

Who Lives with Parents? Living Arrangements of Single Young Adults in Taiwan

Ying-Ting Wang
Yuan Ze University

ABSTRACT

More single young adults are staying with their parents. However, past research on coresidence was mostly on married adults and their elderly parents, and little attention has been paid to single young adults. Using nationally representative data, I investigated who lived with their parents among single young adults aged 25 to 32 in Taiwan. Sixty-nine percent of the respondents lived with their parents as in 2016. Similar to the literature, coresident respondents had lower individual education attainment than the non-coresident respondents. Similar to the common perceptions, coresident respondents had lower intention to move than the non-coresident respondents. However, unlike the negative public perceptions of “parasite singles,” the majority of the coresident respondents provided financial support to parents and did not receive any from parents. Some differences in factors associated with the likelihood of living with parents by age group were observed.

*This is a draft prepared for the 2019 PAA meeting. Correspondence to Ying-Ting Wang, Ph.D. at yingtingwang@saturn.yzu.edu.tw. The paper is still being revised. All rights reserved. No part of this paper may be reproduced without permission from the author.

INTRODUCTION

Coresidence between adult children and their parents is common in East Asia in general due to the filial norms (Lin and Yi 2013; Zhang, Gu and Luo 2014). Extensive studies have been done on who live with their parents and the effect of coresidence on various outcomes of the adult children and their parents. One caveat of this line of research is that it tends to focus on married adult children and elderly parents, and little attention has been given to single adult children. This is a significant omission for two reasons. First, single adults are more likely to live with their parents compared to their partnered counterparts (Fingerman et al. 2015; Fry 2013; Isengard and Szydlik 2012; Lin and Yi 2013). Second, the share of young adults who are single and living with parents has increased over time (Fry 2013; Ting and Chiu 2002). Despite its increasing share, we know little about who the single young adults living with parents are.

Research on the coresidence between single young adults and their parents is especially needed in Taiwan for three reasons. First, coresidence between adult children and their parents is very common in Taiwan even when comparing it to other East Asia societies. In 2006, 47.4% adults in Taiwan lived with parents, a percentage much higher than that of China (24.0%), of Japan (31.6%), and of South Korea (23.5%)(Lin and Yi 2013). Second, coresidence between single adults who live with parents became more common, which contributed to the increase of coresidence of all adults and their parents between 1991 and 2006 (Lin 2012). Third, the age at first marriage has been increasing in Taiwan. Comparing to the year 2007, the average age at first marriage in the year 2017 increased from 31.0 to 32.4 for men and 28.1 to 30.0 for women (Department of Household Registration Affairs 2018). The current trend in delaying marriage in Taiwan would possibly lead to more young people to stay in the parental home because marriage is closely associated with leaving parental home in the Chinese context, especially for women (Ting and Chiu 2002).

A recent article by Li and Hung (2019) provided some insights on the living arrangements of single young adults in Taiwan. The article found that being a man, better personal economic capability (measured by education and types of occupation), and fewer parental resources (as measured by the father's occupation) were associated with higher likelihood of home leaving (live without parents). The article gives a much-needed picture of single people's living arrangements. However, the article leaves some puzzles unsolved. First, the article did not use a nationally representative sample. The article's data was mainly from the 2009 Panel Study of Family Dynamics (PSFD), a nationally representative sample of respondents aged 26 to 32 in Taiwan. Yet, only 69% of the final study sample was from the 2009 PSFD. The remaining 31% of the study sample was the adult children of earlier PSFD panels whose information was gathered in various years. Second, the result that father's resources were negatively related to home leaving is inconsistent with literature where parental *education* positively related to home leaving (Fingerman et al. 2015). Hence, whether the living arrangement pattern found in Li and Hung (2019) can be found in a national representative sample of single

young adults in Taiwan and how parental education relates to their single children's living arrangement remain unknown.

Therefore, this study aims to examine who lives with parents among single young adults in Taiwan. I use a nationally representative survey of adults aged 25 to 32 years old in Taiwan to first describe single young adults' characteristics by their coresidence situation, and then explore which factor is associated with coresidence with parents.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The research on coresidence between adult children and parents can generally be categorized into three types by its study population: studies focused on the parents (e.g., Fingerman et al. 2015; Isengard and Szydlik 2012), studies focused on all adult children regardless of their marital status (Fry 2013; Lin and Yi 2013), and studies focus on married adult children in East Asia (Chu, Xie and Yu 2011; Li and Huang 2017; Ma and Wen 2016; Yasuda et al. 2011; Zhang et al. 2014). Only one recent study, to my knowledge, focused on young single adults' coresidence situation (Li and Hung 2019). Though differences in the focuses, these studies found that characteristics of both adult children and parents were related to whether they live together or not. The direction and the strength of the relationships sometimes vary by the marital status of the children and by the study site.

Adult Children's Characteristics and Their Coresidence with Parents

Adult children's gender was found to be related to the coresidence situation. Most studies found that women were less likely to live with parents compared to men among all adult children (Fingerman et al. 2015; Fry 2013; Isengard and Szydlik 2012) and among married adult children (Lin and Yi 2013; Ma and Wen 2016; Zhang et al. 2014). Though Yasuda et al. (2011) found this gender difference among married adult children only existed in China but not in Japan, South Korea, or Taiwan. However, when examining only young single adults in Taiwan, single women were actually more likely to live with parents than did single men (Li and Hung 2019).

