Published in final edited form as:

Chin Sociol Rev. 2019 ; 51(2): 173–206. doi:10.1080/21620555.2019.1596020.

Parent-Child Coresidence and Experiences of Romantic Relationships: Evidence from Young Adults in Taiwan

Yu Wei-hsin*,

Department of Sociology, University of Maryland, College Park

Lin Zhiyong,

Department of Sociology, University of Maryland, College Park

Su Kuo-hsien

Department of Sociology, National Taiwan University

Abstract

Research on the consequences of young adults' extended coresidence with parents indicates that coresident singles marry later, with a recent study specifically attributing this pattern to these singles' lesser engagement in romantic relationships. Nevertheless, we do not know exactly how coresident singles' relationship dynamics differ from those of individuals living independently and whether the former's relationships are qualitatively different. Using full relationship history data from the Taiwan Educational Panel Survey and Beyond, we examine how coresidence is associated with the paces of entering and exiting romantic relationships among young Taiwanese. We also investigate whether coresident singles exhibit different partner selection patterns from those living apart from parents, based on the argument that the former may be less needy for intimate ties and under greater parental control. Results from random-effects event history models indicate that young Taiwanese who reside in the parental home take longer to form romantic relationships, while ending relationships faster, than those living independently. Once entering relationships, coresident singles have lower odds of becoming highly committed to their relationships. Furthermore, men living with parents are more likely than other men to form relationships that are homogamous in age and, to some extent, family economic background. Meanwhile, coresident women are more likely to enter ethnically homogamous relationships than other women. Altogether, the results suggest that the practice of extended coresidence affects both the quantity and the quality of intimate relationships for young people, which has implications for the marriage tempo and patterns in society.

Keywords

Premarital living arrangements; coresidence; romantic relationships; young adulthood

Young adults throughout the world are increasingly likely to live with their parents (Desilver 2016). In the United States, for example, the percentage of individuals between ages 18 and 34 living in their parents' home has grown steadily since the 1960s, making this living

*corresponding author whyu1@umd.edu.

arrangement the most common among all arrangements in 2016 (Fry 2016). In other parts of world, where leaving the parental home before marriage is less typical, the percentage of young adults coresiding with parents is even higher. Over three quarters of unmarried individuals in their late twenties still live with their parents in various countries in Southern and Eastern Europe, as well as in East Asia, with the average age of leaving the parental home as late as 30 years old in some countries (Eurostat 2017; Huang 2013; Raymo 2003; Raymo et al. 2015).

Young people's living arrangements have long interested family researchers, as leaving the parental home is a key marker in the transition to adulthood (Billari and Liefbroer 2010; Furstenberg 2010). Although much research on young adults' living arrangements focuses on why and when they decide to leave their parental home (Billari and Liefbroer 2010; Goldscheider and Goldscheider 1999; Nauck and Ren 2018; Zeng et al. 1994; Zorlu and Mulder 2011), several studies also suggest that extended coresidence with parents has important consequences (Aquilino 1999; Leopold 2012; Umberson 1992; White and Rogers 1997). As the timings of major life course events during young adulthood, including leaving the parental home and forming a union, are often closely related (Guzzo 2006), one potential consequence of young adults' continued coresidence is thought to be a delay in their transitions to marriage and parenthood (Dalla Zuanna 2001). Studies of countries with both a strong tradition of unmarried adults living with parents and drastic declines in marriage and fertility, such as Italy, Japan, and Taiwan, are especially likely to consider the link between the two (Billari and Tabellini 2011; Raymo 2003), with a few showing an empirical association between premarital coresidence and marriage postponement (Raymo and Ono 2007; Sakamoto and Kitamura 2007; Yu, Su and Chiu 2012).

Despite the empirical evidence connecting extended coresidence to delayed marriage transitions, research on why coresidence may have such an impact remains scarce. The popular discourse and limited research addressing this question—mostly on Japan—typically focus on how the material comforts of the parental home reduce young men's and women's desire to marry (Huang 2013; Raymo 2003; Yamada 1999). Using data with detailed information on young people's marital intention and courtship activities, a recent study of Japan nevertheless demonstrates that extended coresidence delays marriage transitions mainly through its effect on relationship involvement (Yu and Kuo 2016). When living with parents, young adults in Japan are less likely to be in a romantic relationship, though their views on marriage and the amount of effort put into meeting a partner are about the same regardless of their living arrangements. Coresidence is therefore thought to make singles pickier in selecting romantic partners, perhaps because coresident singles are psychologically less needy for intimate companions.

Building on the argument that relationship involvement is the key to understanding how unmarried adults' prolonged coresidence defers their marriage transitions, in this study we examine how premarital coresidence is associated with young adults' paces of entering and exiting romantic relationships in Taiwan. Not only is previous evidence linking extended coresidence with absence of romantic relationships limited to a single country (Japan), but also existing research, lacking full information on individuals' relationship histories, fails to show whether coresident singles' lower rates of romantic involvement result from their

lower tendencies to form a relationship, higher chances of breaking up, or both, compared to singles living independently (Yu and Kuo 2016). With detailed data from Taiwan that document individuals' entire relationship histories from mid-adolescence to early adulthood, we are able to tell exactly how coresident singles come to engage in romantic relationships less often.

In addition to how coresident singles differ from others in the paces of entering and exiting relationships, we also ask whether the former's relationships are qualitatively different from those formed by singles living independently, as premarital living arrangements may contribute to marriage postponement through shaping the characteristics of relationships. Specifically, if coresident singles have a lower psychological need for companionship, as prior researchers argue (Yu and Kuo 2016), they may also be less likely to consider marriage or cohabitation after forming relationships. Consequently, the commitment level of relationships formed while individuals live in the parental home may be lower than that of relationships formed by individuals living independently, which could also decelerate coresident singles' transitions to marriage.

Beyond the level of commitment, coresident singles' relationships may differ in terms of the couple's respective characteristics (e.g., education, ethnicity), as the argument that such singles are pickier in selecting partners also implies that they may pair with different types of partners. Because those less patient in seeking partners are less likely to fulfil their mating preferences—which might be akin to societal preferences—and because independent living can potentially reduce parental control over young people's dating practices and mate selection (Rosenfeld 2007), singles living away from parents may less likely form relationships in which the couples' respective characteristics are compliant with social norms (e.g., educationally and ethnically homogamous relationships). Thus, to provide a comprehensive understanding of how premarital living arrangements shape young people's relationship involvement, in this study we also examine how coresidence is associated with the commitment level of young people's relationships and whether it is relevant to singles' hazards of forming relationships that follow socially approved pairing patterns.

Our study focuses on Taiwan not only because of the availability of detailed relationship data, but also because Taiwan exemplifies societies with both a strong cultural norm for unmarried adults to stay in their parental home and very low marriage and fertility rates. Like Japan and other East Asian countries, Taiwan has experienced rapid increases in the age of first marriage, while the rate of nonmarital childbearing has remained low (Jones 2007). As a result, the fertility rate in Taiwan has declined drastically (Raymo et al. 2015). Although our study focuses on romantic experiences during early adulthood, and relationships during this period may not result in marriage, previous research shows that relationship experiences during late adolescence and early adulthood are closely tied to the likelihood of marriage formation at a later point (Meier and Allen 2009; Raley, Crissey and Muller 2007). Understanding how coresidence with parents may be related to Taiwanese youth's romantic involvement and relationship dynamics can therefore shed light on the extremely low marriage and fertility rates in that society, as well as in other countries with similar demographic trends and premarital living arrangements. In addition, Taiwan is a useful case to tease out the effect of coresidence on young adults' romantic relationships.

Because remaining in the parental home before marriage is normative in Taiwan, singles are unlikely to choose to coreside to avoid economic hardship or not to coreside to enhance dating prospects. Instead, single young adults in Taiwan tend to leave the parental home for reasons exogenous to their romantic involvement, such as attending school or having jobs far away from the parental home (Huang 2013; Nauck, Gröpler and Yi 2017). Thus, the case of Taiwan helps illustrate how coresidence per se shapes different aspects of romantic relationships for young adults and provide insights for other countries in which the proportion of coresident singles is increasing.

Premarital Living Arrangements and Their Consequences

Leaving the parental home has long been regarded as a major life course event during late adolescence and young adulthood (Furstenberg 2010; Guzzo 2006). Within and across societies, research shows considerable differences in young people's paces of leaving their parents' home. The timing of home-leaving tends to vary by individuals' school enrollment status, their parents' education and resources, and local economic conditions (Aassve et al. 2002; Billari and Tabellini 2011; Goldscheider and Goldscheider 1999; Hughes 2003; Manacorda and Moretti 2006; Mulder, Clark and Wagner 2002). Because young people's paces of leaving the parental home also depend on age and life course norms in the society (Billari and Liefbroer 2007; Huang 2013), extended coresidence is especially prevalent in countries with strong kinship ties and a relatively low emphasis on adult children's independence before marriage, such as many East Asian and Southern European countries (Dalla Zuanna 2001; Nauck et al. 2017; Zeng et al. 1994). Besides cultural norms, some researchers also attribute late home-leaving in these countries to the high cost of living and weak institutional support for youth's access to housing (Cordón 1997; Raymo et al. 2015). Regardless of the cause, it is clear that spending most of the premarital years in the parental home is common and socially acceptable in many parts of the world (Desilver 2016; Eurostat 2017).

