicegood and R. A. Rosenfeld. 1987. "Disorder in the Life Course - How Common and Does It Matter." *American Sociological Review* 52(6):785-801. doi: 10.2307/2095835.

Robert, Stephanie A. 1999. "Socioeconomic Position and Health: The Independent Contribution of Community Socioeconomic Context." *Annual Review of Sociology* 25:489-516.
Rosenbaum, E. and S. Friedman. 2007. *The Housing Divide: How Generations of Immigrations Fare in New York's Housing Market*. New York: New York University Press.
Royston, P. 2004. "Multiple Imputation of Missing Values." *Stata Journal* 4(3):227-41.
Rubinowitz, L.S. and J. E. Rosenbaum. 2000. *Cross the Class and Color Lines: From Public Housing to White Suburbia*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Sampson, Robert J., Jeffrey D. Morenoff and Thomas Gannon-Rowley. 2002. "Assessing "Neighborhood Effects": Social Processes and New Directions in Research." *Annual Review of Sociology* 28:443-78.
Sampson, Robert J. 2012. *Great American City: Chicago and the Enduring Neighborhood Effect*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Sandefur, Gary D., Jennifer Eggerling-Boeck and Hyunjoon Park. 2005. "Off to a Good Start? Postsecondary Education and Early Adult Life." Pp. 292-319 in *On the Frontier of Adulthood: Theory, Research, and Public Policy*, edited by R. A. Settersten Jr., F. F. F. Jr. and R. G. Rumbaut. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Semyonov, M. and V. Kraus. 1982. "The Social Hierarchies of Communities and Neighborhoods." *Social Science Quarterly* 63(4):780-89.
Settersten Jr., Richard A. and Barbara Ray. 2010. "What's Going on with Young People Today? The Long and Twisting Path to Adulthood." *Future of Children* 20:19-41.
Shanahan, Michael J. 2000. "Pathways to Adulthood in Changing Societies: Variability and Mechanisms in Life Course Perspective." *Annual Review of Sociology* 26:667-92.
Sharkey, Patrick. 2008. "The Intergenerational Transmission of Context." *American Journal of Sociology* 113(4):931-69. doi: 10.1086/522804.
Sharkey, Patrick. 2012. "Temporary Integration, Resilient Inequality: Race and Neighborhood Change in the Transition to Adulthood." *Demography* 49(3):889-912. doi: 10.1007/s13524-012-0105-0.
Sharkey, Patrick. 2013. *Stuck in Place: Urban Neighborhoods and the End of Progress toward Racial Equality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Shaw, Clifford R. and Henry D. McKay. 1942. *Juvenile Delinquency in Urban Areas*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Sieber, S. D. 1974. "Toward a Theory of Role Accumulation." *American Sociological Review* 39(4):567-78. doi: 10.2307/2094422.
Small, M. L. and M. McDermott. 2006. "The Presence of Organizational Resources in Poor Urban Neighborhoods: An Analysis of Average and Contextual Effects." *Social Forces* 84(3):1697-724. doi: 10.1353/sof.2006.0067.
South, Scott J. and Kyle D. Crowder. 1997. "Escaping Distressed Neighborhoods: Individual, Community, and Metropolitan Influences." *American Journal of Sociology* 102(4):1040-84. doi: 10.1086/231039.
Stevens, D. A. 1990. "New Evidence on the Timing of Early Life Course Transitions - the United-States 1900 to 1980." *Journal of Family History* 15(2):163-78. doi: 10.1177/036319909001500110.
Stryker, S. 1968. "Identity Salience and Role Performance - Relevance of Symbolic Interaction Theory for Family Research." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 30(4):558-64. doi: 10.2307/349494.
Swisher, Raymond R. 2009. "Add Health Wave Iii Contextual Database." Vol. Chapel Hill, NC: Carolina Population Center.
Timberlake, J. M. 2007. "Racial and Ethnic Inequality in the Duration of Children's Exposure to Neighborhood Poverty and Affluence." *Social Problems* 54(3):319-42. doi: 10.1525/sp.2007.54.3.319.
Timberlake, J. M. 2009. "Effects of Household and Neighborhood Characteristics on Children's Exposure to Neighborhood Poverty and Affluence." *Social Science Research* 38(2):458-76. doi: 10.1016/j.ssresearch.2009.01.001.