Studies also found that adult children's age and married adult children's age were negatively associated with the likelihood of living with their parents (Fry 2013; Isengard and Szydlik 2012; Lin and Yi 2013; Ma and Wen 2016; Yasuda et al. 2011; Zhang et al. 2014). One study found that only the wife's age but not the husband's was (negatively) related to the likelihood of coresidence with parents (Li and Huang 2017). Li and Hung (2019) found that single young adult's age was not related to the coresidence with parents.

Generally, adult children with a higher socioeconomic status, either measured by the education level, occupation, or income were less likely to live with their parents, regardless of their marital status (Chu et al. 2011; Fry 2013; Isengard and Szydlik 2012; Li and Hung 2019; Lin and Yi 2013). Though two studies on married adult children in China found a reverse educational pattern (Ma and Wen 2016; Zhang et al. 2014) and one study on married adult children in Taiwan found no association between education and coresidence and between income and coresidence (Li and Huang 2017).

Other children-level factors that are related to coresidence included the number of siblings and the level of filial piety. The number of siblings was negatively associated

with the likelihood of living with parents among all children (Isengard and Szydlik 2012; Lin and Yi 2013; Zhang et al. 2014) and among married man (Chu et al. 2011). Husbands having a brother (Yasuda et al. 2011) or not being the oldest son (Ma and Wen 2016) were also negatively associated with the likelihood of coresidence with parents. In addition, studies on East Asian societies consistently found that filial piety was positively associated with coresidence with parents among all adult children in Taiwan, China, Japan, and South Korea (Lin and Yi 2013) and among married adults in Southeast China and/or Taiwan (Chu et al. 2011; Zhang et al. 2014).

Parents' Characteristics and Their Coresidence with Adult Children

Parents' marital status, surviving status, age, education, income, and health were found to be related to coresidence with children in some studies, though the direction of the relationships was mixed. Two studies in East Asia found married parents were less likely to live with their children compared to non-married parents (Lin and Yi 2013; Zhang et al. 2014) but one study in the United States found a reverse pattern (Fingerman et al. 2015). Regarding parental surviving status, Chu et al. (2011) found that married adult children in Taiwan and Southeast China were more likely to live with the husband's only surviving parent if the other parent was deceased, but Li and Hung (2019) found that young single adults in Taiwan with one or both parents deceased was actually more likely to move out than those with both parents alive.

The findings on whether parents' age was related to coresidence were inconsistent, and no factor (such as the study site or marital status of the adult children) seems to account for this inconsistency. Some studies found no association between parents' age and coresidence (Isengard and Szydlik 2012; Yasuda et al. 2011), but other studies found a positive association (Li and Huang 2017; Lin and Yi 2013; Zhang et al. 2014), and one study found a negative association (Fingerman et al. 2015).

There were no consistent findings on whether parental socioeconomic status was related to coresidence with adult children either. This might be because studies used different measurements of socioeconomic status, and some measurements worked in the opposite direction from other measurements. Even when using the same measurement, such as parental education level, different patterns were observed. For instance, Fingerman et al. (2015) found parents with more education were less likely to live with their adult children, but parental income had no association with the likelihood of coresidence. Zhang et al. (2014) and Chu et al. (2011) found parents' education level was not related to coresidence with married children, and Li and Hung (2019) found that parents with more skilled occupations were more likely to live with their single young children.

Parents' health status was found to be related to their living arrangement, but the direction of the relationship varied by their marital status (Brown et al. 2002; Chen 2005; Isengard and Szydlik 2012; Zhang et al. 2014) and by the measurements of health (Brown et al. 2002). For instance, Brown et al. (2002) found that among married older adults in Japan, better self-rated health status but more chronic conditions were associated with a higher likelihood of living with unmarried children. Among unmarried older adults, those with worse cognitive functions were less likely to live with their children.

Other Factors Related to Coresidence Between the Adult Children and Their Parents
Personal and financial relationships between the adult children and their parents might be related to their living arrangement as well. Public conceptions of single young adults who live with their parents are usually negative. In Japan, they are seen as "parasites" that "feed on" the family system because they rely on the parents' support and do not provide (Yamada 1999, 2001). Similar to the "parasites" analogy, in Chinese, those young people are called "ken-lao-zu," which means elderly-devouring people. These negative conceptions suggest those young people are economically dependent on their parents and the parent-children relationship might be adversely affected as well.

Some empirical studies, though, provided mixed support for these public conceptions. In terms of the relationship between adult children and the parents, two U.S. studies suggested coresidence leads to a mixture of positive and negative experiences between the two parties (Fingerman 2017; Fingerman et al. 2017). On the other hand, Zhang et al. (2014) in China found greater emotional closeness between the married children and the parents was associated with a higher likelihood of coresidence. Zhang et al. (2014) also found any financial transfer between the parents and the married adult children of either direction, was associated with a higher likelihood of coresidence.