One reason researchers pay attention to how long adult children stay in the parental home is that coresidence with parents is potentially consequential. Studies show that young people who live with parents have different intergenerational relations than those who do not (Aquilino 1999; Umberson 1992; White and Rogers 1997). Compared to adult children living independently, coresident adult children tend to feel closer to and perceive greater support from their parents, but at the same time, they report more tension between the generations. Even after leaving the parental home, those who stayed in the parents' home longer tend to maintain a closer relationship with their parents and other family members (Goldscheider and Lawton 1998; Leopold 2012).

In addition to shaping parent-child relations, young people's premarital living arrangements are thought to affect their romantic involvement, union formation, and fertility (Huang 2013; Raymo et al. 2015; Yu and Kuo 2016). Although earlier U.S. research finds those who have left the parental home earlier more likely develop a preference for small families (Goldscheider and Waite 1991), the recent literature based on East Asian or Southern European countries generally links extended parent-child coresidence with marriage postponement and reduced fertility (Billari and Tabellini 2011; Dalla Zuanna 2001; Raymo

2003; Raymo and Ono 2007; Schaffnit and Sear 2014; Yu and Kuo 2016). Arguments for coresidence's negative effect on marriage and fertility often emphasize the extras that coresidence, compared to independent living, can provide for today's young adults. Because many young people today are less financially secure than their parents, the parental home tends to provide more material comforts than their own home after marriage. For women in societies with a highly gendered household division of labour, such as Japan, remaining single in the parental home also shields them from the domestic responsibilities they must undertake upon marriage, as their mothers would do most of the household work in the parental home (Raymo and Ono 2007). In countries where adult children's premarital coresidence with parents is normal and expected, the benefits of living with parents are especially thought to dampen coresident singles' interest in marriage, resulting in late marriage and low fertility (Miyamoto, Iwakami and Yamada 1997; Yamada 1999).

Much of the limited research examining the mechanism linking coresidence to marriage delays, however, fails to support the argument about the material comforts of the parental home. Studies of Japan, for example, indicate that coresident women's pace of entering marriage is related to neither their need to contribute to household income nor their romantic partner's earnings in relation to their father's (Raymo and Ono 2007; Sakamoto and Kitamura 2007). Using longitudinal information on living arrangements and courtship behaviors from Japan, Yu and Kuo (2016) also show that living with parents does not decrease singles' intention to marry or increase their concern about postmarital economic wellbeing. Instead, these researchers find that young adults in Japan are less likely to be romantically involved when they live with parents, compared to when they live apart. This difference in romantic involvement accounts for coresident singles' slower pace of entering first marriage than those living independently.

Although Yu and Kuo's (2016) study demonstrates that coresidence has a significant effect on romantic involvement, they provide no information on exactly why coresident singles are less commonly in romantic relationships, in part, because their study does not include data on young adults' full relationship histories. We do not know whether coresident singles' lower likelihood of romantic involvement results from their slower paces of entering a romantic relationship or their higher hazards of breaking off from one, or both. If coresident singles take longer to form relationships but are no different in the pace of breaking up, then the effect of coresidence on romantic involvement may have more to do with how different living arrangements shape individuals' ability to attract potential partners. If coresident singles form relationships at an equal speed but experience greater relationship instability, it would suggest that coresidence, which enables parents to interfere more with children's romantic relationships (Rosenfeld 2007), serves as an additional stressor for these relationships. Alternatively, coresidence may reduce young adults' need for companionship, given their perception of receiving stronger support from the parents (White and Rogers 1997), or create an illusion that the coresiding children are too young to be fully committed to a relationship (Yu and Kuo 2016). The lower psychological need or readiness for commitment will lead coresident singles to both enter relationships at a slower pace and exit relationships at a faster pace. For the same reason, when singles do form relationships, those who live with parents may be less likely to advance their relationships to a more serious level—namely, considering marriage or cohabitation, both of which require a higher level of

commitment. By analyzing how coresidence is associated with the paces of entering and exiting relationships, as well as the level of commitment of the relationships entered, our study can shed light on the mechanisms through which premarital coresidence affects romantic involvement.

Parent-Child Coresidence and Assortative Mating

The argument that coresiding with parents reduces young people's psychological need for intimate relationships, proposed by Yu and Kuo (2016), implies that coresident singles can afford to be choosier in their search for romantic partners. Not only may this difference result in coresident youth taking a longer time to commit to a relationship, but it could also lead them to pair with partners whose characteristics are more in sync with their preferences, as people who are more willing to wait would have a better chance to realize their preferences in a search. Much prior research indicates an overall tendency for people to marry those similar to them, especially in terms of education and race/ethnicity (Blossfeld 2009; Qian and Lichter 2007; Schwartz 2013), suggesting a preference for homogamy at least in certain aspects. Recent studies of internet dating further confirm that this preference extends to singles' choices of dating partners, with both men and women being more likely to select and respond to internet daters with characteristics similar to their own (Hitsch, Hortaçsu and Ariely 2010; Skopek, Schulz and Blossfeld 2011). Assuming that regardless of their living arrangements, individuals are likely to prefer romantic partners from the same educational or racial/ethnic group as theirs, if coresident singles are indeed more willing to take their time to find a match, then they may also be more likely to enter relationships characterized by couple similarities in education and race/ethnicity.

The different levels of eagerness to form relationships between youth who live with and apart from their parents are not the only possible reason why coresidence may be related to relationship characteristics. Research on trends in assortative mating has long highlighted the importance of third-party control in shaping the prevalence of marriages formed by individuals from different social groups (Schwartz 2013). When a third party, such as the parents, becomes less influential over singles' mate selection, the latter are thought to be able to more freely choose partners who do not resemble themselves, especially in ascribed characteristics, such as race/ethnicity and family of origin. Linking living arrangements with third-party control, Rosenfeld (2007) further proposes independent life stage theory as an explanation for rises in nontraditional unions, including interracial and same-sex unions, in the United States. Framing the independent life stage as a period during which young people are physically separated from their parents, Rosenfeld argues that the emergence and extension of this stage since 1960s have enabled U.S. young adults to break away from their parents' preferences and control over their mate choices. Living independently also gives young people more time and freedom to nurture relationships that are not conventional with respect to couple similarities (e.g., interracial unions). As a result, the number of nontraditional unions has grown over time.

Although the independent life stage perspective specifically posits that parent-child coresidence will decrease singles' likelihood to form the types of unions preferred by their parents, such as racially homogeneous unions or relationships with people from their own

social class, evidence supporting this perspective is generally derived from trend analyses (Rosenfeld 2007)—namely, the trend of increasing independent living corresponds to the trend of rises in nontraditional unions. Such trend analyses may overlook other confounding changes, such as increasing educational levels, to single young adults over time. Only with an individual-level analysis can we know whether, after taking into account differences in individual characteristics, those living in and away from the parental home indeed form different types of relationships.

To fill the gap in the literature, in this study we also examine whether Taiwanese singles' relationship characteristics vary by their living arrangement. We characterize relationships specifically based on how homogeneous the couple's respective characteristics are. Like in many Western countries, research on assortative mating in Taiwan indicates a strong and increasing tendency of educational homogamy (Cheng 2014; Tsay 1996). This tendency may reflect singles' own dating preference or Confucius-influenced societies' norm for the two partners of a union to have matching educational levels (Smits and Park 2009). Either way, we can expect young Taiwanese residing with parents to be more likely to enter educationally homogeneous relationships than those living independently, as the former may be both more patient and more compliant with social norms in choosing partners.

The general tendency of homogamy also extends to ethnicity in Taiwan (Chu and Yu 2010; Tsay and Wu 2006). Taiwan's four major ethnic groups, Hokkien, Hakka, Mainlanders, and Aborigines, are divided roughly along the different timings of arrival in Taiwan. Aborigines are the indigenous people in Taiwan, whose culture and phenotypical features often distinguish and subject them to discrimination from the other three groups made up by Han Chinese. Hokkien and Hakka are descendants of those who migrated from different regions of China to Taiwan in the 16th and 17th centuries, differentiated based on their dialect, whereas Mainlanders refer to Chinese migrants who arrived around 1949 with the Kuomintang government after its loss of the civil war and these migrants' decedents. Although researchers have long observed the propensity of ethnic homogamy in Taiwan (Chu and Yu 2010; Tsay 1996), the division between, in particular, Mainlanders and the other two Han Chinese groups has been brought to fore with Taiwan's democratization and increasing tension with China in recent decades, as they tend to diverge in their affinity toward and preferred relations with China (Hsieh 2005). Against this backdrop, both singles and their parents may prefer ethnic homogamy, making those living with parents more likely to form relationships with individuals in their ethnic group.