Wilson, William J. 1996. *When Work Disappears: The World of the New Urban Poor*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Wodtke, G. T., D. J. Harding and F. Elwert. 2011. "Neighborhood Effects in Temporal Perspective: The Impact of Long-Term Exposure to Concentrated Disadvantage on High School Graduation." *American Sociological Review* 76(5):713-36. doi: 10.1177/0003122411420816.

Yao, Li and Stephanie A. Robert. 2011. "Examining the Racial Crossover in Mortality between African American and White Older Adults: A Multilevel Survival Analysis of Race, Individual Socioeconomic Status, and Neighborhood Socioeconomic Context." *Journal of aging research* 2011:132073. doi: 10.4061/2011/132073.

Appendix A. Fit statistics for latent class models

No. of Classes	Log Likelihood	No. of Free Parameters	Adjusted BIC	Entropy	G^2	*p* -value
			Females (n = 1,455)			
1	-5895.60	87	974.03	n/a	941.19	n/a
2	-5598.74	78	417.26	0.69	347.46	< .001
3	-5511.84	69	280.42	0.77	173.66	< .001
4	-5472.01	60	237.72	0.72	94.01	< .001
5	**-5454.65**	**51**	**239.94**	**0.68**	**59.28**	**< .001**
6	-5444.59	42	256.79	0.64	39.17	< .05
7	-5440.42	33	285.40	0.63	30.82	> .05
			Males (n = 1,437)			
1	-5453.42	87	1103.44	n/a	1070.42	n/a
2	-5040.57	78	314.59	0.83	245.00	< .001
3	-4989.87	69	250.02	0.84	143.59	< .001
4	-4958.32	60	223.77	0.71	80.49	< .001
5	**-4944.88**	**51**	**233.73**	**0.68**	**53.61**	**< .01**
6	-4935.12	42	251.05	0.69	34.09	< .05
7	-4931.19	33	280.05	0.66	26.24	> .05

Note: selected models shown in bold

Table 1. Description of the study sample (N = 2,892)

	Mean/proporion	Std error
Neighborhood poverty		
Consistently nonpoor	0.624	0.040
Consistently poor	0.138	0.027
Entered poor neighborhood	0.116	0.012
Exited poor neighborhood	0.122	0.021
Sociodedemographic indicators		
Wave 3 individual income quintiles	2.873	0.056
Move distance between Wave 1 and Wave 3 (in miles)	84.757	8.330
Female	0.479	0.010
Age in years	17.805	0.029
Race		
Non-Hispanic white (ref)	0.656	0.043
Non-Hispanic black	0.171	0.030
Hispanic	0.124	0.026
Other race	0.049	0.013
Native born	0.924	0.016
Primary language		
English (ref)	0.914	0.020
Spanish	0.059	0.016
Other language	0.028	0.006
Family structure		
Two biological parents (ref)	0.537	0.019
Single parent family	0.222	0.014
Step family	0.118	0.009
Other family type	0.122	0.011
Parental education	4.272	0.094
Income to poverty ratio	3.105	0.124
Years at Wave 1 address	7.968	0.237
Years at Wave 3 address	5.296	0.423

Notes: Estimates based on survey weighted and multiply-imputed data adjusted for design effects

Sociodemographic indicators measured at Wave 1 unless noted otherwise

Table 2. Logistic regression models predicting women's residence in poor neighborhoods in young adulthodood (N = 1,455)

	Model 1		Model 2	
	β	SE	β	SE
Transition sets				
Educated singles (ref)				
Fast starters	0.157	0.266	0.146	0.329
Working partners	-0.200	0.257	0.203	0.288
Singles in the nest	0.136	0.277	-0.383	0.342
Family-oriented women	0.932 **†‡λ	0.304	0.629 λ	0.346
Age in years			-0.037	0.119
Race				
Non-Hispanic black			1.860 ***	0.251
Hispanic			0.917 *	0.375
Other race			-0.198	0.498
Native born			-0.652 *	0.271
Primary language				
Spanish			-0.330	0.477
Other language			-0.538	0.643
Family structure				
Single parent family			0.341	0.237
Step family			-0.260	0.324
Other family type			0.737 **	0.279
Parental education			-0.020	0.065
Income to poverty ratio			-0.012	0.051
Years at Wave 1 address			-0.006	0.017
Years at Wave 3 address			0.017	0.013