Lastly, house ownership and location of the residence were found to be related to the coresidence between adult children and their parents. The adult children, regardless of their marital status, were more likely to live with their parents if parents owned the current residence (Isengard and Szydlik 2012; Li and Huang 2017; Zhang et al. 2014). Married children lived in an urban area versus a rural area were less likely to live with the parents (Chu et al. 2011; Yasuda et al. 2011), but parents lived in metropolises were more likely to live with their young single children (Li and Hung 2019).

To summarize, many characteristics of the adult children and parents were found to be related to whether they live together or not, although empirical studies provided mixed results on some characteristics. The mixed results on coresidence might be because the adult children were at different life stages in these studies. Some studies included late teens as young as 18 years old (e.g., Fingerman et al. 2015; Lin and Yi 2013), and some

included respondents from 20-30 years old to 50-65 years old (e.g., Yasuda et al. 2011; Zhang et al. 2014). Because leaving parental home is an essential transitional event to adulthood (Settersten Jr, Ottusch and Schneider 2015) and it is also closely related to marriage in the Chinese context (Ting and Chiu 2002), the older young adults who remained single and lived with parents may have different characteristics than their younger counterparts

Therefore, as a descriptive study of the coresidence situation of young single adults in Taiwan, I investigate who lived with parents among single young adults by focusing on the abovementioned children-level and parent-level characteristics and housing situations. I further examine the respondents by their age using the usual marriage age as the cutoff line to see whether the factors related to coresidence vary by their age.

DATA AND METHODS

I used data from the 2016 sample of the Panel Study of Family Dynamics (PSFD), a national representative sample of adults aged 25 to 32 in Taiwan. The PSFD is a panel study launched in 1999 by the Academic Sinica in Taiwan to collect data from a representative sample of adults born in 1953-1964 (aged 35 to 46 at the time of the survey) (Project for the Study of Family in Chinese Societies 2012). It contains detailed family-related information, including the background of the respondent, the parents, the spouse, and the children as well as relationships between family members. It followed up with the original panel annually or biannually, and also refreshed the panel by adding national representative adults in the year 2000, 2003, 2009, and 2016. The present study used the 2016 refreshment sample only, which exclusively sampled adults aged 25 to 32 at the time.

Because this study focuses on single young adults' coresidence with parents in Taiwan, I included only respondents who were single (never-married) and with at least one surviving parent. I also restricted my sample to those who lived in Taiwan and who had at least one parent living in Taiwan because the context of living arrangement might be more complex when one party lives abroad. The original sample included 1,973 adults. The final sample size was 1,397 after excluding respondents who were not single (n=452), who had no living parents (n=6), who lived abroad (n=6), who had no parents living in Taiwan (n=6), and who had any missing information on the variables used except for the parents' age. Many respondent (n=191) did not report their parents' age. I decided to include them because I wanted to retain the sample size and parents' age did not associate with the coresidence situation after preliminary analysis, with or without imputation.

Variables

The dependent variable

Living with parents (1=yes, 0=no). Respondents were asked "how far away does your father/mother live from you?", and "we live together" was one of the answer options. Respondents who lived with one or both parents were coded 1 for this variable. Respondents who did not live with any parents were coded 0.

Respondent's characteristics

Respondent's demographic characteristics included *gender* (female and male) and *age* (in continuous years and two age groups). Two *age groups* (age 25 to 29 and age 30-32) were created. I used age 30 as the cutoff because age 30 was found to be the threshold of young adults scheduling marriage plans in Taiwan (Huang 2013).

I included a variable indicating whether the respondent was the *only child* or not (1=yes, 0=no). Respondent's self-rated *health* was a continuous variable with values from 1 to 5, the higher the value representing the better health status. *Employment status* was a dichotomous variable (1=employed, 0=not employed). *Education attainment* was a

categorical variable with four categories (high school or less, associate degree, college degree, and graduate degree).

Filial piety was measured by the average of the following three five-point-scale items: “being grateful to parents,” “treat parents nicely regardless how they treat you,” and “supporting parents to make them live comfortably” (Cronbach's alpha=0.69). A high score indicates these items were important to the respondent and hence higher filial piety. *Family-related value* is measured by a five-point-scale item: “being married and having a family is important.” A higher value indicates this item was important to the respondent and hence greater family value.

Parent-related variables

In the description of the sample, I included the *surviving status of the parents* (1=only one surviving parent, 0=both parents were alive). Parental marital status was not available in the data. *Age of parents* is the average age of parents or the age of the only surviving parent, and it was measured in continuous years. *Highest education of parents* is the highest education level attained by either parents or the only surviving parent, and it was measured as a categorical variable (middle school or less, high school, and more than high school). *The health of the parent* is the average respondent-rated health status of the parents or the health of the only surviving parent. It was measured in a continuous variable with values of 1 to 5, a higher the value representing a better health status.

Relationship with parents was the average relationship score of both parents or the relationship score with the surviving parent. The relationship score with each parent was reported by the respondent on a five-point scale, and a higher score represents a better relationship.