Beyond education and ethnicity, prior research on Taiwan further indicates a tendency for individuals to marry people from families of similar economic conditions (Chu and Yu 2010; Tsay and Wu 2006), perhaps resulting from the legacy of arranged marriages, which are supposed to occur between families with similar socioeconomic status (SES). If Taiwanese parents are likely to prefer family SES homogamy, then their greater control over coresident children will lead the latter to have higher odds of forming relationships with partners with similar family SES. Finally, with increases in women's economic status and bargaining power in the marriage market (Yu 2009), Taiwan has observed a narrowing age gap between husbands and wives (Chu and Yu 2010). Despite women's rising tendency to marry men similar to their own age, the traditional gender norm that prescribes the man to be older than

the woman in a union is still prevalent. The combination of this gender norm with a rising preference for age homogamy is likely to lead young Taiwanese to prefer unions in which the male partner is the same age or slightly older than the female partner. Given that that singles living with parents may be less flexible about their partner's attributes, we may expect such singles to be more likely to form relationships with the male partner being the same age or slightly older than the female one.

Method

Data

The data for our study come from the Taiwan Educational Panel Survey and Beyond (TEPS-B), a project conducted by a collaborative research team from multiple universities and research institutions and funded by the Ministry of Science and Technology in Taiwan. The TEPS-B data were collected in 2014 through face-to-face interviews from a nationally representative sample of young adults born in 1988–1989. The sample of the TEPS-B is derived from the Taiwan Education Panel Survey (TEPS), which collected information from a nationally representative sample of 20,055 7th-grade students in 2001. Out of the 20,055 students, the TEPS further selected a “core sample” of 4,261 individuals at random and followed them through 12th grade. As a follow-up survey to the TEPS, the TEPS-B selected all 4,261 respondents in the TEPS core sample, plus a random subsample from the rest of the TEPS respondents. Using this sampling procedure, the TEPS-B ended up with a sample of 5,172 men and women, who can be considered as being representative of a specific cohort of young adults in Taiwan (Kuan 2017).

One unique feature of the TEPS-B is that in addition to detailed educational and residential histories, it asked respondents to retrospectively report all romantic relationships they had had since 15 years of age. Specifically, the survey asked respondents to provide information about each of their boyfriends or girlfriends, defined as someone with whom (1) they had been emotionally involved or physically intimate, and (2) they had had a steady relationship for one month or more. Respondents were asked to report each relationship's starting and ending years and months, along with the partner's age, educational level, ethnicity, and family economic conditions. Such detailed information enables us to examine young people's paces of forming and ending romantic relationships, as well as their partners' characteristics relative to theirs.

For most of the analysis we use an event history approach, which enables us to tell whether respondents' time-varying characteristics are associated with the paces at which they experience the event of interest (e.g., entering a romantic relationship). To conduct an event history analysis we converted the TEPS-B data into person-month observations, with time-varying information for each respondent from the month they turned age 15 to the interview month, when they were 25–26 years old.¹ Because event history models require us to only include observations exposed to the risk of experiencing the event of interest (Yamaguchi

¹Because relationship experiences during adolescence have crucial implications for later union formation (Meier and Allen 2009; Raley et al. 2007), and because left-censoring is potentially problematic in an event history analysis, we include respondents' full relationship histories, starting from age 15, in our analysis. Our additional analysis, however, indicated that the results were similar when we included only person-month observations since age 18 in the models.

1991), we further select subsamples for different parts of the analysis that concern differing outcomes. We provide details for these subsamples as we discuss the different outcome variables and related models below.

Dependent Variables and Models

As discussed earlier, this study centers on four questions—namely, whether coresident singles (1) have different paces of entering a romantic relationship; (2) are more likely to have a highly committed relationship, conditional on entering a relationship; (3) have differing likelihoods of entering relationships that are homogamous; and (4) are more likely to terminate a relationship than young people living away from their parents. We create a series of dependent variables to address these questions. For the first question, about the pace of entering a romantic relationship, we use a binary outcome variable, coded as 1 if respondents entered a relationship at an observed month, and 0 otherwise. To ensure the proper time order between respondents' relationship entry and their time-varying characteristics included in the models, we use individual characteristics at the previous month ($t-1$) to estimate the odds of entering a relationship at a given month (t). We lag all other outcome variables in the same way.

We use discrete-time hazard rate models, estimated with logistic regression techniques (Yamaguchi 1991), for this part of the analysis. The models specifically estimate the log odds of the event of interest—the entry into a relationship—occurring in a given month, conditional on the event not occurring earlier. We select all the person-months when respondents were not romantically involved for this part of the analysis, assuming that those in relationships are not at risk of entering a new one.² This selection results in an analytic sample of 196,126 and 162,405 valid person-months for men and women, respectively.

Because entering a relationship is a repeatable event, respondents can potentially have multiple episodes during which they were under the risk of entering a relationship in our data. We use the duration of exposure, a variable used to estimate how the hazard rate of the event occurring varies with the time exposed to the risk in discrete-time hazard models (Yamaguchi 1991), to differentiate the different episodes. Specifically, we measure the duration as the number of months since age 15 if respondents had no prior relationships and the number of months since the end of the previous relationship if a previous one was reported. That is to say, we reset the duration clock for every episode that individuals experienced after their first relationship. Based on an exploratory analysis that suggested a curvilinear relationship, we include both duration and duration squared in the models concerning the entry into a romantic relationship. In addition, we introduce the number of prior relationships to control for potential differences in paces between an individual's first and later entries to romantic relationships. Because the same respondents' multiple episodes are not independent, we further introduce an individual random effect in the models to correct this non-independence (Scheike and Jensen 1997).³

²Despite our assumption that all relationships are monogamous, 130 relationships in our sample (1.5%) overlapped with the next one in duration. In such cases, we treated it as if the old relationship ended as soon as the new relationship began to make the event history analysis feasible. Handling these cases in alternative ways, such as eliminating every relationship that overlapped with the next one, did not make any meaningful difference to the main results.

Second, for the question regarding relationship commitment, we create a dummy variable indicating a relationship is highly committed (coded as 1). We define a relationship as highly committed if respondents reported that they had been engaged to, married to, or cohabited with the partner at some point. Although using union formation and related experiences to indicate relationship commitment is somewhat conservative, it has the advantage of not being subject to respondents' own interpretations. This measure also enables us to gauge whether coresident single's romantic relationships differ from the others' specifically in terms of how likely the relationships will lead to union formation.

Because the TEPS-B did not ask exactly when respondents entered engagement, marriage, or cohabitation, we can only tell whether a relationship had ever reached a high intensity level, but not the pace at which it became relatively serious. For this reason, our analysis focuses on whether coresidence around the time of entering a relationship is associated with the odds that the relationship would become a highly committed one. Thus, the units of the analysis for this part are relationship episodes, not person-months. In total, our sample contains 4,353 episodes reported by male respondents and 3,847 by female respondents. We use random-effects logistic regression models and the individual characteristics in the month prior to individuals' entry into the relationship to predict whether a relationship would later become highly committed.

To address the third question, regarding whether coresiding singles tend to enter relationships that are more homogamous, we further differentiate the event of entering a relationship by the characteristics of the relationship formed—namely, the educational, ethnic, family SES, and age differences between the partners in the relationship. Starting from the couple's educational difference, we create a dependent variable that indicates whether in a given month, respondents have formed an educationally homogamous relationship, an educationally heterogamous relationship, or a relationship in which the partner's educational level is unknown, as opposed to not entering any relationship. The TEPS-B provides detailed information about respondents' education, making a distinction, for example, between general high school and vocational high school, and between technical university and general university. Although we utilize detailed educational categories when measuring respondents' time-varying educational level, as the different types of educational institutions have different implications for individuals' long-term academic pursuits and opportunities to meet members of the other sex (e.g., technical universities), we collapse a few of the educational categories in measuring educational homogamy, to be consistent with previous research (e.g., Schwartz and Mare 2012). Specifically, we consider a relationship to be educationally homogamous if at the time of entering the relationship, both partners' highest schooling attended is: (1) high school or less, (2) technical or general university, or (3) post-graduate school.

To investigate the association between coresidence and ethnic homogamy, we construct an outcome variable indicating whether respondents have entered relationships in which the partner belongs to the same, different, or unknown ethnic group, or they have not formed

³We use the same methods for the models predicting the other outcomes as well, given that our other outcomes, such as entering a relationship of a certain characteristic and exiting a relationship, are also repeatable events.

any relationships in a given month. As discussed earlier, there are four main ethnic groups in Taiwan: Hokkien, Hakka, Mainlanders, and Aborigines. Because among the three Han Chinese groups, the main political divide is between Mainlanders and the other two groups (Hokkien and Hakka), and because the similar times of arrival in Taiwan have enabled Hokkien and Hakka to have a longer history of interethnic marriages, we combine Hokkien and Hakka when measuring whether a relationship is within or across the broader ethnic boundaries. That is to say, we consider a relationship to be ethnically homogamous if it is between a Hokkien and a Hakka. For family SES homogamy, we similarly create a dependent variable indicating whether respondents have formed a relationship with a partner whose family economic conditions were similar, different, or unknown, or they have not entered a relationship, based on respondents' reports.

