Leaving home and poverty among youth: A cross European analysis

Arnstein Aassve[✞], Maria Davia[❑], Maria Iacovou[✞], Stefano Mazzuco[#]

September 2005

Abstract

A particular feature of poverty in Europe is the close connection between young people's living arrangement and economic disadvantage. Leaving home is generally associated with a higher degree of poverty and compared to other events, such as experiencing unemployment and having children, it is by far the most important driver behind youth poverty. There is however huge variations across countries. It is natural to assume that young people would delay leaving home if they consider this to jeopardise their level of wellbeing (i.e. entering poverty). However, assessing the causality issue between leaving home and poverty is difficult. In this paper we implement a statistical approach to analyse the causal effect of leaving home on entering poverty. We use data from the European Community Household Panel and propensity score estimation techniques, and find that the event of leaving home does have a particularly strong effect in entering poverty in Scandinavian countries, but rather weak effect among Mediterranean countries.

Keywords: youth poverty, leaving home, propensity score matching

✞ **Institute for Social and Economic Research, Essex University, Wivenhoe Park, Colchester CO4 3SQ, U.K.**
Telephone: +44 (0) 1206 873994
E-mail: maria@essex.ac.uk, aassve@essex.ac.uk

\# **Department of Statistics, University of Padua**
Via Cesare Battisti, 241, 35121, Padova, Italy
Telephone: ++39 0498 274192,
E-mail: mazzuco@stat.unip.it

❑ **Universidad de Castilla La Mancha**
Facultad CCEE y EE de Albacete. Plaza de la Universidad, s/n, Albacete.
02017, Spain
Telephone: ++44 967 599200 (ext 2380),
E-mail: mangeles.davia@uclm.es

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This paper forms part of the project "Poverty Among Youth: International Lessons for the UK", funded by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation Grant no. 803554 under the Ladders Out Of Poverty programme. The ECHP data used in the analysis were produced and made available by Eurostat. All errors and inconsistencies in the paper are our own.

Introduction/motivation

The young adult years is a time characterised by dramatically changing circumstances for most individuals. Whereas the transition to adulthood traditionally used to be a rather sequential and well structured passage in the life cycle, it is has more recently become considerably complex and in many countries more protracted. Completion of education, finding a stable career path, finding a partner, having children, leaving the parental home, are all crucial life events contributing to the vulnerability of youth. Poverty studies have repeatedly shown that employment, children and union formation are important factors in entering and escaping poverty, and thus highly relevant for poverty among youth. Though young individuals are particularly exposed to these events as they make the transition to adulthood, very few studies have in fact focused on youth poverty and the possible links to the crucial life events.

Here we focus on the most important event driving youth poverty, namely the event of leaving the parental home. Previous literature shows that whereas employment, union formation and presence of children tend to be the most important factors behind poverty among the population in general, the event of leaving home is particularly important among young individuals. This is of course not surprising. As poverty is defined over the net equivalised household income, it is clear that a move from the parental home will bring a about a reduction in household income. Perhaps the most interesting facet of leaving home and youth poverty is the large discrepancies across European countries, both in terms of the mean age of leaving home, but also the extent to which leaving home is associated with poverty. The emphasis on the current work is therefore on the link between leaving home and youth poverty, with a particular emphasis on why large differences across Europe persist.

Building on previous work on youth poverty in Europe we implement a statistical approach to analyse the causal effect of leaving home on entering poverty. More specifically, we use data from the European Community Household Panel and propensity score estimation techniques, and find that the event of leaving home does have an impact on entering poverty. The strongest effect of leaving home on poverty is found for Scandinavian countries, whereas the effect is weakest among Mediterranean countries. Moreover, the mean age of leaving home in Scandinavian

countries is the lowest in Europe, whereas it is highest in Mediterranean countries. The estimates suggest that young individuals in Scandinavian countries, though experiencing higher poverty as they leave home, realise that for most individuals this is a temporary state, and is alleviated through good job prospects and a generous welfare system protecting young individuals from adverse economic events.