Financial transfer between the respondents and their parents was measured by the following questions, “In the past year, did your parents give you some financial aids for daily living expenses” and “In the past year, did you give your parents some pocket money, living expenses or festive red envelopes.” Adapting from the typology from Tsai and Wang (in press), I categorized financial transfer in four categories: those who provided and received financial support were categorized as having “reciprocal exchange” with their parents. Those who did not provide nor receive financial support were categorized as having “mutual independence” with their parents. Those who provided financial support but did not receive any were considered to have “upward transfer” to their parents. Those who received financial support but did not provide any were considered having “downward transfer” with their parents.

Parents’ residential location was recoded to four categories based on the residential location’s demographic characteristics, economic development, and economic structure from the typology of Hou, Liao and Hung (2008). The four categories were “metropolitan regions,” “established regions,” “emerging regions,” and “other.”

Generally, “metropolitan regions” was the most developed regions, followed by “established regions” and “emerging regions.” The less developed regions or remote regions were included in the “other” category. If the two parents did not live in the same region, this variable was recoded to the more developed region of the two parents’.

Housing situation

House ownership was measured by the question, “who owns the house you currently live in?”. I categorized the ownership variable into 4 categories: parent-owned, self-owned, rental units, and others (including all other types of ownership). Lastly, the *intention to move in 2 years* (1=yes, 0=no) was measured by the following question, “do you plan to move in 2 years?”

Analytic Approach

In the first part of the analysis, I described the descriptive statistics by whether the respondent lived with their parents. In the second part of the analysis, I used logistic regression to examine which factor is associated with the likelihood of coresidence when controlling for other factors. Both parts of the analyses were stratified by the respondent’s age.

RESULTS

Sample Characteristics

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics of the sample by whether the respondent lived with the parents. More than two-thirds of the respondents (69.4%) lived with their parents. Slightly more than half (57.5%) of the respondents were men. The average age of the sample was 28 years old, and most of the sample (70.4%) were under 30 years old. The majority of the sample was not the only child. The average health status was 3.6 out of 5. The majority of the sample was employed and had a degree more than high school. About one in five respondents had a graduate degree. Regarding filial piety and family-related value, the respondents had a strong sense of filial piety (average score was 4.3 out of 5) but had a more neutral view on being married and having their own family (average score 3.4 out of 5).

(Table 1 about here)

In the sample, 11.5% of the respondents only had one surviving parent. The average age of the parents was 56.3 years old, and half of the parents' highest education level was high school. The parents on average had neutral health status (score 3.5 out of 5) and a good relationship with the respondent (score 4.1 out of 5). The most common (66.7%) financial transfer type was upward transfer. The parents' residential location was roughly evenly distributed among the four categories with established regions being the most common one (29.9%) and other regions being the least common (20.0%) one. As for the housing situation, 59% of the respondents lived in a place owned by the parents, and 26.7% lived in a rental unit. Slightly less than a quarter of the respondents intended to move in 2 years.

Similarities and Differences Between the Coresident Respondents and the Non-Coresident Respondents

The coresident respondents and the non-coresident respondents had similar gender distribution, age, only-child status, health status, employment status, filial piety value, family value, parental age, parental health status, relationship with parents, and financial transfer situations with parents. However, compared to the non-coresident respondents, the coresident respondents had lower personal education, a higher percentage of only one surviving parent, lower parental education, a lower percentage of parents who lived in the less-developed regions (18.4% vs 25.7%), a higher percentage of living in a parent-owned place (76.6% vs. 18.2%), a lower percentage of living in a rental unit (13.3% vs. 54.9%), and a lower intention to move (14.8% vs. 45.1%). Besides, all non-coresident respondents had both surviving parents (0% had only one surviving parent), which means those with only one surviving parent all lived with the surviving parent.

Table 2 and Table 3 present the descriptive statistics of the sample by whether the respondent lived with their parents for those who aged 25 to 29 years and for those who aged 30 to 32 years, respectively. The overall pattern among those aged 25 to 29

years was similar to the overall sample except for the relationship with parents. The coresident respondents had a worse relationship with their parents than did non-coresident respondents. Among those who aged 30 to 32 years, the coresident respondents and non-coresident respondents were not much different except for their parental surviving status, relationship with their parents, and the housing situation. Interestingly, the coresident respondents had a better relationship with their non-coresident counterparts, a reverse pattern than the one found among the younger age group.

(Table 2 and Table 3 about here)

Regression Analysis

Table 4 shows the coefficients of logistic regression analysis on the likelihood of living with parents. In the regression model, I only included factors that were significantly related to coresidence in the descriptive analysis and two basic demographic variables (gender and age). I excluded the “only one surviving parent” variable because of its perfect prediction of living with parents (respondents with only one surviving parent all lived with the surviving parent.) I combined the house ownership category “self-owned” with “others” because very few respondents (3.7%) were in the self-owned category.

(Table 4 about here)

Among all respondents, gender and age were not associated with the likelihood of living with parents. Personal education level, parental education level, and relationship with parents were all negatively related to the likelihood of living with parents. Compared to the respondents whose parents lived in metropolitan regions, the respondents whose parents lived in the less developed “other” regions were significantly less likely to live with their parents. In terms of the housing situation, compared to those who live in a parent-owned place, those who lived in a non-parent-owned place (a rental unit or self-owned/other situation) were less likely to live with parents. Last, the intention to move was negatively associated with the likelihood of living with parents.