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

†: Log odds are significantly ($p < .05$) greater compared to fast starters

‡: Log odds are significantly ($p < .05$) greater compared to working partners

λ: Log odds are significantly ($p < .05$) greater compared to singles in the nest

Table 3. Logistic regression models predicting men's residence in poor neighborhoods in young adulthodood (N = 1,437)

	Model 1		Model 2	
	β	SE	β	SE
Transition sets				
Singles in the nest (ref)				
Fast starters	-0.107	0.221	-0.233	0.237
Educated workers	-0.386	0.274	-0.177	0.278
Former partners	-0.107	0.262	-0.207	0.268
Cohabiting partners	0.508 †‡λ	0.314	0.455 †‡λ	0.339
Age in years			0.053	0.114
Race				
Non-Hispanic black			1.146 ***	0.334
Hispanic			0.108	0.408
Other race			-1.108	0.571
Native born			-0.971 *	0.405
Primary language				
Spanish			-0.018	0.421
Other language			0.532	0.739
Family structure				
Single parent family			0.255	0.203
Step family			0.477	0.284
Other family type			-0.073	0.326
Parental education			-0.096	0.063
Income to poverty ratio			-0.090	0.058
Years at Wave 1 address			0.009	0.017
Years at Wave 3 address			-0.003	0.012

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

†: Log odds are significantly ($p < .05$) greater compared to fast starters

‡: Log odds are significantly ($p < .05$) greater compared to educated workers

λ: Log odds are significantly ($p < .05$) greater compared to former partners

Table 4. Multinomial logistic regression models predicting women's locational attainment between adolescence and young adulthodood (N = 1,455)

	Model 1 vs. Consistently in nonpoor neighborhood (ref)						Model 2 vs. Consistently in poor neighborhood (ref)			
	Panel A. Entered poor neighborhood		Panel B. Exited poor neighborhood		Panel C. Consistently in a poor neighborhood		Panel A. Entered poor neighborhood		Panel B. Exited poor neighborhood	
	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE
Transition sets										
Educated singles (ref)										
Fast starters	0.223	0.399	0.332	0.393	0.238	0.442	-0.015	0.445	0.094	0.499
Working partners	0.339 λ	0.346	0.161	0.333	-0.054	0.396	0.393	0.437	0.214	0.486
Singles in the nest	-0.611	0.486	0.035	0.596	-0.272	0.487	-0.339	0.544	0.306	0.576
Family-oriented women	0.227	0.609	0.387	0.565	1.021 *†‡λ	0.442	-0.794	0.742	-0.633	0.611
Age in years	-0.025	0.188	-0.149	0.152	-0.121	0.141	0.096	0.206	-0.028	0.169
Race										
Non-Hispanic black	1.611 ***	0.342	1.763 ***	0.456	2.970 ***	0.489	-1.359 *	0.571	-1.207 *	0.542
Hispanic	0.442	0.492	-0.199	0.616	1.344 *	0.568	-0.901	0.657	-1.543 *	0.595
Other race	-0.353	0.618	0.279	0.576	0.163	0.844	-0.516	0.941	0.115	0.771
Native born	-0.490	0.452	-0.132	0.759	-0.885	0.451	0.395	0.672	0.753	0.792
Primary language										
Spanish	0.342	0.630	1.114	0.757	-0.541	0.612	0.883	0.765	1.656 *	0.779
Other language	-2.369 *	1.096	0.211	0.763	0.014	0.871	-2.383	1.434	0.197	1.293
Family structure										
Single parent family	0.507	0.302	0.189	0.293	0.205	0.316	0.302	0.363	-0.016	0.344
Step family	-0.547	0.426	0.516	0.403	0.244	0.437	-0.792	0.552	0.271	0.555
Other family type	0.767	0.404	0.837 *	0.346	1.127 **	0.402	-0.360	0.510	-0.290	0.380
Parental education	0.091	0.092	-0.132	0.067	-0.170 *	0.075	0.261 *	0.106	0.038	0.084
Income to poverty ratio	0.035	0.040	-0.138 *	0.064	-0.233 *	0.099	0.269 **	0.088	0.095	0.106
Years at Wave 1 address	-0.018	0.019	0.014	0.022	0.010	0.023	-0.028	0.024	0.004	0.027
Years at Wave 3 address	-0.023	0.017	-0.026	0.017	0.030	0.016	-0.053 *	0.021	-0.056 **	0.018