Background

There is little research on youth poverty in general, which contrasts the rather extensive evidence on poverty problems amongst other groups, particularly children (Bradbury and Jantti 1999, Cantillon and Van den Bosch 2002, and many others). The factors behind youth poverty are rather more complicated than child poverty and poverty in general (Aassve et al 2005). The main reasons for this is that young adults tend to go through a range of important life cycle events, all of which being potential triggers for economic disadvantage, and likewise potential pathways out of poverty. Education, employment, partnership formation, having children, and setting up an own dwelling, are all crucial life events contributing to the vulnerability of youth. However, very few studies have in fact focused on youth poverty and the possible links to these crucial life events. There is however strong indications that this is an important issue. From the European commission report on poverty (Eurostat 2002) it emerges clearly that across Europe, the incomes of young people below age 24 are below national averages. These lower incomes translate into a higher poverty risk, which clearly appears when the risk of poverty is assessed as a function of an individual's position in the income distribution. The importance of the issue is confirmed by Cantó-Sánchez and Mercader-Prats (1999) who study entry-level jobs held by new school leavers (aged 16 to 29) one year after leaving education in selected European countries. Finding that the labour market conditions varies markedly between countries, they find that in Spain more than 80 per cent of school leavers hold a temporary job, mainly because they are unable to find a permanent job, and is believed to be an important factor behind youth poverty. Pavis, Platt and Hubbard (2000), highlighting the key role of education, shows that simply obtaining a job is not sufficient in avoid social exclusion. Smeeding et al (1999) and Berthoud and Robson (2003) show that in Anglo-Saxon nations, single parenthood is a strong

risk factor for youth poverty. Teenage motherhood is much less common in continental Europe, but teen mothers fare much less well on average in later life. Magadi et al (2005) examining the effect of timing and sequence of transitions to parenthood and partnership formation among young females aged 16-35 years, show a rather strong association between timing of first birth and the risk of household poverty and low age at first birth being consistently associated with high risk of both income poverty and deprivation.

Though it seems clear that lifecycle events are related to youth poverty, it seems also clear that there are huge variations across European countries. Aassve et al (2005) [this is the parametric paper] using the ECHP provides a comprehensive descriptive analysis of youth poverty in Europe. Using parametric estimation techniques they show that most of the aforementioned events are significantly related to youth poverty. Employment, marriage, and cohabitation is associated with lower poverty risk in most countries, whereas independent living (away from parents), having children and being without work are all associated with higher poverty risk. One important conclusion from this work is that independent living, away from parents, is by far the strongest driver behind youth poverty, but that the effect differs across countries. In fact leaving home has the strongest effect on poverty Scandinavian countries and the smallest effect is found for Mediterranean countries. Given the importance of living arrangement for youth poverty it is useful to plot the descriptive statistics of youth poverty and leaving home from the ECHP. Figure 1 shows poverty rates separately for young men and women in fifteen European countries. The effect of living arrangements is striking. Young individuals having left home are on average three times more likely to be poor than those who still live in the parental home. There are of course differences for the age groups. Those in the youngest group (20 – 24) have by far the highest risk of poverty if they leave home. As young individuals grow older their income and job prospects improves, reducing the risk of poverty. There are important country differences. Among those who live at home poverty is highest in Mediterranean countries, and lowest in Scandinavian countries. Once having left the parental home, the picture changes, with dramatically higher poverty rates in Scandinavian countries. The poverty rates also shoot up in Mediterranean countries but not to the same extent. Interestingly, the high poverty rates among young Scandinavians are short lived, which is reflected by the poverty

rates among the age group as the poverty rate for age groups 25 – 34. This group has in fact the lowest poverty rate among all those having left home.