To study how coresident singles' relationships may differ in age-related characteristics, we similarly create a dependent variable indicating respondents entering an age-homogamous, age-heterogamous, or age-difference-unknown relationship or not entering any relationship during an observed month. Because of the strong social norm for men to date women no older than themselves, we define age homogamy as when the man is the same age or up to 3 years older than the woman. That is to say, a relationship is categorized as heterogamous even if the woman is only slightly older than her partner. In an exploratory analysis, we tried to define age homogamy using a different cutoff point (e.g., within 2 years), and the results were similar.⁴

For each of the dependent variables concerning pairing patterns, we treat the homogamous, heterogamous, and unknown types of relationships as competing destinations and employ competing-risk hazard rate models. We estimate such models using multinomial logit regression techniques (with random effects). Because respondents were assumed to be under the risk of entering any type of relationships so long as they are not in a relationship, this part of analysis uses the same person-month sample and make similar adjustments for handling repeatable events as those for the analysis of entering any romantic relationship.

Finally, for the question concerning the termination of relationships, we use the occurrence of a relationship exit as the dependent variable. We code the variable as 1, and otherwise 0, if respondents reported ending the relationship in a given month. We consider a relationship as ongoing so long as respondents did not report a breakup, regardless of whether respondents were married to the partner during any period of the relationship. In our sample, 4.6% of respondents were married by the survey time, indicating that a small proportion of ongoing relationships were in the form of marriage at the time of the survey. Unfortunately, we cannot control for marital status, as the TEPS-B lacked information on the marriage date.

⁴In practice, we code this variable based on whether a male respondent is the same age or up to 3 years older than his partner, or whether a female respondent is the same age or no more than three years younger than her partner. We should nevertheless note that 3% of the TEPS-B respondents who had ever had romantic relationships reported having a same-sex relationship, for which the gendered norm that prescribes the male partner to be older than the female partner does not apply. Excluding all same-sex relationships from the models, however, did not affect our results with regards to the association between coresidence and the age-related characteristic of the relationship. Because the TEPS-B respondents did not report sexual orientation, we cannot control for it in the models—most of our models include people who had never been in any relationship (22% in the sample). For the same reason, we cannot limit our sample to heterosexually oriented people. Given the percentage of same-sex relationships, the dynamics revealed in our models should mostly reflect those of different-sex oriented people. Testing how same-sex relationships differ from different-sex relationships is beyond the scope of the current paper.

Because the proportion of married respondents is very small, however, we do not expect the results to have been different had we controlled for marital status.

We also use discrete-time event history models for the analysis of exiting a relationship. The analytic sample for the models includes person-months in which respondents were romantically involved for the analysis of relationship exits, given that the risk of terminating a relationship starts only as respondents enter one. The sample contains 93,569 person-months for men and 100,601 person-months for women. We also reset the duration of exposure (measured as the number of months since the beginning of the relationship), control for prior relationships, and add an individual random effect to handle the fact that exiting a relationship is a repeatable event. Because our exploratory analysis that indicated no curvilinear relationship, we include only duration, but not duration squared, for this part analysis. Using duration and duration squared in all models, however, did not alter the results in a meaningful way. For all parts of the analysis, we fit models for men and women separately, because certain factors, such as age and education, may affect men's and women's odds of entering and exiting relationships differently. *Independent Variables*

We employ a similar set of independent variables for all the models. Our main predictor of interest is coresidence with parents. Based on respondents' reports of residential histories, we construct a time-varying indicator of whether they lived with at least one parent in an observed month (coded as 1, otherwise 0).⁵ Aside from coresidence status, our models include many individual characteristics that may affect the formation and termination of romantic relationships. To begin, we introduce the highest education level attended in the observed month, divided into six categories: (1) general high school, (2) vocational high school, (3) junior college, (4) technical college, (5) university, and (6) postgraduate school. Because individuals enrolled in school may have more time and opportunities to meet potential romantic partners, we also introduce a time-varying dummy variable for being enrolled in school.

We further include ethnicity, measured in four categories: (1) Hokkien, (2) Hakka, (3) Mainlanders, and (4) Aborigines. Because of the patrilineal norm in Taiwan, descendants of interethnic unions are typically considered as members of the same ethnic group as their fathers'. Hence, we do not have a separate category for children of interethnic unions. The models also control for respondents' age, measured in three categories: (1) 17 years old or younger, (2) 18–22 years old, and (3) 23 years old and older. These categories roughly capture the time periods when most Taiwanese people experience high school, college, and post-college transition to work life, respectively. Aside for capturing the three distinct stages, we measure age as a categorical variable also for the reason that many of our models include the duration of exposure to the risk of forming a relationship. For those without prior relationship experience, age as a linear measure (in years) would overlap with the duration variable. The results, however, remained similar when we included age as a continuous variable in an exploratory analysis. We also tried not to include age, because it may be

⁵As mentioned earlier, we use individuals' characteristics, including their coresidence status, in month $t-1$ to predict outcomes in month t to ensure the time order. In an additional analysis, we tried to lag coresidence status differently, using the status at month $t-2$, $t-3$, or $t-6$ to predict relationship entry or termination in month t , and the results were similar.

correlated with time-varying educational attainment or the duration of exposure to relationship formation, and the main results were virtually unchanged.⁶

In addition, we control for respondents' income, as a higher income may increase singles' attractiveness. The TEPS-B respondents reported their detailed work histories and the wage received at the beginning of each job. We link the person-month observations in the sample to the jobs reported and use the starting wage of the job as the corresponding respondent's income for the entire job duration. Although individuals' wages at a given job may change over time, our assumption of constant wages is less problematic for this sample of fairly young people, as most of them had not had the same job for long by the time of the survey. To reduce the skewness of the income variable, we take the natural log of respondents' income (after adding NT\$1, about 3 cents in U.S. dollars, to handle the observations where respondents have no income).

We also include several controls concerning respondents' family background characteristics, such as their number of siblings, parental education, and experience of family instability. We include the number of siblings, because research indicates that women from larger families marry earlier in Taiwan (Yu et al. 2012) and we may find a similar association with the pace of entering romantic relationship. We use parental education, measured as the highest educational level that either of respondents' parents has attended, to approximate respondents' family SES. We use somewhat different categories for the parents' education than respondents' own to adjust for the different distributions of schooling between the generations. Because the parents of respondents attended school before Taiwan's educational expansion, few of them went to technical college or postgraduate school, while many of them had middle school or less education. Hence, we divide the parents' education into just three levels: (1) middle school or less, (2) high school, and (3) college and more. We measure family instability with a dummy variable indicating whether respondents had ever been in a nonintact family by the observed month.

The models further include respondents' number of prior relationships, as those who had more relationship experiences may find it easier to enter another one. In addition, we include a time-varying variable for respondents' residential area. Using the ZIP codes of respondents' residences from age 15 to the survey time, we categorize their residential area's urbanization levels into: (1) major population center (2) other urban areas, and (3) rural areas, following the categorization commonly used in major social surveys in Taiwan (Chang, Tu, and Liao 2012). To provide more details about the sample, Table 1 presents characteristics of the TEPS-B respondents at the survey time, as well as descriptive statistics of all the relationships reported by them.

Dealing with Selectivity

Young people who select to live with parents may differ from those who do not, and such differences may account for their likelihood of being involved in romantic relationships. To take into account different people's different propensities to live with parents in our analysis,

⁶In fact, the main results regarding coresidence remained similar when we further eliminated time-varying educational level from the models. The potential correlations among several of our time-varying variables therefore do not constitute a concern.

we adopt the propensity score methods proposed to be used in conjunction with even history models by Austin (2013, 2014). The propensity score methods assume that the differences in the distribution of measured baseline characteristics between the treated and untreated groups—in this case, people living with and away from parents—affect their likelihood of experiencing the treatment, thus confounding the treatment effect. Adjusting for individuals' propensities to undergo the treatment helps remove this confounding effect. We specifically use the inverse probability of treatment weighting (IPTW) method to account for the differing propensities to live with parents. Unlike the propensity score matching method that pair treated and untreated subjects with similar characteristics, the IPTW method relies on weights derived from propensity scores to reduce the effect of confounders. By giving subjects with high propensity scores larger weights and subjects with low propensity scores smaller weights, the IPTW method is able to utilize the full sample and estimate the average treatment effect for the entire population.⁷ To create the weights, we first fitted a logistic regression of coresidence on a series of variables that likely affect living arrangements, including respondents' gender, age, education, school enrollment, income, sibling composition, parental education, urbanization level of their location, and whether their parents lived together, using the person-month sample. From the regression results, we calculated a weight for each person-month that is equal to the inverse of the probability of coresiding with parents in that month. We opt for time-varying weights, instead of person-specific baseline weights, because previous research shows that using time-varying propensity scores significantly improves the estimation of the treatment effect in event history models (Lu 2005). We incorporate the time-varying weights into our estimation of each model and report robust standard errors.⁸

Although the propensity score methods are useful in addressing the different propensities to coreside with parents among the individuals in our sample, we should acknowledge the methods' limitation in handling selection on the unobservable (e.g., a greater interest in romantic relationships, which may lead to the choice of leaving the parental home). Selecting to live apart from parents based on unobserved personality traits, however, is likely to be uncommon in Taiwan. Because of the cultural norm for children to stay in the parental home at least until marriage, most Taiwanese children who have left their parents' home did so for going to college (and occasionally high school) or working in a different city (Huang 2013; Nauck et al. 2017), and their preferences about coresidence tend not to play much a role in deciding where to study or work. Especially in terms of college attendance, because there is a clear ranking among colleges in Taiwan, and college admissions are largely determined by national standardized exam scores (Yu 2009), young Taiwanese are often compelled to put other considerations aside and go to the best-ranking college their exam scores allow.