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

†: Log odds are significantly ($p < .05$) greater compared to fast starters

‡: Log odds are significantly ($p < .05$) greater compared to working partners

λ: Log odds are significantly ($p < .05$) greater compared to singles in the nest

Table 5. Multinomial logistic regression models predicting men's locational attainment between adolescence and young adulthodood (N = 1,437)

	Model 1 vs. Consistently in nonpoor neighborhood (ref)						Model 2 vs. Consistently in poor neighborhood (ref)			
	Panel A. Entered poor neighborhood		Panel B. Exited poor neighborhood		Panel C. Consistently in a poor neighborhood		Panel A. Entered poor neighborhood		Panel B. Exited poor neighborhood	
	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE
Transition sets										
Singles in the nest (ref)										
Fast starters	-0.016	0.402	1.361 **	0.443	0.162	0.352	-0.179	0.564	1.199 **	0.449
Educated workers	0.139	0.390	0.731	0.514	-0.386	0.445	0.524	0.570	1.116 *	0.562
Former partners	-0.066	0.430	0.799	0.468	-0.128	0.369	0.063	0.547	0.927	0.516
Cohabiting partners	0.935 *†‡λ	0.415	0.856	0.569	0.244	0.436	0.691	0.501	0.612	0.648
Age in years	0.290	0.151	-0.380 *	0.163	-0.334 *	0.151	0.624 ***	0.185	-0.046	0.177
Race										
Non-Hispanic black	1.298 ***	0.311	1.517 **	0.508	1.738 ***	0.513	-0.440	0.546	-0.220	0.617
Hispanic	-0.347	0.605	0.638	0.535	0.517	0.588	-0.863	0.772	0.121	0.632
Other race	-1.336	0.739	-1.128	0.899	-1.197	1.008	-0.139	1.302	0.069	0.912
Native born	-1.667 *	0.734	-1.150 **	0.378	-1.071	0.550	-0.596	0.958	-0.079	0.546
Primary language										
Spanish	0.449	0.980	0.040	0.585	-0.158	0.516	0.607	1.103	0.198	0.586
Other language	0.230	1.118	-1.142	0.906	0.184	0.905	0.046	1.378	-1.326	1.123
Family structure										
Single parent family	-0.160	0.284	0.110	0.304	0.555 *	0.252	-0.715 *	0.353	-0.445	0.344
Step family	0.669 *	0.282	-0.048	0.353	-0.006	0.489	0.676	0.427	-0.042	0.511
Other family type	-0.241	0.456	0.092	0.434	0.136	0.364	-0.377	0.417	-0.044	0.466
Parental education	0.023	0.094	-0.270 **	0.088	-0.315 ***	0.093	0.338 *	0.138	0.044	0.120
Income to poverty ratio	-0.038	0.062	-0.166	0.103	-0.265 *	0.091	0.227	0.112	0.099	0.094
Years at Wave 1 address	-0.005	0.019	0.005	0.022	0.026	0.026	-0.031	0.029	-0.021	0.027
Years at Wave 3 address	-0.042 *	0.018	-0.002	0.020	0.013	0.016	-0.056 *	0.022	-0.016	0.018

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

†: Log odds are significantly ($p < .05$) greater compared to fast starters

‡: Log odds are significantly ($p < .05$) greater compared to educated workers

λ: Log odds are significantly ($p < .05$) greater compared to former partners

Table 6. Multinomial logistic regression models testing income and move distance as explanations for young women's locational attainment (N = 1,455)