Figure 1: poverty rates for youths by age group, gender and living arrangements

Empirical approach

Needless to say there is a strong relationship between independent living and youth poverty, as highlighted in Figure 1. However, the *extent* to which the event of leaving home leads to poverty is not clear. Figure 1 represents simple tabulations and does not reveal the extent leaving home impose poverty. Likewise, the study by Aassve et al (2005) based on parametric estimation of important trigger events on poverty, does not take into account possible endogeneity bias generated by the various background variables. The problem is essentially that the leaving home event cannot be considered exogenous with respect to household income and therefore poverty. Multivariate regression analysis, with living arrangements or change in living arrangements being an explanatory variable will necessarily be prone to this problem, and therefore produce biased estimates. The standard approach is to implement an Instrumental Variable approach by utilising variables that are correlated with the endogenous variable, but independent of the error term. The problem in our setting is that it is that finding valid and powerful instruments is exceedingly difficult. We take therefore an alternative approach by implementing Propensity Score Matching techniques. In brief the approach can be outlined as follows. Our interest lies in the effect of leaving home net of other unobserved aspects influencing the likelihood of falling into poverty. The ideal setting would be to compare the risk of poverty for individuals leaving home with the same individuals if they did not leave home, which would be the counterfactual situation. The problem of course is that for the same individual these two scenarios are mutually exclusive. Propensity Score Matching is a common approach in this setting, in which the idea is to create an approximation to the counterfactual situation (Rosenbaum and Rubin 1983). In simple terms the application of this method for our case is as follows. Youths are divided into two types: those who leave home, denoted as $D_i=1$ and those that do not, i.e. $D_i=0$. Youths are then matched by pairing units who undertook "treatment", which here is to leave the parental home (i.e. $D_i=1$), with units of comparison (i.e. $D_i=0$) that are similar in terms of their observable characteristics prior to the event. When the relevant differences between treated (leavers) and controls (stayers) are captured by observable covariates, matching methods yield an unbiased estimate of the average impact of leaving home on treated. The matching approach is generating the conditional

expectation of the outcome variable on observable covariates. Rosenbaum and Rubin (1983) proved that conditioning on a one-dimensional variable, namely the conditional probability of receiving treatment - in our case leaving parental home - given the set of covariates X, which is referred to as propensity score, is equivalent to conditioning directly on the set of background variables X. The propensity score for individual *i* is defined as:

$$P(X_i)=Pr(D_i=1|X_i) \qquad (1)$$

where X_i is the vector of explanatory variables recorded prior to the childbearing event. If exposure to treatment is random within each cell as defined by X_i, it will also be random within cells defined by the propensity score variable $P(X_i)$. This is commonly referred as conditional independence or strong ignorability which means that conditional on X (the observable variables) – the outcome Y is independent on assignment to treatment. Provided the conditional independence assumption holds, one may proceed to the matching stage, when treated and comparison units are paired according their scores. We use Nearest Neighbour Matching to perform the matching (see Becker and Ichino, 2002, and Smith and Todd, 2000 and Caliendo and Kopeinig , 2005, for details concerning the other matching methods). The precise algorithm used here has been nearest neighbour (3) with a calliper of 0.01. This calliper may be binding in some countries and age groups and it is not binding in others (i.e., it does not affect the results at all). Therefore the calliper seems to be quite generous, and only makes sure that we disregard very bad matches. We have also performed radius[1] with the same bandwidth (0.01) for consistency checks and results (not provided for the sake of brevity but available from the authors upon request) are quite similar[2].

[1] For a given calliper, radius is the most equivalent method. It will link not the nearest neighbours, but all those who are in the radius, and will weight every observation with the inverse of the distance, using a Kernel distance procedure. For any given radius/bandwidth, the radius method will have a lower variance than the nearest neighbour, because it uses much more information, but, given that it will also use worse matches, it is likely to increase bias. There is always a bias-variance trade off between different algorithms in PSM so that it is very difficult to define which is the best method. Amongst all the ones that were tried, the one that reduces bias most is the nearest neighbour, which that it is the one we report in table 2.

[2] All of the analysis is implemented by the use of the psmatch2 module in STATA (Leuven and Sianesi 2003), and the analysis is performed separately for the age groups and countries previously outlined.