To further support that young Taiwanese rarely select to live away from the parents if not for the distance to school or work, we conducted a separate analysis of the residential histories of people from Taiwan's major population center, the Taipei metropolitan area, where most

⁷In comparison, the propensity score matching method can only estimate the average treatment effect for the treated, and it requires the sample of untreated subjects to be larger than the sample of treated ones (Austin 2013, 2014).

⁸In an additional analysis, we also fitted the same models without the propensity-score-based weights. The results were in similar directions, but generally stronger. It appears that without adjusting for differences in the propensities to live in the parental home, we would overestimate the effect of coresidence.

colleges and jobs are located. Among respondents who lived in the Taipei metropolitan area at 15 years of age (31% of all respondents), who were unlikely to need to attend school or work outside of the metropolitan area, 88% of them still lived in the same metropolitan area by their mid-20s, and 88% of those living in the same area continued to live in the parental home.⁹ This coresidence rate is much higher than the national average (see Table 1). An analysis of respondents from the second largest population center in Taiwan (11% of the sample), Kaohsiung metropolitan area, indicated a similar pattern. Among those still living in the same area (71%), 85% lived with at least one parent. Leaving the parental home appears to be mostly a necessity for those who had grown up in areas where there are relatively few prestigious schools and jobs, rather than a reflection of personality traits or concerns about dating prospects. Our analysis is likely to address the selection on this necessity well, as our estimate of the propensity to live with parents specifically takes into account respondents' parental backgrounds and geographic locations.

RESULTS

Table 2 presents discrete-time hazard rate models with random effects predicting the entry into any intimate relationship since age 15 by gender, as well as logistic regression models predicting whether each relationship was highly committed, conditional on respondents forming a relationship. The coefficients for duration of exposure and duration squared are omitted to conserve space. Based on the first set of models, living with parents is negatively associated with both men's and women's odds of entering a romantic relationship in the following month. For both gender groups, coresident singles' odds of entering a relationship are about 26% lower than those of individuals living independently ($\exp(-.298) = .742$; $\exp(-.293) = .746$). Conditional on entering a relationship, those coresiding with parents have significantly lower odds of being in a committed one than those out of the parental home. The odds that a relationship would become highly committed are about 60% lower for men and 54% lower for women if they lived with, rather than away from, their parents immediately before entering the relationship ($\exp(-.916) = .400$ and $\exp(-.780) = .458$).

Table 2 also indicates that those with higher educational levels and income are generally more likely to enter a romantic relationship. These patterns are similar to what we would expect from examining the pace of transitioning to first marriage, suggesting a close link between romantic relationship formation and marriage in Taiwan. Being older also increases one's odds of forming an intimate relationship. Whereas having a larger number of siblings delays men's entry into a relationship, the number of siblings hardly makes a difference for women. Both men and women more prior relationship experiences are more likely to enter another relationship. Although family instability does not significantly affect men's pace of entering a relationship, it tends to decelerate women's pace. Consistent with this tendency, the relationships of women from nonintact families also have lower odds of becoming highly committed. Moreover, conditional on their forming a relationship, men and women enrolled in school have lower odds of becoming highly committed to their relationships, suggesting

⁹Although we do not know why a small percentage of people in the major population centers did not live with their parents, a very long commute to school or work could still be the main reason, as the distance and commute time between one's parental home and job or school can sometimes be considerable even within the same metropolitan area.

that being students discourages young people from transforming their relationships to marriage or other highly committed union.

Tables 3 shows partial results from discrete-time multinomial logit models predicting entry into different types of relationships by gender. We include the same variables as those in the models in Table 2, but only show the coefficients for living with parents in the table to conserve space. For each model, we show the multinomial logit results using not entering any romantic relationship as the baseline category. The coefficients therefore indicate respondents' log odds of entering a specific type of relationship, as opposed to not entering any, in a given month, conditional on their not entering a relationship earlier. To show whether coresident singles are more likely to enter a homogamous relationship than a heterogamous or relationship, we further indicate whether the coefficients for entering the former type of relationships are significantly different from those for entering the latter type of relationships for each model.

Starting from Panel A, the models for both men and women indicate that those living with parents have lower odds of entering either educationally homogamous or heterogamous relationships, as opposed to not entering any relationships. Coresidence, however, is not associated with the odds of entering educationally homogamous unions significantly more than those of entering educationally heterogamous unions. Perhaps the current norm for educational homogamy is so strong among young Taiwanese that despite being subjected to less parental pressure and potentially being more eager to form intimate ties, singles living independently are still fairly unlikely to pair with partners with different educational levels from their own. As a result, the difference in the tendency to form educationally homogamous relationships by living arrangement is too small to be significant. An alternative possibility is that our sample captures relationship experiences from middle adolescence to young adulthood, during which opportunities to encounter potential partners from different schooling levels are especially limited. The likelihood of forming an educationally homogamous union in this life stage might have less to do with individuals' or a third party's mate-selection preferences, but more to do with other circumstances that may facilitate the meeting of people from different educational levels.

With respect to the tendency of ethnic homogamy, Panel B in Table 3 shows that compared to those living independently, coresident men have lower odds of entering ethnically homogamous relationships than not entering any relationship. Coresidence, however, does not the tendency to enter an ethnically homogamous, rather than ethnically heterogamous, relationship. We should note that ethnic identification in Taiwan generally follows the patrilineal rule; both officially and customarily, individuals are often identified as members of a given ethnic group based on their father's ethnicity. In this cultural context, it is possible that young men and their parents both find it relatively easy to accept the former's romantic partner being from a different ethnic group, as an interethnic marriage implies that the partner would become a convert to their ethnic group, not the other way around. Hence, the stake of forming an interethnic relationship is higher for women. Consistent with the higher stake, the difference between the coefficients for entering ethnically homogamous and ethnically heterogamous relationships is significant for Taiwanese women. Whereas coresident women are unlikely to enter either ethnically homogamous or heterogamous

relationships, they are especially unlikely to form ethnically heterogamous relationships, compared to those living independently.

Turning to the models about family SES homogamy, living with parents is strongly and negatively associated with men's odds of entering heterogamous relationships in terms of family SES, as opposed to not being romantically involved (Panel C in Table 3). For men, coresidence appears to discourage their entry into a relationship that is heterogamous in family SES more than one that is homogamous, as the difference in the coefficients for entering the two types of relationships is marginally significant. This finding provides some support for the argument that the greater parental influences on coresident singles make them more likely to seek partners from similar family economic backgrounds. For Taiwanese women, although the coefficient for entering a heterogamous relationship in family SES also seems more negative than that for entering a homogamous relationship, the difference is statistically nonsignificant.

Panel D in Table 3 further shows that coresident men have significantly lower odds of entering an age-heterogamous relationship or a relationship in which the partner's age is unknown, as opposed to not entering a relationship. More important, those living with parents have significantly lower odds of entering a homogamous than heterogamous relationship with respect to the couple's age difference. This finding is consistent with the argument that coresidence increases singles' likelihood of entering relationships with characteristics endorsed by social norms, as opposed to forming relatively atypical unions. In contrast to men, women who coreside with parents are not significantly different from those living apart in the odds of entering an age-homogamous relationship versus a heterogamous relationship.

Next, to examine the link between coresidence and relationship stability, Table 4 shows partial results from discrete-time event history models predicting the occurrence of an exit from a relationship (with some coefficients omitted to conserve space). We first present a short model without relationship characteristics (Model 1). Because those living with and apart from parents may form different types of relationships (in terms of how homogamous the relationships are), we add the relationship characteristics in Model 2 to show the extent to which the association between coresidence and relationship dissolution may be explained by certain relationship characteristics. According to the short models in Table 4, both men and women living with parents have higher odds of exiting a relationship in the subsequent month. Including relationship characteristics in the long models only make the coefficients stronger. Based on Model 2s, coresident men's and women's odds of ending a relationship in the following month are about one-fourth greater the odds of those living independently ($\exp(.217) = 1.24$ and $\exp(.227) = 1.25$). Thus, not only do coresident singles have a slower pace of forming intimate relationships, but when they do form them, their relationships dissolve at a faster rate.