Factors associated with living with parents for younger respondents (aged 25 to 29) and for older respondents (aged 30 to 32) had some similarities. For both younger and older respondents, higher parental education was negatively associated with the likelihood of living with parents. Also, those who lived in a non-parent-owned place (versus a parent-owned place) and those who intended to move in 2 years were less likely to live with parents.

Factors associated with living with parents for younger respondents and for older respondents also had some differences. A higher personal education level, a better relationship with parents, and a less-developed parental residential location were negatively associated with the likelihood of living with parents for the younger

respondents but not for the older respondents. Women were more likely to live with parents than were men for the older respondents but not for the younger respondents.

DISCUSSION

More young adults are single due to late marriage (Department of Household Registration Affairs 2018), and more single adults are living with their parents in Taiwan (Lin 2012). However, past research on coresidence between the adult children and their parents was mostly on married adults or elderly parents, and little attention has been paid to single young adults. Using nationally representative data, I investigated who lived with their parents among single young adults aged 25 to 32 in Taiwan.

Overall, 69.4% of the respondents lived with their parents. The coresident respondents had the following characteristics in comparison to the non-coresident respondents: lower individual education attainment, lower parental education attainment, a lower percentage of parents who lived in the less-developed regions, a higher percentage of living in a parent-owned place, and a lower intention to move in two years. Controlling for other variables, individual education attainment, parental education attainment, parental residential location, the house ownership, and the intention to move were still related to the likelihood of living with parents. In addition, the relationship with parents was negatively related to the likelihood of coresidence.

Some of the findings are similar to and some are different from those of Li and Hung (2019), a similar study on the same population (young single adults aged 25 to 33 in Taiwan) but with non-representative data. For instance, similar to their study, I found age was not related to coresidence, and individual education level was negatively associated with the likelihood of coresidence. Different from their results where parental occupation's skill level was positively associated with the likelihood of coresidence, I found parental education level, another measurement of socioeconomic status, was negatively related to the likelihood of coresidence. Respondents with only one surviving parent all lived with the surviving parent in the present study, but they found that those with only one or no surviving parent were actually more likely to live without parents. Also, overall, women were more likely to live with their parents in their study, but the same pattern only found for those aged 30 or above in the present study. Furthermore, this study includes factors that were not considered in Li and Hung (2019) but are likely related to coresidence such as the personal and financial relationship between the adult children and the parents. This present study also distinguishes the sample by their age. Some similarities and differences in factors associated with the coresidence situation by age group were observed.

The results indicate that coresidence between single young adults and their parents may be more of practice for limited resources other than a form of filial piety for those aged 25 to 29. Although employment status was not related to coresidence and there was no measurement of family or personal income, the results show that higher education of the individual and the parents, a measurement for socioeconomic status, was associated with lower likelihood of living with parents for single adults aged 25 to 29. This result is similar to the findings of all adult children in East Asia (Lin and Yi 2013) and in Europe (Isengard and Szydlik 2012), and all young adults in the United States (Fry

2013), where lower individual education was associated with higher likelihood of coresidence. On the other hand, filial piety was not associated with coresidence for these young single adults, which contradicts to findings on all adult children and married adult children in East Asia (Chu et al. 2011; Lin and Yi 2013; Zhang et al. 2014). Therefore, living together may be more a practical practice for resource sharing and not a moral obligation for younger adults.

For single adults aged 30 to 32, coresidence might be less to do with personal socioeconomic status and only slightly about parental socioeconomic status. Thus, it is difficult to conclude that the coresidence among this age group was for resource sharing. In addition, for this above-usual-marriage-age group, the living arrangement is gendered: compared to men, women were more likely to live with their parents. This pattern is consistent with the notion and empirical findings that home leaving was closely related to marriage in Chinese context especially for women (Ting and Chiu 2002). That is, single men might be more likely to leave parental home before marriage, but single women would often remain in the parental home till marriage.

The results also provide some insights into the intergenerational relationship regarding coresidence. Fingerman et al. (2017) found that coresidence with their parents of adults aged 18 to 30 led to both negative and positive experiences. The regression results indicate that, overall, single young adults who lived with parents might have a worse relationship with their parents because the relationship with parents was negatively associated with the likelihood of living with parents. However, this pattern was found only among respondents aged 25 to 29 but not among respondents aged 30 to 32. In fact, among those aged 30 to 32, coresident respondents actually had a better relationship with their parents in the descriptive analysis. The differences by age group echo the discussions in the previous two paragraphs: coresidence might be more a practical practice for younger adults than for older adults. The frequent contact due to coresidence may lead to more negative emotions for those who live together for a practical purpose and lead to ambivalent emotions for those who live together for non-practical reasons.

In addition, contrary to the “parasite singles” notion (Yamada 2001) or the Chinese phrase of “ken-lao-zu (elderly-devouring people)”, the most common financial transfer type among the coresident respondents was “upward transfer” (i.e., the adult child provides to the parents financially but do not receive any from the parents). Only 10.9% of the coresident respondents did not provide any financial support to parents but received some from parents. In addition, financial transfer types did not differ by coresidence status. However, similar to the common notion that, like parasites, these coresident singles would stay at the parental home for a prolonged period of time and do not want to move out, intention to move was negatively associated with the likelihood of living with parents.

This study is not without limitations. First, because of the cross-sectional nature of the data, I cannot establish any causal inference for coresidence with parents and cannot tease out the selection issues. Second, some related factors were not available in the data, such as parental marital status. Third, the relationship with parents was rated by the respondents, and thus it may not be very accurate.

Despite the above limitations, this study provides an overview of the coresidence situation of the single young adults in Taiwan by highlighting the factors associated with coresidence and the differences between the coresident adults and non-coresident adults. Though having a similar design to a recent study (Li and Hung 2019), this study adds to the literature by using nationally representative data and examining coresidence by age groups. Factors associated with coresidence differ by age group if using age 30 as a cutoff point. Lastly, the study also provides some evidence as well as counterevidence of the common negative conceptions of single adult children who live with their parents.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of the sample by whether the respondent lived with the parents, the 2016 PSFD

N	Coresidents		Non-Coresidents		All	
	969		428		1,397	
	%/Mean(SD)		%/Mean(SD)		%/Mean(SD)	
Respondent's characteristics						
Live with parents (%)						
Yes (coresidents)					69.4	
No (non-coresidents)					30.6	
Gender (%)						
Male	57.0		58.6		57.5	
Female	43.0		41.4		42.5	
Age (mean)	28.0 (2.2)		28.0 (2.3)		28.0 (2.2)	
Age 25-29 (%)	70.8		69.6		70.4	
Age 30-32 (%)	29.2		30.4		29.6	
Only child (%)	4.9		4.4		4.7	
Health (mean, range 1-5)	3.6 (0.8)		3.6 (0.8)		3.6 (0.8)	
Employed (%)	85.4		88.1		86.2	
Education* (%)						
High school or less	16.3		11.5		14.8	
Associate degree	38.8		32.2		36.8	
College degree	29.1		29.2		29.1	
Graduate degree	15.8		27.1		19.3	
Filial piety (mean, range 1-5)	4.3 (0.6)		4.3 (0.6)		4.3 (0.6)	
Family value (mean, range 1-5)	3.4 (1.2)		3.4 (1.2)		3.4 (1.2)	
Parent-related variables						
Only one surviving parent* (%)	16.5		0.0		11.5	
Age of parents (mean)	56.3 (0.2)		56.4 (0.2)		56.3 (0.1)	
Highest education of parents* (%)						
Middle school or less	31.2		22.4		28.5	
High school	50.5		52.3		51.0	
More than high school	18.4		25.2		20.5	
Health of parents (mean, range 1-5)	3.5 (0.8)		3.5 (0.8)		3.5 (0.8)	
Relationship with parents (mean, range 1-5)	4.1 (0.8)		4.1 (0.8)		4.1 (0.8)	
Financial transfer with parents (%)						
Upward	66.5		67.3		66.7	
Downward	10.8		11.0		10.9	
Mutual	9.9		10.1		10.0	
Independent	12.8		11.7		12.5	

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of the sample by whether the respondent lived with the parents, the 2016 PSFD, continued

	Core-sidents	Non- Core-sidents	All
N	969	428	1,397
Parents' residential location*			
Metropolitan regions	26.3	20.6	24.6
Established regions	29.9	29.7	29.9
Emerging regions	25.4	24.1	25.0
Other	18.4	25.7	20.6
Housing situations			
House ownership* (%)			
Parent-owned	76.6	18.2	58.7
Self-owned	3.3	4.7	3.7
Rental units	13.3	54.9	26.1
Other	6.8	22.2	11.5
Intend to move in 2 years* (%)	14.8	43.9	23.7

* Difference between the core-sidents and non-core-sidents is significant at the $p < 0.05$ level

Table 2. Descriptive statistics of the respondents aged 25-29 by whether the respondent lived with the parents, the 2016 PSFD

N	Co-residents		Non-Co-residents		All	
	686		298		984	
	%/Mean(SD)		%/Mean(SD)		%/Mean(SD)	
Respondent's characteristics						
Live with parents (%)						
Yes (co-residents)					69.7	
No (non-co-residents)					30.3	
Gender (%)						
Male	57.0		57.4		57.1	
Female	43.0		42.6		42.9	
Age (mean)	26.9 (1.4)		26.8 (1.4)		26.8 (1.4)	
Only child (%)	4.8		4.4		4.7	
Health (mean, range 1-5)	3.6 (0.8)		3.7 (0.8)		3.6 (0.8)	
Employed (%)	85.8		86.2		85.3	
Education* (%)						
High school or less	15.2		9.1		13.3	
Associate degree	39.5		33.2		37.6	
College degree	31.1		30.2		30.8	
Graduate degree	14.3		27.5		18.3	
Filial piety (mean, range 1-5)	4.3 (0.6)		4.4 (0.6)		4.3 (0.6)	
Family value (mean, range 1-5)	3.4 (1.2)		3.4 (1.3)		3.4 (1.2)	
Parent-related variables						
Only one surviving parent* (%)	14.4		0.0		10.1	
Age of parents (mean)	55.3 (0.2)		55.2 (0.3)		55.3 (0.1)	
Highest education of parents* (%)						
Middle school or less	27.7		19.5		25.2	
High school	52.9		53.7		53.2	
More than high school	19.4		26.9		21.7	
Health of parents (mean, range 1-5)	3.5 (0.8)		3.6 (0.8)		3.6 (0.8)	
Relationship with parents* (mean, range 1-5)	4.1 (0.8)		4.2 (0.8)		4.1 (0.8)	
Financial transfer with parents (%)						
Upward	63.6		63.1		63.4	
Downward	12.7		13.8		13.0	
Mutual	11.4		11.4		11.4	
Independent	12.4		11.7		12.2	

Table 2. Descriptive statistics of the respondents aged 25-29 by whether the respondent lived with the parents, the 2016 PSFD

N	Core-sidents	Non- Core-sidents	All
	686	298	984
	%/Mean(SD)	%/Mean(SD)	%/Mean(SD)
Parents' residential location*			
Metropolitan regions	26.5	18.5	24.1
Established regions	29.5	28.2	29.1
Emerging regions	25.8	26.5	26.0
Other	18.2	26.9	20.8
Housing situations			
House ownership* (%)			
Parent-owned	77.7	17.1	59.4
Self-owned	2.6	3.0	2.7
Rental units	12.8	55.4	25.7
Other	6.9	24.5	12.0
Intend to move in 2 years* (%)	15.2	42.0	23.3

* Difference between the coresidents and non-coresidents is significant at the $p < 0.05$ level

Table 3. Descriptive statistics of the respondents aged 30-35 by whether the respondent lived with the parents, the 2016 PSFD

N	Coresidents		Non-Coresidents		All	
	283		130		413	
	%/Mean(SD)		%/Mean(SD)		%/Mean(SD)	
Respondent's characteristics						
Live with parents (%)						
Yes (coresidents)					68.5	
No (non-coresidents)					31.5	
Gender (%)						
Male	56.9		61.5		58.4	
Female	43.1		38.5		41.4	
Age (mean)	30.9 (0.8)		31.0 (0.9)		30.9 (0.9)	
Only child (%)	5.0		4.6		4.8	
Health (mean, range 1-5)	3.6 (0.8)		3.6 (0.9)		3.6 (0.8)	
Employed (%)	86.6		92.3		88.4	
Education (%)						
High school or less	19.1		16.9		18.4	
Associate degree	37.1		30.0		34.9	
College degree	24.4		26.9		25.2	
Graduate degree	19.4		26.2		21.6	
Filial piety (mean, range 1-5)	4.4 (0.6)		4.3 (0.6)		4.3 (0.6)	
Family value (mean, range 1-5)	3.4 (1.2)		3.3 (1.1)		3.4 (1.2)	
Parent-related variables						
Only one surviving parent* (%)	21.6		0.0		14.8	
Age of parents (mean)	58.7 (0.3)		59.0 (0.3)		58.8 (0.2)	
Highest education of parents (%)						
Middle school or less	39.6		29.2		36.3	
High school	44.5		49.2		46.0	
More than high school	15.9		21.5		17.7	
Health of parents (mean, range 1-5)	3.5 (0.8)		3.4 (0.8)		3.4 (0.8)	
Relationship with parents (mean, range 1-5)	4.1 (0.8)		4.0 (0.8)		4.1 (0.8)	
Financial transfer with parents (%)						
Upward	73.5		76.9		74.6	
Downward	6.4		4.6		5.8	
Mutual	6.4		6.9		6.5	
Independent	13.8		11.5		13.1	

Table 3. Descriptive statistics of the respondents aged 30-35 by whether the respondent lived with the parents, the 2016 PSFD

N	Co-residents	Non-Co-residents	All
	283	130	413
	%/Mean(SD)	%/Mean(SD)	%/Mean(SD)
Parents' residential location			
Metropolitan regions	25.8	25.4	25.7
Established regions	31.1	33.1	31.7
Emerging regions	24.4	18.5	22.5
Other	18.7	23.1	20.1
Housing situations			
House ownership* (%)			
Parent-owned	73.9	20.8	57.1
Self-owned	5.0	8.5	6.1
Rental units	14.5	53.9	26.9
Other	6.7	16.9	9.9
Intend to move in 2 years* (%)	13.8	48.5	24.7

* Difference between the co-residents and non-co-residents is significant at the $p < 0.05$ level

Table 4. Coefficients of logistic regression analysis on the likelihood of living with parents, the 2016 PSFD

	All	25-29 years old	30-32 years old
N	1,397	984	413
Respondent's characteristics			
Female (ref.= male)	0.20	0.04	0.61*
Age	-0.01	0.04	-0.13
Education (ref.= high school or less)			
Associate degree	-0.45	-0.67*	-0.09
College degree	-0.68**	-0.88**	-0.35
Graduate degree	-0.96***	-1.26***	-0.41
Parent-related variables			
Highest education of parents (ref.= middle school or less)			
High school	-0.43*	-0.35	-0.63*
More than high school	-0.67**	-0.69*	-0.52
Relationship with parents	-0.19*	-0.29**	0.04
Parents' residential location (ref=. metropolitan regions)			
Established regions	-0.23	-0.28	0.00
Emerging regions	-0.43	-0.56*	-0.14
Other	-0.73***	-0.94***	-0.26
Housing situations			
House ownership (ref.=parent-owned)			
Rental units	-2.72***	-2.90***	-2.28***
Self-owned/Other	-2.53***	-2.74***	-2.11***
Intend to move in 2 years	-0.73***	-0.56**	-1.29***
Constant	4.79***	4.18*	6.79

* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

REFERENCES

- Brown, J.W., J. Liang, N. Krause, H. Akiyama, H. Sugisawa, and T. Fukaya. 2002. "Transitions in living arrangements among elders in Japan: Does health make a difference?" *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B* 57(4):S209-S220.
- Chen, F. 2005. "Residential patterns of parents and their married children in contemporary China: A life course approach." *Population Research and Policy Review* 24(2):125-148.
- Chu, C., Y. Xie, and R.R. Yu. 2011. "Coresidence with elderly parents: A comparative study of southeast China and Taiwan." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 73(1):120-135.
- Department of Household Registration Affairs, Ministry of the Interior. 2018. "Median age and the average age at marriage." Available online at http://www.ris.gov.tw/346?p_p_id=populationdata_FastDwnld&p_p_lifecycle=2&p_p_state=normal&p_p_mode=view&p_p_resource_id=getFile&p_p_cacheability=cacheLevelPage&p_p_col_id=column-1&p_p_col_count=1&m4=y4s5&e3=xls&d5=.
- Fingerman, K.L. 2017. "Millennials and their parents: Implications of the new young adulthood for midlife adults." *Innovation in Aging* 1(3):igx026-igx026.
- Fingerman, K.L., M. Huo, K. Kim, and K.S. Birditt. 2017. "Coresident and noncoresident emerging adults' daily experiences with parents." *Emerging Adulthood* 5(5):337-350.
- Fingerman, K.L., K. Kim, E.M. Davis, F.F. Furstenberg, Jr., K.S. Birditt, and S.H. Zarit. 2015. "'I'll give you the world': Socioeconomic differences in parental support of adult children." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 77(4):844-865.
- Fry, R. 2013. "A rising share of young adults live in their parents' home." Pew Research Center.
- Hou, P.-C.T., Su-Hao, P.-S. Liao, and Y.-T.C. Hung, Ying-Hwa. 2008. "The typology of townships in Taiwan: The analysis of sampling stratification of the 2005-2006 "Taiwan Social Change Survey" [in chinese]." *Survey Research-Method and Application* 23:7-32.
- Huang, L.-W.W. 2013. "The transition tempo and life course orientation of young adults in Taiwan." *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 646(1):69-85.
- Isengard, B. and M. Szydlik. 2012. "Living apart (or) together? Coresidence of elderly parents and their adult children in Europe." *Research on Aging* 34(4):449-474.
- Li, W.D. and J.-W. Huang. 2017. "Housing the intergenerational families: Married couples coresident with parents in Taiwan." *Journal of Family History* 42(1):54-66.

- Li, W.D. and C.-Y. Hung. 2019. "Parental support and living arrangements among young adults in Taiwan." *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment* 34(1):219-233.
- Lin, J.-P. 2012. "Trends of changes in intergenerational relationship and interaction types in Taiwan [in Chinese]." in *Social changes in Taiwan, 1985-2005: family and marriage*, edited by C.-C. Yi and Y.-H. Chang. Taipei: Institute of Sociology, Academia Sinica.
- Lin, J.-P. and C.-C. Yi. 2013. "A comparative analysis of intergenerational relations in East Asia." *International Sociology* 28(3):297-315.
- Ma, S. and F. Wen. 2016. "Who coresides with parents? An analysis based on sibling comparative advantage." *Demography* 53(3):623-647.
- Project for the Study of Family in Chinese Societies, RCHSS, Academia Sinica. 2012. "Overview of the Panel Study of Family Dynamics." Vol. 2018, article August 20. Available online at https://psfd.sinica.edu.tw/web/plan_02en.htm.
- Ting, K.-f. and S.W.K. Chiu. 2002. "Leaving the parental home: Chinese culture in an urban context." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 64(3):614-626.
- Tsai, M.-c. and Y.-T. Wang. in press. "Intergenerational exchanges in East Asia: A new look at financial transfers." *Comparative Sociology*.
- Yamada, M. 1999. *Parasite single nojidai (The era of parasite singles)*.
- . 2001. "Parasite singles feed on family system." *Japan Quarterly* 48(1):10.
- Yasuda, T., N. Iwai, C.-c. Yi, and G. Xie. 2011. "Intergenerational coresidence in China, Japan, South Korea and Taiwan: Comparative analyses based on the East Asian Social Survey 2006." *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 42(5):703-722.
- Zhang, Z., D. Gu, and Y. Luo. 2014. "Coresidence with elderly parents in contemporary China: the role of filial piety, reciprocity, socioeconomic resources, and parental needs." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Gerontology* 29(3):259-276.