	Model 1 vs. Consistently in a nonpoor neighborhood			Model 2 vs. Consistently in poor neighborhood	
	Panel A. Entered poor neighborhood	Panel B. Exited poor neighborhood	Panel C. Consistently in poor neighborhood	Panel A. Entered poor neighborhood	Panel B. Exited poor neighborhood
Transition sets					
Educated singles (ref)					
Fast starters	0.189	0.342	0.098	0.090	0.244
Working partners	0.356 λ	0.178	-0.043	0.399	0.221
Singles in the nest	-0.661	0.005	-0.335	-0.326	0.340
Family-oriented women	0.072	0.360	0.747	-0.675	-0.387
Individual income quintiles	-0.201	-0.059	-0.337 *	0.135	0.277
Move distance between Wave 1 and Wave 3 (in miles)	0.000	0.000	-0.002	0.002	0.002
Age in years	-0.010	-0.151	-0.100	0.090	-0.051
Race					
Non-Hispanic black	1.646 ***	1.770 ***	2.999 ***	-1.353 *	-1.230 *
Hispanic	0.384	-0.190	1.305 *	-0.922	-1.495 *
Other race	-0.376	0.188	0.132	-0.508	0.056
Native born	-0.487	-0.042	-0.744	0.257	0.701
Primary language					
Spanish	0.310	1.072	-0.454	0.764	1.526 *
Other language	-2.610 ***	0.288	0.156	-2.765 *	0.132
Family structure					
Single parent family	0.471	0.159	0.155	0.316	0.004
Step family	-0.520	0.522	0.204	-0.725	0.318
Other family type	0.798	0.868 *	1.079 *	-0.281	-0.211
Parental education	0.037	-0.134 *	-0.146	0.183	0.012
Income to poverty ratio	0.049	-0.149 *	-0.198	0.247	0.048
Years at Wave 1 address	-0.014	0.013	0.006	-0.020	0.007
Years at Wave 3 address	-0.023	-0.023	0.021	-0.043 *	-0.044 **

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

λ: Log odds are significantly ($p < .05$) greater compared to singles in the nest

Table 7. Multinomial logistic regression models testing income and move distance as explanations for young men's locational attainment (N = 1,437)

	Model 1 vs. Consistently in a nonpoor neighborhood			Model 2 vs. Consistently in poor neighborhood	
	Panel A. Entered poor neighborhood	Panel B. Exited poor neighborhood	Panel C. Consistently in poor neighborhood	Panel A. Entered poor neighborhood	Panel B. Exited poor neighborhood
Transition sets					
Singles in the nest (ref)					
Fast starters	0.106	1.483 ***	0.438	-0.332	1.045 *
Educated workers	0.220	0.825	-0.135	0.355	0.960
Former partners	0.047	0.867	-0.031	0.078	0.898
Cohabiting partners	0.983 *†‡λ	0.937	0.363	0.620	0.575
Individual income quintiles	-0.193 **	-0.081	-0.253 *	0.060	0.171
Move distance between Wave 1 and Wave 3 (in miles)	0.000	0.000	-0.003	0.003	0.002
Age in years	0.270	-0.399 *	-0.394 *	0.664 ***	-0.005
Race					
Non-Hispanic black	1.232 ***	1.501 **	1.669 **	-0.437	-0.169
Hispanic	-0.314	0.686	0.547	-0.861	0.139
Other race	-1.312	-1.201	-1.078	-0.234	-0.123
Native born	-1.654 *	-1.134 **	-1.063	-0.591	-0.071
Primary language					
Spanish	0.399	0.070	-0.155	0.554	0.224
Other language	0.344	-0.930	0.335	0.009	-1.264
Family structure					
Single parent family	-0.185	0.099	0.565 *	-0.750 *	-0.466
Step family	0.709 *	-0.046	-0.091	0.800	0.044
Other family type	-0.214	0.109	0.179	-0.394	-0.071
Parental education	-0.013	-0.252 *	-0.324 **	0.312 *	0.072
Income to poverty ratio	-0.031	-0.179	-0.236 **	0.204 *	0.056
Years at Wave 1 address	-0.003	0.010	0.028	-0.031	-0.019
Years at Wave 3 address	-0.042 *	-0.004	0.007	-0.049 *	-0.011

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

†: Log odds are significantly ($p < .05$) greater compared to fast starters

‡: Log odds are significantly ($p < .05$) greater compared to educated workers

λ: Log odds are significantly ($p < .05$) greater compared to former partners