Interestingly, relationships that are more homogamous do not necessarily have slower paces of dissolution. Whereas family SES heterogamy, as opposed to homogamy, is conducive to a faster pace of dissolution for women, ethnic heterogamy, rather than homogamy, decreases the odds of relationship dissolution for men. Unsurprisingly, men and women involved in

relationships in which the partner's characteristics are unknown tend to exit the relationship faster, as a lack of knowledge about the partner likely reflects poor relationship quality.

CONCLUSIONS

Although demographers and family researchers have long been interested in young adults' premarital living arrangements, relatively little research addresses how the different living arrangements may shape individuals' intimate relationship experiences, which have important consequences for their transitions into marriage and childbearing. Using relationship histories of young people in Taiwan, the statistical analysis in this study shows that singles coresiding with parents tend to form intimate relationships more slowly, and experience relationship dissolution more quickly, than those living independently. Moreover, when coresident singles do form relationships, they are less likely to become highly committed to their relationships. Altogether, these findings suggest that living with parents decreases both the quantity and quality of young people's romantic relationships in Taiwan. Such results are consistent with the argument that young adults living in the parental home have a lower psychological need or readiness for committed relationships outside of their family of origin, making their romantic relationship experiences different from those of their counterparts living independently.

Building on emerging research that attributes coresident singles' delayed marriage to their lower levels of romantic involvement (Yu and Kuo 2016), the present study contributes to the literature on living arrangements and life course transitions by showing the exact ways in which coresident singles end up less engaged in committed intimate relationships during emerging and early adulthood. Not only do coresident singles form and stay in romantic relationships less frequently than those living independently, but their relationships are also less likely to result in further life-course transitions, such as cohabitation and marriage. Because Taiwan exemplifies societies in which grown children tend to leave the parental home for reasons relatively exogenous to their chances of romantic involvement,¹⁰ the associations between coresidence and relationship dynamics shown in this study provide especially critical support for the argument that living in the parental home impedes the development of young people's intimate relationships.

Results from this study also indicate that living with parents is relevant to the types of relationships formed. Taiwanese men who reside in the parental home are less likely to enter relationships with a partner whose is older or much younger than they are, compared to a partner who is the same age or just slightly younger. These men also appear to be less likely to enter relationships with a partner whose family economic background is very different from theirs, as opposed to with a partner from a similar family background. For women, coresidence is associated with lower odds of entering an ethnically heterogamous, rather than homogamous, relationship. Although we do not find coresident men and women more likely to form relationships that are homogamous, rather than heterogamous, in every aspect, the aforementioned results consistently point to that coresident singles' pairing patterns are

¹⁰Even though we still face the limitation that there could be unobserved factors that lead young Taiwanese to leave their parental home, such as a conflict with parents, it is difficult to imagine that this conflict explains all our findings, especially coresident singles' slower paces of relationship formation and faster paces of dissolution.

more similar to societal preferences than those of singles living independently.¹¹ Our findings thus provide some support for the argument that living with parents reduces singles' psychological need for intimate ties and allows them to wait for partners who resemble themselves in some ways. Of course, we cannot rule out the possibility that the greater parental control over coresident children also explains the somewhat different pairing patterns between coresident singles and those living independently, as suggested by independent life stage theory (Rosenfeld 2007). Future research with precise information on young people's need for companionship and their parents' influences on them is required to differentiate the mechanisms through which living with parents affects singles' partner choices.

At a more general level, this study contributes to our understanding of the phenomenon of very low fertility found in a range of East and Southeast Asian societies (Jones 2007; Raymo et al. 2015). Along with previous research on Japan (Yu and Kuo 2016), our study suggests that the widespread practice of extended parent-child coresidence in the region may very well play a part in deterring marriage transitions, which further reduces fertility. The reason why extended coresidence delays marriage, however, appears not to be that marriage becomes less appealing when one enjoys the material comforts of the parental home. Rather, we suggest that those living with parents encounter greater difficulties forming and maintaining intimate relationships. As the societal belief in committed romantic relationships as the prerequisite for marriage has strengthened in many Asian countries with time (Allendorf 2013; Retherford, Ogawa and Matsukura 2001), the decreased relationship involvement associated with coresidence has become a larger obstacle to young adults' marriage transitions. Despite this important implication, we should note that our data are limited to a specific cohort of young adults observed in their mid-20s. We cannot be certain that those coresiding with parents, while having less romantic experience by their mid-20s, will not compensate by transitioning to first marriage sooner upon starting a relationship in their late 20s or 30s. Nevertheless, we do know that coresident singles tend not to advance their relationships to a higher-intensity level through their mid-20s, making them highly unlikely to marry much before Taiwan's average age of first marriage (around 30). In this sense, coresident singles are likely to contribute to Taiwan's relatively high average age of first marriage more than those apart from their parents do. Future data collection of relationship histories through an older age, however, is needed to ascertain whether the patterns of slower relationship entry and faster relationship exit among those living with parents continue through their 30s.

The different relationship dynamics observed between those living with and away from parents may also shed light on the intimate relationship experiences of young adults elsewhere, such as the United States, where premarital coresidence with parents has grown in recent years (Fry 2016). It is possible that the lack of psychological need and readiness that appears to be behind coresident singles' lower romantic involvement in Taiwan similarly affect the quantity and quality of relationships among U.S. young adults who live in their

¹¹Even in the cases where we do not find coresidence's effect on entering a heterogamous relationship to be statistically different from its effect on entering a homogamous relationship (see Table 3), the former effect is generally more negative than the latter (i.e., in the same direction as the significant findings reported here).

parental home. If this is the case, the steady rise in adult children's coresidence with parents in the United States may further exacerbate the recently revealed trend that young people have been delaying their engagement in adult activities, including dating (Twenge and Park 2017). Thus, in the future, researchers on the life course transition tempo in young adulthood may need to pay special attention to the relevance of living arrangements to individuals' considerations of intimate relationships.

REFERENCES

- Aassve Arnstein, Billari Francesco C., Mazzucco Stefano and Ongaro Fausta. 2002 "Leaving Home: A Comparative Analysis of Echn Data." *Journal of European Social Policy* 12(4):259–75.
- Allendorf Keera. 2013 "Schemas of Marital Change: From Arranged Marriages to Eloping for Love." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 75(2):453–69. [PubMed: 27147752]
- Aquilino William S. 1999 "Two Views of One Relationship: Comparing Parents' and Young Adult Children's Reports of the Quality of Intergenerational Relations." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 61(4):858–70.
- Austin Peter C. 2013 "The Performance of Different Propensity Score Methods for Estimating Marginal Hazard Ratios." *Statistics in Medicine* 32(16):2837–49. [PubMed: 23239115]
- Austin Peter C. 2014 "The Use of Propensity Score Methods with Survival or Time-to-Event Outcomes: Reporting Measures of Effect Similar to Those Used in Randomized Experiments." *Statistics in Medicine* 33(7):1242–58. [PubMed: 24122911]
- Billari Francesco C. and Liefbroer Aart C.. 2010 "Towards a New Pattern of Transition to Adulthood?". *Advances in Life Course Research* 15(2–3):59–75.
- Billari Francesco C. and Tabellini Guido. 2011 "Italians Are Late: Does It Matter?" Pp. 371–412 in *Demography and the Economy* edited by Shoven JB. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Billari Francesco C. and Liefbroer Aart C.. 2007 "Should I Stay or Should I Go? The Impact of Age Norms on Leaving Home." *Demography* 44(1):181–98. [PubMed: 17461342]
- Blossfeld Hans-Peter. 2009 "Educational Assortative Marriage in Comparative Perspective." *Annual Review of Sociology* 35(1):513–30.
- Cheng Yen-hsin Alice. 2014 "Changing Partner Choice and Marriage Propensities by Education in Post-Industrial Taiwan, 2000–2010." *Demographic Research* 31(33):1007–42.
- Chu CY Cyrus and Yu Ruoh-Rong. 2010 *Understanding Chinese Families: A Comparative Study of Taiwan and Southeast China*: Oxford University Press.
- Cordón Juan Antonio Fernández. 1997 "Youth Residential Independence and Autonomy: A Comparative Study." *Journal of Family Issues* 18(6):576–607.
- Zuanna Dalla, Gianpiero. 2001 "The Banquet of Aeolus: A Familistic Interpretation of Italy's Lowest Low Fertility." *Demographic Research* 4(5):133–62.
- Desilver Drew. 2016 "In the U.S. And Abroad, More Young Adults Are Living with Their Parents." Vol. Washington D.C.: Pew Research Center.
- Eurostat. 2017, "Being Young in Europe Today: Family and Society", http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Being_young_in_Europe_today_-_family_and_society (http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Being_young_in_Europe_today_-_family_and_society).
- Fry Richard. 2016 "For First Time in Modern Era, Living with Parents Edges out Other: Living Arrangements for 18- to 34-Year-Olds Share Living with Spouse or Partner Continues to Fall." Vol. Washington, D.C.: Pew Research Center.
- Furstenberg Frank F. 2010 "On a New Schedule: Transitions to Adulthood and Family Change." *The Future of Children* 20(1):67–87. [PubMed: 20364622]
- Goldscheider Frances K. and Waite Linda J.. 1991 "New Families, No Families? The Transformation of the American Home" Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Goldscheider Frances K. and Lawton Leora. 1998 "Family Experiences and the Erosion of Support for Intergenerational Coresidence." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 60(3):623–32.