Data and definition of the sample

The European Community Household Panel (ECHP) is a set of comparable large-scale longitudinal studies set up and funded by the European Union. The first wave of the ECHP was collected in 1994 for the original countries in the survey: Germany, Denmark, the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg, France, the UK, Ireland, Italy, Greece, Spain and Portugal. Three countries were late joiners to the project: Austria joined in 1995, Finland in 1996 and Sweden in 1997. All countries except Luxembourg and Sweden are included in the analysis; Luxembourg is omitted because of an extremely small sample, Sweden because the data do not form a panel[3]. Eight waves of the ECHP were collected in total, with the last wave collected in 2001. The ECHP provides excellent scope for comparing among countries in the European Union, together with the fact that it provides up-to-date information. A drawback of the panel is the lack of retrospective information. For instance, parental information cannot be recovered if the respondent has left the parental home in the first wave. Furthermore, retrospective information in terms of demographics and labour market experiences is limited (see Nicoletti and Peracchi, 2002 and Peracchi, 2002, for a general review of the quality of the ECHP). The ECHP was designed to provide information on income and social cohesion, and is therefore rich in information on income, which facilitates easy calculation of poverty status. The income information is however collected retrospectively, and covers the calendar year prior to the survey interview. Thus, for example, Wave 1 interviews in 1994 contain information about individuals' income in 1993, Wave 2 interviews in 1995 contain information about individuals' income in 1994, and so on. Adding together the incomes of all individuals present in a household in Wave 2 (for example) gives the sum of all the 1994 incomes for those present in the household in 1995 – but because household composition changes year-on-year, this total may include some individuals who were not living in the household in 1994, and may omit some individuals who *were* present in that year. For population groups for whom household structure is relatively stable, the problems arising from this inaccuracy may not be serious. However, for young people, for whom household structure is likely to be fluid, and highly dependent upon

[3] For the purposes of cross-sectional analysis this is not a problem – but because household income is measured retrospectively, it makes it impossible to analyse the links between living arrangements and incomes.

the sufficiency of current incomes, the problems are potentially serious. To compute household equivalent income in year *t*, we use income data pertaining to year *t* collected at year $t + 1$, summing this over all the individuals present in the household at year *t* and using an equivalence scale based on the numbers and ages of individuals present at year *t* (Heuberger, 2003). The reader should note that this procedure was not possible using Finnish data, and thus for Finland, all data relates to incomes for year $t - 1$.

Results

The main results of the PSM analysis are displayed in Table 2 and Figure 2. Results which hare labelled ATT refers to the Average Treatment on the Treated. Table 2 encounters all the ATT and their corresponding bootstrapped standard errors. The ATT is essentially the difference between the probability of becoming poor for those who leave home - given that they left - and the probability of becoming poor if they had stayed at home. For instance in Table 2 we see that 20-24 year old Finnish youths are 54.3% more likely to become poor if they leave home than if they stayed at home. The average treatment on the controls (ATC) is the difference between probability of becoming poor for those who stay at home - given that they stayed at home - and the probability of becoming poor if they had left home. The average treatment effect (ATE) is the increase in the probability of becoming poor of an average individual taken randomly from the sample if (s)he had left home.

The estimates provided in Table 2 are, not surprisingly, similar to the descriptive statistics. As expected these estimates confirm our suspicion that youths who leave home are more vulnerable towards poverty than those who stay with their parents in all countries, although there is great variation across countries and genders. For those under 25 years the average treatment on the treated is always positive and significant, while the levels acquire a wide range of values. By far the strongest effect of leaving home is found in Finland, here reported with an estimate of 54 percent. The effect is also strong in Denmark, but significantly smaller than in Finland. Following Denmark we find the Netherlands, France, Germany, Greece and the UK. The smallest effect of leaving home is found in Belgium, Austria, Italy, Spain and Portugal. Comparing these estimates with the descriptive statistics in Figure 1

indicates that among the latter group of countries, the effects are lower than what is indicated in Figure 1, indicating presence of selection effects. We return to this issue below.

Table 2 Average treatment on the treated (ATT) for those who leave home compared to stayers

	20-24 year olds			25-29 year olds			30-34 year olds		
	Both	**Men**	**Women**	**Both**	**Men**	**Women**	**Both**	**Men**	**Women**
FIN	0.542	0.549	0.547						
	0.029	*0.044*	*0.047*						
DEN	0.315	0.269	0.384						
	0.040	*0.054*	*0.100*						
NET	0.256	0.296	0.245						
	0.042	*0.052*	*0.062*						
UK	0.189	0.201	0.175						
	0.025	*0.037*	*0.042*						
IRE	0.133	0.138	0.161	0.038	0.032	0.085			
	0.033	*0.046*	*0.044*	*0.028*	*0.038*	*0.044*			
FR	0.260	0.307	0.224	0.094	0.059	0.129			
	0.025	*0.041*	*0.028*	*0.026*	*0.025*	*0.038*			
GER	0.231	0.232	0.176	0.053	0.047	0.071			
	0.025	*0.039*	*0.035*	*0.017*	*0.018*	*0.035*			
AT	0.121	0.105	0.176	0.036	0.041	0.026			
	0.032	*0.034*	*0.042*	*0.026*	*0.036*	*0.034*			
BEL	0.137	0.250	0.103						
	0.034	*0.081*	*0.048*						
PT	0.052	0.066	0.032	0.011	0.009	0.015	0.085	0.052	0.158
	0.015	*0.023*	*0.021*	*0.015*	*0.019*	*0.025*	*0.036*	*0.038*	*0.081*
ES	0.060	0.023	0.091	0.072	0.078	0.082	0.090	0.061	0.121
	0.025	*0.027*	*0.051*	*0.017*	*0.023*	*0.025*	*0.027*	*0.035*	*0.038*
ITA	0.126	0.148	0.112	0.090	0.104	0.059	0.062	0.097	0.004
	0.028	*0.049*	*0.043*	*0.021*	*0.025*	*0.031*	*0.019*	*0.028*	*0.039*
GRE	0.209	0.233	0.155	0.062	0.062	0.065	0.008	0.000	0.027
	0.041	*0.056*	*0.039*	*0.005*	*-0.014*	*0.030*	*0.032*	*0.032*	*0.070*

Note: numbers in italics refer to bootstrapped standard errors.
Source: ECHP (Eurostat) (1994-2001)

The estimates do show some difference between genders, but it is difficult to decipher particular patterns. Leaving home generates higher poverty for women than men in some countries, but lower poverty in others. However, in terms of the ranking of countries we get a similar picture for both genders. Though it is difficult make any inference with regards to welfare regime theory, we may nevertheless say that North-South differences are relevant. Ireland, however, seem closer to the Mediterranean countries (particularly Spain and Portugal). Greece is a different case since the decision to leave home in Greece is quite related to the decision to attend university, given that the supply of university places is concentrated in only two locations).

Austria register similar values to southern countries. In the intermediate values of the main outcome variable (the ATT) we have France, the Netherlands, Belgium, Germany, UK and Greece.

Another distinguishing feature, though not unexpected is that the effect of leaving home on poverty is considerably smaller among the higher age groups. Note that in Table 2 we are not able to estimate ATT for "older" youths in Finland, Denmark, Netherlands, and UK, simply because the great majority of individuals leave home in their early twenties. For the other countries we find that older youths have lower poverty risk for those who leave home, to the point that it becomes non significant in several cases. There is hardly any significant difference in poverty risks for late leavers (30-34 year olds, who are only observed in Italy, Greece, Portugal and Spain). In some cases, if those who stay at home had left, their poverty risk could be lower, which may be indicating that, in those age groups, we find that not only children have no particular higher risk of falling into poverty, but also may of them are supporting economically to their parents, and not the other way around, so that they remain at home for helping and not for being helped. This is particularly the case with Spain and more particularly, with Spanish women.

In Figure 2 we make direct comparisons of ATT and ATC estimates. The three boxes on the left hand side in Figure 2 measure the level of ATT on the vertical axis and ATC on the horizontal axis. If the ATT and ATC estimates are the same – then they will lie on the 45 degree line. The difference between ATT and ATC is also a measure of the selection effect related to the leaving home event. In other words, the leaving home is orthogonal entering poverty if the ATT is similar to the ATC. Comparing the ATT with ATC estimates reveals that in almost all countries the ATT is below the ATC, as well as the ATE (not shown here). The implication of this is that though those who leave home have a higher risk of falling into poverty than those who do not leave home – if the latter group instead *did* leave home – they would have had an *even* higher poverty rate (than those who were recorded as having left home). As a result, the average risk of falling into poverty is higher than the average risk for those who actually leave home. This is always the case except from Denmark and Finland, where in fact we find the ATC to be slightly larger than ATT, implying that the risk of falling into poverty for those who leave home is even higher than the poverty risk among those staying home – if they had left. Overall these estimates

Figures 2: Average treatment (ATT) on the treated and its counterfactual (ATC), for youths of both genders. Leaving home rates.

indicate that young individuals do indeed take into account the poverty risk when deciding to leave home. Of course, the fact that ATC is slightly higher than ATT in Denmark and Finland, indicate that if anything, young individuals "rationally" leave home, despite knowing that they will face higher poverty as a result of this action.

In the majority of countries we find ATT to be higher than ATC, which indicates that poverty risk is an important reason for *delaying* the transition out of the parental home. That is, they tend to delay leaving home not only because they know their chances of entering poverty are higher if they leave, but also those who leave, even facing a higher risk, "know" their risk is smaller than for those who decide to stay behind in the parental home. We find the strongest effects for Belgium, Italy and Netherlands for the age group 20 – 24.

Whereas the graphs to the left in Figure 2 plots differences between ATT and ATC against the effect of leaving home on poverty, the right hand side graph shows that difference between ATT and ATC against the rate of leaving home. Here the interest lies in whether those countries which have a large difference between difference between the ATT and ATC, also have a lower rate of leaving home. That is, in countries where youth delay leaving home due to their expected poverty risk, should they also leave home at a slower rate? The results show that youths in Belgium, where we know the selection effect is the strongest, also have a low rate of leaving home. In contrast, Denmark and Finland, which has the highest effect of leaving home on poverty, but where the selection effect is small, have very high rates of leaving home. Apart from Italy which here resembles Belgium, it is difficult to discern a clear patter for the other countries.

Moving on to the next age group we see a continued small effect for Portugal and Austria: the effect of leaving home is small, and there is little evidence of any selection bias. There is a large effect for Italy and France, but compared to the age group 20 – 24 the effects are not dramatic. The effects are even smaller for the next age group. There is little correlation between the relative risk of falling into poverty and the rates of leaving home rates, implying that any economic motivations for leaving home is weaker in this age group. We should bear in mind that family formation (i.e. marriage or cohabitation) is an important reason for leaving home among this age group. And, again, the very low exit rates for some groups of Southern European 30-34 year-olds, even when being confronted by higher ATCs than ATTs

would confirm the hypothesis that, for those who reach a given age and have not left already, the most likely scenario is that they are supporting their parents rather than parent supporting the young individual.

Conclusion

In this paper we have addressed the issue of to which extent leaving home may be considered as a triggering effect into poverty among youths in Europe. We have chosen a technique that provides a precise estimate of the net effect of this event by matching individuals who are observationally equivalent in terms of their likelihood of leaving home, but still are different in the sense that some do actually leave home and some do not.

By applying this technique on this precise problem we not only contribute to the literature of mobility into poverty, but also to the literature of youth poverty, which is a fairly unexplored field. We have used a multinational data set which allows us to observe different trends in European (EU-15) countries, and striking differences between northern and southern countries, with Central European and English Speaking countries falling into intermediate categories.

The higher risk of poverty amongst those who have left home in Scandinavian countries are corroborated in this dynamic perspective, since we find an extraordinary impact of leaving home itself on the risk of poverty among those under 25 year olds in those countries. The higher risk of entering poverty for early home leavers is a common feature across Europe, but in these countries it is far more pronounced than in the rest. The effect of leaving home on poverty risk diminishes with age in all countries, and sometimes it becomes non significant (particularly for those over 30 years old) in southern countries, meaning that the elder the youth, the lower is the risk of poverty deterring the decision to leave home.

Those youths in Scandinavian countries face the higher risk of falling into poverty and, despite of that, they leave home earlier than in any other country. Given these results one may wonder to which extent youths are rational (rational meaning taking decisions targeted at the maximum economic utility), particularly in those countries where they face such high poverty rates. In order to answer this question we have compared the average risk of poverty for home leavers with their counterfactual, and we have observe a trend that would corroborate that youths, regardless the

poverty rates they face if they leave, tend to be rational: in those countries where youths who do not leave home would experience a higher poverty risk if they left than those who actually leave, the exit rates are really low, whereas in the Scandinavian countries this difference is negligible. This means that, even though those who leave home face a higher risk of poverty than those who do not, should the ones who stay actually leave they would experience even a higher poverty risk, so that it is rational to stay, and it is rational to leave: those who leave face a higher risk of poverty but, at the same time, are better sheltered from poverty than those who stay.

The economic incentives to stay at home or to leave home are less and less pronounced with age, to the point that in some southern countries, women over 30 would face a lower risk of poverty if they left their parents than if they stay, and by staying they may be showing a decision of supporting their parents, and not of being supported.

References

Aassve, A., S. Mazzucco and L. Mencarini (2004), Childbearing and Wellbeing: a comparative analysis of the European community, *Journal of European Social Policy* (*forthcoming*).

Aassve, A., Iacovou, M. and L. Mercarini (2005), youth poverty in Europe, what do we know? ISER working paper number 2/2005. University of Essex.

Bradbury, B. and M. Jantti (1999), Child Poverty Across Industrialized Nations, *Innocenti Occasional Papers Economic and Social Policy Series* no. 71, September 1999. UNICEF, Florence.

Becker, S, and Ichino, A. (2002) 'Estimation of average treatment effects based on propensity scores', *The STATA Journal*.

Berthoud, R. & K. Robson (2003) *Early Motherhood and Disadvantage: A Comparison Between Ethnic Groups* ISER working paper no. 2003-29, Colchester, Essex.

Boys, A., J. Marsden and J. Strang (2001). Understanding reasons for drug use amongst young people: a functional perspective. *Health Education Research*, Vol. 16, No. 4, 457-469, August 2001.

Caliendo, M. and S. Kopeinig (2005), some practical guidance for the implementation of propensity score matching. IZA working paper, number 1588.

Cantillon, B. and K. Van den Bosch (2003), Social Policy Strategies to Combat Income Poverty of Children and Families in Europe, *Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs working paper* no. 336 (January 2003), Syracuse University, New York.

Cantó-Sanchéz, O. and M. Mercader-Prats (1999), Poverty among children and youth in Spain: the role of parents and youth employment status. Document de Treball 99.07, Departament d'Economia Aplicada, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.

EUROSTAT (2002), *Income, Poverty and Social Exclusion: second report, European Social Statistics*, Luxembourg, pp. 76 – 92.

Heckman, J. J. and Ichimura, H., and Todd, P. E. (1997), 'Matching as an Econometric Evaluation Estimator: Evidence from Evaluating a Job Training Programme', *Review of Economic Studies*, 64:605-654

Heuberger, R. (2003) “What household gets what income?” Conference paper, EPUNET conference 2003, Essex, UK.

Iacovou, M. and R. Berthoud (2001) Young People’s Lives: A Map of Europe. Colchester: University of Essex, Institute for Social and Economic Research.

Leuven, E. and Sianesi, B. (2003), psmatch2, STATA module to perform full Mahalanobis and propensity score matching, common support graphing, and covariate imbalance testing, version 1.1.3 5sep2003.

Micklewright (2004) Child poverty in English-speaking countries LIS working paper no. 376, Syracuse University, New York.

Nicoletti, C. and Peracchi, F. (2002), *A cross-country comparison of survey non-participation in the ECHP*, ISER Working Paper.

Pavis, S., S. Platt and G. Hubbard (2000) *Young People in Scotland: Pathways to Social Inclusion and Exclusion* Joseph Rowntree Foundation 2000.

Peracchi, F. (2002), ‘The European Community Household Panel: A Review’, Empirical Economics, 27:63-90.

Rosenbaum, P.T. and Donald B. Rubin (1983) The Central Role of the Propensity

Score in Observational Studies for Causal Effects, *Biometrika*, 70(1): 41-55.

Rugg, J. (1999), *Young People, Housing and Social Policy* Routledge, London, 1999.

Russell, H. and P. O’Connell (2001), Getting a Job in Europe: the transition from unemployment to work among young people in nine European countries. *Work, Employment and Society* Vol. 15,No. 1, pp. 1–24.

Shucksmith, J. and J. Spratt (2002), Young people’s self identified health needs *HEBS Young People and Health Initiative Working Paper*, University of Aberdeen, 2002.

Smeeding, T. and K. Ross Phillips (2002) “Cross-National Differences in Employment and Economic Sufficiency” *Annals of the American Association of Political and Social Science*, no. 580, pp 103-133.

Smith, J. A. and Todd, P., "Does Matching Overcome Lalonde's Critique of Nonexperimental Estimators?" (November 2000). PIER Working Paper No. 01-035.

Table 1: Selection of the sample

	Proportion of young adults living with, at least, one parent			number of cases in the PSM estimations		
	20-24	**25-29**	**30-34**	**20-24**	**25-29**	**30-34**
Finland	**0.45**	0.11	0.07	**978**	265	159
Denmark	**0.45**	0.08	0.03	**514**	68	34
Netherlands	**0.54**	0.14	0.03	**1,329**	332	75
UK	**0.57**	0.23	0.08	**1,743**	645	264
Ireland	**0.87**	**0.54**	0.22	**3,419**	**1,481**	657
France	**0.70**	**0.27**	0.10	**3,747**	**1,224**	456
Germany	**0.74**	**0.34**	0.15	**3,384**	**1,502**	662
Austria	**0.72**	**0.39**	0.21	**2,050**	**1,176**	640
Belgium	**0.85**	0.37	0.12	**1,611**	560	169
Portugal	**0.88**	**0.60**	**0.28**	**5,546**	**2,912**	**1,473**
Spain	**0.93**	**0.68**	**0.37**	**7,246**	**4,335**	**2,000**
Italy	**0.93**	**0.68**	**0.35**	**7,914**	**5,760**	**2,679**
Greece	**0.82**	**0.58**	**0.28**	**3,897**	**2,838**	**1,384**

Source: ECHP (Eurostat) (1994-2001)

Table A1: Leaving home rates

	FIN	DK	NET	UK	IRE	FR	GER	AT	BEL	PT	ES	ITA	GRE
male	0.24	0.28	0.1	0.15	0.05	0.11	0.09	0.05	0.1	0.07	0.06	0.05	0.05
female	0.26	0.4	0.15	0.21	0.06	0.17	0.16	0.1	0.13	0.08	0.08	0.06	0.08
not single	0.17	0.54	0.26	0.29	0.19	0.34	0.3	0.1	0.32	0.14	0.13	0.17	0.09
single	0.25	0.31	0.12	0.17	0.06	0.13	0.11	0.07	0.11	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.06
not a student	0.23	0.32	0.11	0.17	0.06	0.15	0.13	0.07	0.15	0.09	0.08	0.07	0.06
student	0.29	0.32	0.13	0.17	0.04	0.1	0.09	0.09	0.05	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.06
in the LF or a student	0.27	0.33	0.14	0.19	0.06	0.14	0.12	0.07	0.12	0.08	0.06	0.06	0.06
out of the LF	0.2	0.28	0.07	0.13	0.06	0.12	0.09	0.03	0.08	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.05
ISCED 5-7	0.22	0.25	0.2	0.21	0.08	0.19	0.19	0.15	0.18	0.12	0.09	0.08	0.08
ISCED 3	0.28	0.39	0.15	0.18	0.05	0.13	0.12	0.07	0.1	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.05
ISCED 0-2	0.17	0.27	0.1	0.14	0.05	0.12	0.09	0.06	0.08	0.08	0.07	0.06	0.06
mother present	0.24	0.32	0.12	0.17	0.06	0.13	0.12	0.07	0.11	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.06
mother absent	0.31	0.29	0.12	0.22	0.07	0.15	0.08	0.09	0.12	0.11	0.1	0.08	0.09
working mother	0.22	0.32	0.11	0.16	0.06	0.13	0.12	0.07	0.11	0.08	0.07	0.06	0.06
not working mother	0.26	0.32	0.13	0.18	0.07	0.14	0.11	0.08	0.1	0.07	0.06	0.05	0.06
mother isced 3 or less	0.23	0.29	0.12	0.16	0.06	0.13	0.12	0.07	0.11	0.08	0.07	0.06	0.06
mother isced 5-7	0.32	0.43	0.15	0.21	0.08	0.16	0.11	0.07	0.1	0.03	0.06	0.04	0.08
not short of space	0.26	0.33	0.12	0.17	0.06	0.14	0.11	0.07	0.11	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.06
short of space	0.21	0.27	0.09	0.17	0.06	0.1	0.13	0.11	0.12	0.08	0.06	0.05	0.06
lowest quartile household income	0.22	0.28	0.1	0.18	0.07	0.11	0.11	0.06	0.11	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.05
highest quartile household income	0.27	0.44	0.18	0.23	0.06	0.17	0.13	0.08	0.14	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.07
lowest quartile wage income	0.23	0.36	0.1	0.2	0.05	0.08	0.08	0.06	0.04	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.05
highest quartile wage income	0.26	0.4	0.21	0.24	0.09	0.19	0.17	0.08	0.21	0.13	0.12	0.1	0.08

Source: ECHP (Eurostat) 1994-2001