- Goldscheider Francis and Goldscheider Calvin. 1999 *The Changing Transition to Adulthood: Leaving and Returning Home*, Vol. 17: Sage Publications.
- Guzzo Karen B. 2006 “The Relationship between Life Course Events and Union Formation.” *Social Science Research* 35(2):384–408.
- Hitsch Gunter J., Hortaçsu Ali and Ariely Dan. 2010 “Matching and Sorting in Online Dating.” *American Economic Review* 100(1):130–63.
- Hsieh John Fuh-sheng. 2005 “Ethnicity, National Identity, and Domestic Politics in Taiwan.” *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 40(1–2):13–28.
- Huang Lang-Wen Wendy. 2013 “The Transition Tempo and Life Course Orientation of Young Adults in Taiwan.” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 646(March):69–85.
- Hughes Mary Elizabeth. 2003 “Home Economics: Metropolitan Labor and Housing Markets and Domestic Arrangements in Young Adulthood.” *Social Forces* 81(4):1399–429.
- Jones Gavin W. 2007 “Delayed Marriage and Very Low Fertility in Pacific Asia.” *Population and Development Review* 33(3):453–78.
- Kuan Ping-Yin. 2017 “From School to the Labor Market: Introduction to Teps and Teps-B.” *Journal of the Chinese Statistics Association* (55):24–40.
- Leopold Thomas. 2012 “The Legacy of Leaving Home: Long-Term Effects of Coresidence on Parent – Child Relationships.” *Journal of Marriage and Family* 74(3):399–412.
- Lu Bo. 2005 “Propensity Score Matching with Time-Dependent Covariates.” *Biometrics* 61(3):721–28. [PubMed: 16135023]
- Manacorda Marco and Moretti Enrico. 2006 “Why Do Most Italian Youths Live with Their Parents: Intergenerational Transfers and Household Structure “. *Journal of the European Economic Association* 4(4):800–29.
- Meier Ann and Allen Gina. 2009 “Romantic Relationships from Adolescence to Young Adulthood: Evidence from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health.” *The Sociological Quarterly* 50(2):308–35. [PubMed: 25332511]
- Miyamoto Michiko, Iwakami Mami and Yamada Masahiro. 1997 *Mikonka Shakai No Oyako Kankei: Okane to Aijou Ni Miru Kazoku No Yukue* [Parents-Child Relations in a Late-Marriage Society: Money, Love, and the Future of Family]. Tokyo: Yuhikaku sensho.
- Mulder, Clara H, Clark William A.V. and Wagner Michael. 2002 “A Comparative Analysis of Leaving Home in the United States, the Netherlands and West Germany.” *Demographic Research* 7(17):565–92.
- Nauck Bernhard, Gröpler Nicolai and Yi Chin-Chun. 2017 “How Kinship Systems and Welfare Regimes Shape Leaving Home: A Comparative Study of the United States, Germany, Taiwan, and China.” *Demographic Research* 36(38):1109–48.
- Nauck Bernhard and Ren Qiang. 2018 “Coresidence in the Transition to Adulthood: The Case of the United States, Germany, Taiwan, and Mainland China.” *Chinese Sociological Review* 50(4):443–73.
- Qian Zhenchao and Lichter Daniel T.. 2007 “Social Boundaries and Marital Assimilation: Interpreting Trends in Racial and Ethnic Inter-marriage.” *American Sociological Review* 72(1):68–94.
- Raley, Kelly R, Crissey Sarah and Muller Chandra. 2007 “Of Sex and Romance: Late Adolescent Relationships and Young Adult Union Formation.” *Journal of marriage and the family* 69(5):1210–26. [PubMed: 20221420]
- Raymo James M. 2003 “Premarital Living Arrangements and the Transition to First Marriage in Japan.” *Journal of Marriage and Family* 65(2):302–15.
- Raymo James M. and Ono Hiromi. 2007 “Coresidence with Parents, Women’s Economic Resources, and the Transition to Marriage in Japan.” *Journal of Family Issues* 28(5):653–81.
- Raymo James M., Park Hyunjoon, Xie Yu and Yeung Wei-jun Jean. 2015 “Marriage and Family in East Asia: Continuity and Change.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 41(1):471–92.
- Retherford Robert D., Ogawa Naohiro and Matsukura Rikiya. 2001 “Late Marriage and Less Marriage in Japan.” *Population and Development Review* 27(1):65–102.
- Rosenfeld MJ 2007 *The Age of Independence: Interracial Unions, Same-Sex Unions, and the Changing American Family*: Harvard University Press.

- Sakamoto Kazuyasu and Kitamura Yukinobu. 2007 "Marriage Behavior from the Perspective of Intergenerational Relationships." *Japanese Economy* 34(4):76–122.
- Schaffnit Susan B. and Sear Rebecca. 2014 "Wealth Modifies Relationships between Kin and Women's Fertility in High-Income Countries." *Behavioral Ecology* 25(4):834–42.
- Scheike Thomas H. and Jensen Tina Kold. 1997 "A Discrete Survival Model with Random Effects: An Application to Time to Pregnancy." *Biometrics* 53(1):318–29. [PubMed: 9147597]
- Schwartz Christine R. and Mare Robert D.. 2012 "The Proximate Determinants of Educational Homogamy: The Effects of First Marriage, Marital Dissolution, Remarriage, and Educational Upgrading." *Demography* 49(2):629–50. [PubMed: 22450676]
- Schwartz Christine R. 2013 "Trends and Variation in Assortative Mating: Causes and Consequences." *Annual Review of Sociology* 39(1):451–70.
- Skopek Jan, Schulz Florian and Blossfeld Hans-Peter. 2011 "Who Contacts Whom? Educational Homophily in Online Mate Selection." *European Sociological Review* 27(2):180–95.
- Smits Jeroen and Park Hyunjoon. 2009 "Five Decades of Educational Assortative Mating in 10 East Asian Societies." *Social Forces* 88(1):227–55.
- Tsay Ruey-ming. 1996 "Who Marries Whom? The Associations between Wives' and Husbands' Educational Attainment and Classes in Taiwan." *Proceedings of Humanities and Social Sciences* 6(2):258–77.
- Tsay Ruey-ming and Wu Li-hsueh. 2006 "Marrying Someone from an Outside Group." *Current Sociology* 54(2):165–86.
- Twenge Jean M. and Park Heejung. 2017 "The Decline in Adult Activities among U.S. Adolescents, 1976–2016." *Child Development*.
- Umberson Debra. 1992 "Relationships between Adult Children and Their Parents: Psychological Consequences for Both Generations." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 54(3):664–74.
- White Lynn K. and Rogers Stacy J.. 1997 "Strong Support but Uneasy Relationships: Coresidence and Adult Children's Relationships with Their Parents." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 59(1):62–76.
- Yamada Masahiro. 1999 *Parasaito Shinguru No Jidai [the Era of Parasite Singles]*. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo.
- Yamaguchi Kazuo. 1991 *Event History Analysis*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Yu Wei-hsin. 2009 *Gendered Trajectories: Women, Work, and Social Change in Japan and Taiwan*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Yu Wei-hsin, Su Kuo-hsien and Chiu Chi-Tsun. 2012 "Sibship Characteristics and Transition to First Marriage in Taiwan: Explaining Gender Asymmetries." *Population Research and Policy Review* 31(4):609–36.
- Yu Wei-hsin and Kuo Janet Chen-Lan. 2016 "Explaining the Effect of Parent-Child Coresidence on Marriage Formation: The Case of Japan." *Demography* 53(5):1283–318. [PubMed: 27624323]
- Zeng Yi, Coale Ansley, Minja Kim Choe Liang Zhiwu and Li Liu. 1994 "Leaving the Parental Home: Census-Based Estimates for China, Japan, South Korea, United States, France, and Sweden." *Population Studies* 48(1):65–80.
- Zorlu Aslan and Mulder ClaraH. 2011 "Ethnic Differences in Leaving Home: Timing and Pathways." *Demography* 48(1):49–72. [PubMed: 21290208]

Table 1.

Descriptive statistics

	Men		Women	
A. Individual characteristics at the survey time				
Living with parent(s) (%)	62.9		65.1	
Education (%):				
General high school	2.5		1.8	
Vocational high school	10.4		6.3	
Junior college	3.2		4.0	
Technical college	30.8		32.3	
University	29.5		40.0	
Postgraduate school	23.6		15.6	
Enrolled in school (%)	10.7		8.2	
Ethnicity (%):				
Hokkien	77.1		76.8	
Hakka	12.3		12.3	
Mainlanders	7.7		8.5	
Aborigines	2.9		2.4	
Income (in NT)	19,398.6	(19,428.4)	20,602.7	(16,767.9)
Number of siblings	1.5	(0.8)	1.7	(0.9)
Parents' education (%):				
Middle school and less	24.1		25.2	
Upper secondary	41.5		38.7	
College and more	34.4		36.1	
Family instability (%)	87.5		87.8	
Residential area (%):				
Large population center	55.0		60.4	
Other urban areas	36.2		32.5	
Rural areas	8.8		7.1	
Number of relationships entered since age 15	1.6	(1.4)	1.6	(1.3)
Number of relationships exited since age 15	1.2	(1.3)	1.1	(1.1)
N of individuals	2,763		2,409	
B. Relationship characteristics				
Educational difference (%):				
Homogamous	69.8		67.1	
Heterogamous	21.8		25.4	
Unknown	8.4		7.5	
Ethnic difference (%):				
Homogamous	67.4		70.2	
Heterogamous	11.5		12.3	
Unknown	21.1		17.5	
Family SES difference (%):				

	Men	Women
Homogamous	48.1	45.7
Heterogamous	36.3	41.6
Unknown	15.6	12.7
Age difference (%):		
Homogamous	73.9	65.5
Heterogamous	23.1	31.1
Unknown	3.0	3.4
Highly committed relationship (%)	11.4	12.6
N of relationships	4,353	3,847

Note: Values for categorical variables are in percent (with “%” following the variable labels). The mean values, followed by standard deviations in parentheses, are presented for all other variables.

Table 2.

Regression models predicting entry into romantic relationships

	Entering any relationship		Relationship highly committed, conditional on relationship entry	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
Living with parent(s)	-.298 *** (.069)	-.293 *** (.078)	-.916 ** (.292)	-.780 * (.313)
Education (<i>ref.</i> general high school):				
Vocational high school	.176 (.111)	.120 (.146)	1.960 ** (.638)	.642 (.665)
Junior college	.584 ** (.206)	.576 ** (.183)	1.018 (.773)	1.142 (.779)
Technical college	.811 *** (.136)	.959 *** (.149)	1.737 ** (.567)	.612 (.671)
University	.805 *** (.115)	1.025 *** (.121)	1.390 * (.607)	.587 (.657)
Postgraduate school	1.000 *** (.197)	1.546 *** (.201)	1.824 * (.846)	.045 (.985)
Enrolled in school	.092 (.085)	-.151 (.105)	-.676 * (.340)	-.819 * (.392)
Ethnicity (<i>ref.</i> Hokkien):				
Hakka	.025 (.111)	.283 * (.125)	.542 * (.272)	-.262 (.274)
Mainlanders	.265 † (.152)	.161 (.149)	.651 * (.288)	.273 (.307)
Aborigines	1.437 *** (.204)	1.233 *** (.254)	1.864 *** (.462)	2.434 ** (.932)
Age (<i>ref.</i> 17 and younger):				
18–22	.536 *** (.101)	.551 *** (.113)	2.705 *** (.605)	1.783 ** (.617)
23 and older	1.580 *** (.151)	1.575 *** (.164)	1.425 † (.757)	1.399 † (.799)
Log income	.059 *** (.008)	.035 *** (.007)	.015 (.029)	-.014 (.029)
Number of siblings	-.110 * (.054)	.043 (.049)	-.032 (.104)	.213 † (.125)
Parental education (<i>ref.</i> middle school and less):				
High school	.298 ** (.103)	-.090 (.109)	.175 (.216)	-.736 ** (.228)
College and more	.049 (.116)	-.405 ** (.124)	-.171 (.239)	-.895 *** (.255)
Family instability	-.156 (.128)	-.337 * (.140)	-.453 † (.237)	-.762 * (.298)
Number of prior relationships	-.367 *** (.057)	-.317 *** (.057)	.563 ** (.167)	.708 *** (.194)
Residential areas (<i>ref.</i> major population centers):				
Other urban areas	.003 (.078)	-.005 (.085)	-.085 (.305)	.074 (.306)
Rural areas	-.046 (.138)	.031 (.143)	-.140 (.425)	-.355 (.525)
Constant	-5.281 *** (.253)	-4.759 *** (.251)	-9.836 *** (1.382)	-6.457 *** (1.834)
N	196,126	162,405	4,353	3,847

Note: Numbers in parentheses are robust standard errors. All models include duration of exposure and duration squared and are weighted based on the propensity to coreside with parents in a given month. Each model also includes an individual random effect.

p < .001

**
p < .01

*
 $p < .05$

†
 $p < .10$ (two-tailed tests)

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Table 3.

Results from discrete-time multinomial logit models predicting entering different types of relationships

Models	Coefficient for living with parent(s)	
	Men	Women
A. Educational difference		
Homogamous	-.305 (.073) ***	-.320 (.086) ***
Heterogamous	-.370 (.130) **	-.345 (.109) **
Unknown	-.127 (.115)	-.088 (.136)
B. Ethnic difference		
Homogamous	-.229 (.080) **	-.253 (.090) *** ^d
Heterogamous	-.212 (.135)	-.592 (.164) ***
Unknown	-.148 (.098)	-.030 (.120)
C. Family SES difference		
Homogamous	-.208 (.081) * ^b	-.240 (.089) **
Heterogamous	-.395 (.084) ***	-.302 (.098) **
Unknown	-.360 (.121) **	-.453 (.137) **
D. Age difference		
Homogamous	-.194 (.071) *** ^a	-.325 (.085) ***
Heterogamous	-.428 (.104) ***	-.317 (.105) **
Unknown	-.675 (.271) *	-.169 (.217)

Note: Numbers in parentheses are robust standard errors. All models include education, school enrollment, ethnicity, age, log income, number of siblings, parental education, family instability, residential area, number of prior relationships, duration of exposure, duration squared, and a random effect for individuals, as in the models presented in Table 2. The models are also weighted based on the propensity to coreside with parents in a given month.

^a indicates the difference between “homogamous” and “heterogamous” is significant at the .05 level.

^b indicates the difference between “homogamous” and “heterogamous” is significant at the .10 level.

 $p < .001$

**
 $p < .01$

*
 $p < .05$

[†]
 $p < .10$ (two-tailed tests)

Table 4.

Partial results from discrete-time event history models predicting relationship dissolution

	Men		Women	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
Living with parent(s)	.169 * (.074)	.160 * (.075)	.217 * (.090)	.227 * (.090)
Age (<i>ref.</i> 17 and younger):				
18–22	.607 *** (.116)	.599 *** (.119)	.397 ** (.154)	.462 ** (.151)
23 and older	.576 *** (.162)	.573 *** (.164)	.231 (.197)	.308 (.196)
Log income	-.011 (.007)	-.005 (.007)	.001 (.008)	.003 (.008)
Number of siblings	.033 (.050)	.033 (.049)	-.094 (.059)	-.070 (.054)
Parents' education (<i>ref.</i> middle school and less):				
Upper secondary	.008 (.105)	.020 (.103)	.007 (.115)	.036 (.111)
College and more	.109 (.118)	.051 (.114)	-.035 (.129)	-.030 (.125)
Family instability	-.101 (.124)	-.068 (.136)	.020 (.132)	-.016 (.130)
Number of prior relationships	-.423 *** (.054)	-.393 *** (.055)	-.643 *** (.067)	-.623 *** (.069)
Residential areas (<i>ref.</i> major population center):				
Other urban localities	-.060 (.073)	-.089 (.076)	-.130 (.099)	-.077 (.099)
Rural areas	-.069 (.135)	-.069 (.134)	-.210 (.184)	-.133 (.183)
Relationship characteristics:				
Education (<i>ref.</i> homogamy):				
Heterogamy		-.022 (.098)		-.139 (.117)
Unknown		.103 (.160)		.560 ** (.192)
Ethnicity (<i>ref.</i> homogamy):				
Heterogamy		-.403 ** (.154)		-.189 (.203)
Unknown		1.008 *** (.104)		1.089 *** (.139)
Family SES (<i>ref.</i> homogamy):				
Heterogamy		.089 (.083)		.197 * (.095)
Unknown		1.313 *** (.134)		1.437 *** (.147)
Age (<i>ref.</i> homogamy):				
Heterogamy		-.142 (.097)		-.157 (.098)
Unknown		.852 ** (.279)		.359 (.347)
Constant	-3.967 *** (.237)	-4.550 *** (.250)	-4.107 *** (.272)	-4.687 *** (.274)
N of person-month observations	93,569	93,569	100,601	100,601

Note: Numbers in parentheses are robust standard errors. The models also include educational level, school enrollment, ethnicity, and duration, coefficients of which are omitted to conserve space. All models are weighted by the propensity to coreside with parents in a given month and include a random effect for individuals.

p < .001

**
p < .01

*
p < .05

[†]
 $p < .10$ (two-tailed tests)

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript