Survey of Income and Program Participation

Residential Mobility of
One-Person Households

No. 8803 *50*

James Witte and Herbert Lahmann
German Institute for Economic Research

July 1988

PREFACE

The increase in the number of persons living alone and the patterns of
residential mobility among one-person households can only be understood
in light of the transitions between one-person and multi-person house-
holds. The likelihood of a change in dwelling or household composition
varies among one-person households, most obviously with the age of the
person living alone. This paper presents exploratory research on one-
person households, the processes leading to their formation and dis-
solution and the residential mobility associated with such households.
The analysis is based on panel data collected over a two year time period
in the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION

The current population of one-person households is made up of persons of different ages, at varying stages in their family careers. Young persons who have left the parental household but have not yet formed a family of their own are one significant component of the population of one-person households. Other persons living alone are somewhat older: persons who left the parental household some time ago and never formed a family of their own, as well as those who have only recently begun living alone. Some individuals in the latter group continued to live with their parents longer than most persons of their generation. Others are divorced, widowed or separated from their spouses, and still others began living alone after having lived with other relatives or non-related persons. The largest bloc of one-person households are elderly. Many of these persons only began to live alone recently, after long years of living with others, while a few have not lived with other persons since leaving the parental household long ago. The underlying premise of the research presented below is that the residential mobility of one-person households is inseparable from the processes by which such households are formed and dissolved at different stages in the lives of individuals.

Moverover, along with the different age related patterns of transitions between one-person households and multi-person households the economic forces of labor and housing markets also influence the character and frequency of residential mobility over the course of individuals' lives. Young persons, relatively free from family obligations, are ideal candidates for employment-related residential mobility. Once an individual has found a more or less stable position in the labor market, the decision to move is more likely to be a response to the cost and quality of housing. In later years several contradictory factors come into play. On the one hand, the individual, no longer bound by the responsibilities of employment, is free to move. In addition, financial considerations or physical impairment may force the person to find smaller quarters. On the other hand, the social ties to a particular place and dwelling, acccumulated during the preceeding years of relative immobility, may hold over into this phase of a person's life. In short, observable patterns of residential mobility are the joint product of economic and social forces that combine and interact in different ways at different phases of people's lives.

In part, our research concentrates on one-person households because the complex process of household mobility is simplified when the household consists of one person rather than many. More importantly, however, one-person households have assumed a critical role in the overall household structure at both the macro and micro levels. This can be seen in the increasing number of persons living alone. In the past twenty-five years the number of one-person households in the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) has more than doubled--from just over 4 million in 1961 to 8.8 million in 1985 (Statistisches Bundesamt 1987). The proportion of one-person households among all households in the FRG thereby increased from 20.6% in 1961 to 33.6% in 1985. In the United States (US) the number of one-person households rose even more dramatically from 6.9 million in 1960 to 20.6 million in 1985 and the proportion of one-person households among all households in the US increased from 13.1% in 1960 to 23.7% in 1985 (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1987a). This

means that in a quarter of a century the proportion of one-person households in the FRG increased by 63.1% and in the US by 80.9%; a vast change in living arrangements over a particularly short period of time. Similar rates of change can be found in other European and Scandinavian countries (Roussel 1983).

The increasing proportion of one-person households among all households is linked to concrete economic and technological developments--in particular the rising standard of living, the improved income and labor market position of women, and improved birth control techniques. At the same time there has been a shift in popular values, norms and ideals, which by no means are unrelated to changing economic circumstances. Independence, individual freedom and self-realization are the catchwords for these changes in contemporary culture's normative framework. Demographic analysis or econometric analysis based on aggregate data, or models built around how individuals have acted in the past are not sufficient to explain this change or to consider its consequances. The increasing proportion of one-person households can only be understood by considering the changing behavioral patterns of individuals.

This papee describes recent developments in the population of one-person households in the Federal Republic of Germany and the United States. In the following section the data used in the analysis is discussed and a framework for describing the coincidence of changes in household composition and residential mobility is introduced. Based on representative panel data on one-person households in the US and the FRG, the empirical part of the paper concentrates on those households which acquire additional members or change dwellings and the extent to which both types of change occur simultaneously. The formation of new one-person households is similarly discussed and the two processes are then examined in combination to consider how they interact to determine the aggregate number of one-person households in each of the two countries. Finally, methods to include the formation and dissolution of one-person households in models of residential mobility are discussed and exploratory results using a logit regression model are presented.

2 SOURCES OF DATA AND ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 The Analysis of Comparative Panel Data

Our research on one-person households is based on two sets of panel data: the German Sozio-okonomisches Panel (SOP) and the 1984 Panel from the Census Bureau's Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) (1). These panel studies are similar in many respects. This fact greatly aids comparative research, for there is always the risk that differences between two societies are confounded with differences in study design and research methodology. Perhaps the most important difference between the two studies is the shorter time period between SIPP waves, four months as opposed to the year-long interval between SOP waves. For some research questions, for example, the exact amount of program benefits received, more frequent interviews may well

----

(1) An overview of the SOP Panel may be found in Hanefeld (1984) and of SIPP in U.S. Bureau of the Census (1987b).

reduce recall error. However for something as salient as changes in household composition, the longer time span between SOP waves is of less significance. Owing to our concern for the mobility of one-person households it is more important that both panels use essentially the same following rules (2).

The following rules adopted by both SIPP and SOP have one particularly important implication for the study of one-person households. A dynamic approach is necessary to determine which households give rise to one-person households, as well as those that absorb persons who previously lived alone. Both panels share this advantage and yet bind it by the same restrictions: persons not selected in the original sample who subsequently enter the sample (because they enter a household with an adult member of the original sample) are no longer interviewed when they stop living with a member of the original sample. This means, by definition, that all persons in one-person households in both studies are members of the original sample. By limiting one's analysis to members of the original sample some of the more complicated problems rooted in panel data, in particular those related to missing data and weighting, are simplified.

Our analysis of German one-person households is based on the first three waves of the SOP, interviews that took place in the spring of 1984, 1985, and 1986. A one-person household is defined as one in which a person is found to be living alone on at least one of the interview dates. In this way a discrete time structure is imposed on a process that is essentially continuous; just because the interviews fall in a regular cycle does not mean that changes in household composition follow the same rhythm. As a result some information concerning the exact timing of changes in household composition is lost and short spells of living alone may go unobserved. As the purpose of this paper is primarily exploratory, the decision was made to sacrifice a measure of precision to simplify the problem. However, it should be emphasized that both panels date changes in household membership, as well as a number of other processes, more precisely. Later work can adopt a more accurate and realistic time structure.

Given a discrete time framework, the subsequent changes in household structure experienced by persons in a panel are considerably simplified. At each of the three points, an individual belongs to either a one-person or a multi-person household. Panel members in one-person households in 1984 (TI) fall into one of four categories in 1985 (T2): 1) those continuing to live alone, 2) those now living with other persons in a multi-person household, 3) those who have died, emigrated or moved into an institution and thus left the population, 4) and those who have left the panel (wave nonresponse), whereby their status regarding population membership is open. The same four possibilities exist between 1985 (T2) and 1986 (T3). Other panel members in multi-person households in 1984 (T1) or 1985 (T2) stopped living in multi-person households between 1984 and 1985 or between 1985 and 1986 and represent newly formed

----

(2) In a panel the following rules are just as important as the original sample design itself (Kalton and Lepkowski 1985). Based on theoretical concerns (such as the boundaries of the population of inference) and practical concerns (such as following mobile members of the original sample) they provide an ongoing definition of who will be interviewed and the population represented by the longitudinal sample.

one-person households. In this manner data is available for persons continually living in one-person households during this time period, as well as for persons who have begun to live alone and those who have begun living in households with other persons. Data concerning American one-person households from the 1984 SIPP Panel was then organized in a similar manner (3).

Weighting presents a problem for a longitudinal analysis of this type using the SIPP public-use cross-sectional files. The Census Bureau's recommendation is that the initial Wave 1 weights may be used if, as is the case here, the analysis is solely based on members of interviewed Wave 1 households. However, the Census Bureau also stresses that the weights do not account for sample attrition (Census Bureau 1987b). In the course of developing longitudinal weights for the SOP project it has become apparent that sample attrition is associated with changes in household composition and residential mobility and that their influence is particularly strong in the case of one-person households (Rendtel 1987). To compensate for this problem a simple strategy proposed by Little and David (1983) was adopted. All persons in one-person households at T1 but no longer in the panel at T2 were identified and the reasons for their departure from the panel were explored using the public-use cross-sectional files for the intervening time period. Persons who left the sample due to death, emigration or institutionalization were thus distinguished from cases of nonresponse.

The T1 weights of one-person households who remained in the panel at T2 were then weighted-up using an adjustment factor equal to the inverse of the response rate for one-persons households. Likewise persons in multi-person households at T1 who subsequently formed one person households, but then become nonrespondents by T2 were used to adjust the weights of persons who began to live alone after T1 and remained in the panel at T2. The same procedure was then performed to further adjust the weights to compensate for nonresponse between T2 and T3. The adjustment factors for the T2 and T3 time period also included those cases leaving the sample due to the 15% reduction in the SIPP sample that took place between T2 and T3. While a number of more sophisticated techniques have been developed (Little and David 1983; Kalton 1987; Rendtel 1988) these adjustment factors are adequate for the exploratory analysis presented here and produce estimates of the population of one-person households very close to cross-sectional estimates

----
(3) Three time points--September 1983 (T1), September 1984 (T2) and September 1985 (T3)--were selected. The public release cross-sectional files for the first eight panel waves were then read to identify persons who lived in one-person households at any time between T1 and T3. Based on the respondent's rotation group the appropriate waves and reference months were then used to determine the type of household to which individuals belonged at each of these time points. Cases where the entire interview was imputed for one or more of these time points were dropped, owing to the particular problems associated with imputed data in analyses of change. (Census Bureau, 1987b).

prepared by the Census Bureau using the SIPP data (4).

2.2 Residential Mobility and Changes in Household Composition

Panel studies are designed to measure change, but collecting individual
mobility data is never easy, even in the context of projects like SIPP and
SOP, where special efforts are made to follow mobile sample members. Some
of the problems are concrete questions of measurement and sample selection
and the related costs and benefits. In addition, complex analytical and
conceptual issues are unavoidable in the study of changes in household
composition, such as the question of the proper operationalization and
definition of households and the relationship of individuals to households
over time (McMillen and Herriot 1985; Duncan 1985). Residential mobility is
often a question of individual and not household mobility; yet it is affected
by the stability or instability of household composition. Changes in house-
hold composition alter housing needs and thus often lead to residential
mobility (5).

Figure 1 describes five different degrees of household mobility (A through
E) that may result from different combinations of residential mobility and
changes in household composition. Case A, immobility, is the simplest,
household composition remains unchanged and all persons remain the the same
dwelling. Case B, pure residential mobility, occurs when the household moves
to a different dwelling and there is no change in household composition.
Mobility of this type is typically rooted either in the households living
situation (in the dwelling or the neighborhood) or labor market factors,
whereby one or more members may be "pushed out" of an area due to poor labor
market conditions, and/or "pulled to" another area due to the prospects of a
better labor market position.

----

(4) For example, the monthly average of one-person households July to
September 1983 is given as 19.71 million (US Bureau of the Census 1984)
and for the same time period 1984 as 20.78 million (US Bureau of the
Census 1985) an increase of 5.4% in the number of one-person households.
The same rate of increase between 1984 and 1985 would yield 21.91 million
one-person households and increase of 11.2% over the two year period.
Our results for September 1983 yield 20.3 million one-person households
and for September 1985 22.6 million - an increase of 11.3%.

(5) These events need not be simultaneous: a time lag in either direction is
possible. The existing members of a household may move in anticipation
of a change in household composition or after the change has occurred.
Moverover, the perception of housing needs, as well as the possibility
to fulful perceived needs, are subject to the full gamut of social and
economic constraints and necessities.

Figure 1: Relatiuonships between Changes in Household Composition
and Residential Mobility

Case	Change in Household Composition	Residential Mobility Yes	No	Type of Mobility	Effect on one-person household
A	No change		X	Immobility	No change
B	No change	X		Pure residential	New dwelling
C1	Individuals enter household (including births)		X	Latent	Transition to multi-purpose household
C2	Individuals leave household (including death and emigration)		X	Latent	Dissolution
C3	Individuals enter and leave		X	Latent	Dissolution
D1	Individuals enter household (including births)	X		Complex	Transition to multi-person household
D2	Individuals leave household (including death and emigration)	X		Complex	Dissolution
D3	Individuals enter and leave	X		Complex	Dissolution
E	All individuals leave population	-	-	Household dissolution	Dissolution

Cases C1 through C3 result when there is a change in household composition--
the addition of new members and/or the loss of old members--whereby one or
more old members of the household remains in the dwelling. We refer to such
changes as latent mobility, since addition or loss of members often results
in changed housing needs but a move may not be desirable or possible at the
time. A move may subsequently follow or may have presiously occurred, if the
change in household composition was anticipated. Cases D1 through D3 involve
the same types of changes in household composition, but are coupled with
residential mobility and are referred to as complex mobility. Either the move
or the change may precipitate the other: larger or smaller quarters may be
found to adjust to the change in household composition. The move to smaller
quarters may force someone to leave the housheold; or a larger dwelling may
allow or necessitate the addition of household members. Empirically the
distinction between latent and complex mobility depends on how close together
a change in household composition and dwelling need to be in order to be
defined as simultaneous. For the analysis presented below a yearly cycle has
been chosen: complex mobility means that both household composition and
dwelling change between T1 and T2 or between T2 and T3. An important question
to consider is the extent to which cases of pure residential mobility are
lagged responses to or anticipations of changes in household composition.

The final type of mobility, <u>household dissolution</u> (Case E), occurs when all members of the household simultaneously leave the dwelling and are no longer part of the population. Theoretically household dissolution only occurs upon the death of all household members, but in empirical research the incidence of household dissolution is determined by the following rules and definition of the population of inference. In the SIPP and SOP studies household dissolution occurs through the institutionalization, emigration or death of all household members.

One-person households are an appropriate starting point for the study of the relationship between changes in household composition and residential mobility, because the different types of mobility are logically simplified. The possibilities C2, C3, D2 and D3 exist only for multi-person households; for with one-person households, household dissolution results when the one and only member leaves the household. The three types of latent mobility (C1, C2, and C3) and complex mobility (D1, D2, and D3) each reduce to a single form (when a person enters the household), the <u>transition to a multi-person household</u>. The household does not leave the population, but ceases to exist as a one-person household. As a case of latent mobility, the transition to a multi-person household means that the individual involved has remained at his or her old address and additional persons have joined the household. In the event of complex mobility either the individual has moved in with another person or persons, who remain at their old address, or both parties change addresses and together occupy a common dwelling at a new address.

In addition, the study of one-person households within a panel design touches on the important but difficult question of <u>household formation</u>. Household formation is inextricably tied to the processes described as latent and complex mobility. The departure of a household member from any type of household and the subsequent formation of a one-person household by this person is a case of the formation of a one-person household through complex mobility. A child leaving the parental dwelling to establish his or her own household is perhaps the most simple example of this type of complex mobility. The formation of a one-person household takes the form of latent mobility when all but one member of the household leave the dwelling. Those leaving the dwelling may form one or more one-person households of their own, while the individual remaining in the old dwelling defaults to a one-person household, as long as no additional persons occupy the dwelling.

3 EMPIRICAL RESULTS

3.1 Immobile One-Person Households

Previous research indicates a number of associations between living alone and patterns or clusters of socio-economic traits. The sex-specific difference in life expectancy and the lower average marriage age of women leaves a number of women alone at the end of married life in many industrial countries (Spiegel 1987). This pattern is further strengthened in the FRG due to the great number of women who were divorced or widowed during the war years, a time when the remarriage rates for women were much lower than today (Witte 1988). Table 1 presents univariate distributions for several socio-economic variables (age, sex, marital status, employment status, income and minority status) for immobile one-person households in the FRG and the US between 1983 and 1986. The immobile households, persons living alone for the entire observation

	Socio-economic Panel (SOP)						Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) - 1984 Panel					
	54 years and older		34 to 53 years		16 to 33 years		54 years and older		34 to 53 years		16 to 33 years	
	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male
	in percent						in percent					
Age (=100%)	60.7	10.1	8.2	7.7	7.1	6.2	53.4	14.8	8.7	10.4	5.6	7.1
Minority status 2)												
white (=100%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	55.1	14.6	8.4	9.7	5.5	6.7
non-w. (=100%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	41.5	16.2	11.1	15.1	6.3	9.8
Marital status 3)												
married, living apart	0.8	0.5	2.9	5.6	1.8	1.5	2.7	2.4	3.8	6.1	1.8	2.5
single	10.9	1.5	26.8	26.8	46.6	44.5	8.4	4.4	20.2	23.8	35.6	40.0
divorced	6.9	2.6	13.8	13.3	4.7	0.9	9.8	5.7	16.4	22.5	5.1	13.4
widowed	67.0	9.8	8.5	2.3	-	-	57.4	9.2	5.4	1.8	1.6	-
Employment status 3)												
employed	11.1	3.2	44.6	39.4	43.3	39.1	16.3	6.0	38.2	46.5	40.5	47.6
not employed	76.4	9.3	7.2	8.6	9.7	7.9	62.1	15.6	7.5	7.8	3.6	8.3
Income 3)												
lower tercile	31.7	2.7	6.2	8.1	19.9	11.3	34.9	6.4	10.7	10.5	6.3	13.1
middle tercile	34.0	3.8	12.3	9.0	15.5	13.5	30.3	7.7	12.6	7.4	17.7	11.9
upper tercile	19.9	7.9	33.2	31.2	18.5	21.3	13.1	7.6	22.4	36.4	20.1	30.9
Weighted population (thousands)	4,106		918		771		8,976		2,509		1,671	
Observed cases	417		119		125		1,545		414		274	

∞

1) That is, without changes in household composition or dwelling. 2) Alien residents in the FRG are excluded from this table. 3) Based on the start of the observation period.

The data is based on waves 1 - 3 of the SOP and on waves 1 - 8 of the 1984 SIPP panel public release files.

Table 1
Socio-economic Characteristics of One-Person Households
Immobile 1) Households T1 - T3

period without an address change, correspond to the typical image of elderly one-person households. Women 54 years of age and older make up over 60% of the immobile one-person households in the FRG and 53% in the US. If one considers male one-person households in this age group as well, approximately 70% of the total number of immobile one-person households in both countries are made up of persons 54 years of age or older. Characteristically these persons are not members of the labor force--14% of the German respondents were employed at the beginning of the observation period as compared to 22% of these American one-person households. Despite the lower employment rate in the FRG, older immobile one-person households in the FRG are relatively better-off than their American counterparts. Using terciles based on monthly income of all one-person households in each country, just about a third of all German but over 40% of American households in this age group fall into the lowest income group.

In the two younger age groups in both countries more than 80% of the persons in immobile one-person households are employed. The lowest employment quota is found among the youngest German one-person households of this type, which is presumably explained by the longer period of education in the FRG. Similarly while over half of the youngest American one-person households fall into the highest income category only 40% of Germans in this group have this level of income. On the other hand, among persons 34 to 53 years of age, 64% of Germans in immobile one-person households have incomes in the upper tercile as compared to 59% of the Americans.

Perhaps the most striking difference, however, between the immobile one-person households in the two younger age groups is to be found in their marital status. Over 90% of the persons in the youngest immobile one-person households in the FRG have never been married, as compared to 76% in the US. Correspondingly only 6% of the Germans in this group had been divorced, as compared to 18% of the Americans. Among those older than 34 and younger than 54 years of age, divorce is more common among persons in immobile one-person households in the FRG (27%). Nonetheless a far greater proportion of persons in this group in the US have been divorced (39%).

3.2 Pure Residential Mobility

Cases of pure residential mobility are a subset of those persons who lived alone for the entire observation period. Pure residential mobility occurs when persons move in the absence of a change of household composition. There is little difference between the US and the FRG in the proportion of cases of residential mobility to the total population of stable one-person households--12.5% in the FRG and 14.6% in the US. In both countries, as Table 2 shows, mobility of this type is clearly associated with age and gender. As a rule, moving from the oldest to the youngest age group the proportion of persons changing addresses increases, whereby within each age group men are more mobile than women. The gender-specific difference is weaker in the US, not only in the middle age group (where women are slightly more mobile than men), but also in the oldest and the youngest age categories. In the FRG the gender-specific difference declines, moving from the oldest to the youngest age groups, but even among one-person households younger than 34 men are still move likely to change addresses than women. Otherwise in the FRG, within the individual age groups, there is nothing in the socio-economic characteristics of those who move that sets them apart from the

	54 years and older	34 to 53 years	16 to 33 years	Total
FRG				
Total	7.2	13.7	31.9	12.5
Male	12.9	17.9	39.0	22.9
Female	6.2	9.4	24.2	8.5
US				
Total	8.2	14.4	38.0	14.6
Male	12.3	13.5	40.0	20.7
Female	6.9	15.5	35.2	11.3

Based on waves 1-3 of the SOP and waves 1-8 of the SIPP 1984 panel public release files. (FGR: n = 661, estimated weighted population = 6.1 million; US: n = 2,604, estimated weighted population = 14.4 million)

Table 2
Mobility of Stable One-Person Households According to Age
Percentage Moved in the Course of 2 Year Observation Period

immobile one-person households. Similarly in the US, apart from age and gender, the cases of pure residential mobility do not drastically differ from the immobile one-person households. In the youngest age group, stable one-person households who moved are less likely to be divorced and are less well-off financially than those who remained in the same dwelling during the observation period. These differences, however, can be traced back to an age difference between the two groups (6).

Extensive information regarding housing quality, satisfaction with housing and housing costs is an important element of the SOP data. The hypothesis that pure residential mobility of one-person households is connected principally with their housing situation may be more closely examined in the light of this data. To begin with, those who move are questioned regarding the reason for the move. Table 3 presents the reasons given by all household reference persons, regardless of household size, and compares these with the reasons given in the cases of pure residential mobility of one-person households. For the latter group the responses are further broken down according to age. Among all household reference persons the move to a new dwelling is most often (42%) related to housing concerns. A slightly greater proportion (45%) of the persons living alone attributed the move to such concerns--in particular the desire for a dwelling of the appropriate size, more comfort, a better location or rent, or the purchase

----

(6) The mean age among the movers is 36, two years younger than those remaining at the same address (T-value = 7.35 with 605 df). This difference fits with the results presented below and in section 3.6 where we find that in the youngest age group in the FRG, mobility is most common among those not yet settled into occupational careers.

of a house or condiminium. Among all households changing addresses, 12% of
the household reference persons described the move as occupation or employ-
ment related, as compard to 19% of the one-person households. Nearly one
third of all moves were described as family-related. However, as one would
expect, such reasons are far less common for stable one-person households
(13%). Presumably these persons moved to be closer to family members in
other households or the move was a lagged response to a change in household
composition that took place prior to the observation period. When one con-
siders the three age groups separately, the importance of occupational place-
ment for residential mobility among young persons becomes apparent. Housing
related reasons were named least commonly (39%) and occupational and employ-
ment related reasons most commonly (26%) among the youngest age group (6).

	Improvement of dwelling situation	Asked to leave by landlord	Employment related reasons	Family related reasons	Other
		in percent			
One-Person Households	45.4	5.5	18.8	13.1	17.2
Age					
≥ 54 years	41.5	4.2	9.9	12.6	31.8
53-34 years	67.1	9.4	14.7	7.9	.9
33-16 years	39.2	4.8	26.5	15.2	14.3
All Households	41.8	5.9	12.2	32.3	7.9

Based on waves 1-3 of the SOP (observed cases = 826 including 92 one-person
households)

Table 3
Reasons Given for Moving in the FRG
All Households Compared to Stable One-person Households

A difficulty with the design of this question is that it forces respondents
to name a single most important reason for the move and thereby obscures
the fact that a variety of factors may be involved. This becomes apparent
when one compares the characteristics of previous dwellings with those of
new dwellings (see Table 4). The housing situation of one-person households
in the youngest age group is generally improved through a move. Thus the
size of the dwelling and the number of rooms increased. The average rent
also increased considerably, whereby in most cases the increased rent is
deemed appropriate. Surprisingly the assessment of the need for renovation
of the building in which the dwelling is located indicates a decline in

----

(6) The mean age among the movers is 36, two years younger than those remaining
at the same address (T-value = 7.35 with 605 df). This difference fits with
the results presented below and in section 3.6 where we find that in the
youngest age group in the FRG, mobility is most common among those not yet
settled into occupational careers.

	In the event of pure residential mobility 1)						In the event of immobility 2)		
	1984			1986					
	≥ 54 years	34-53 years	16-33 years	≥ 54 years	34-53 years	16-33 years	≥ 54 years	34-53 years	16-33 years
			in percent					in percent	
Need for renovation of the building									
completely	1.2	0.7	4.2	1.5	0.9	4.4	3.2	1.1	1.1
somewhat	5.4	4.5	14.4	4.7	6.3	16.7	10.2	9.1	11.8
not at all	20.9	12.8	25.9	30.9	10.1	24.5	22.0	23.7	17.8
Facilities									
with bath, with central heating	27.7	9.8	31.3	35.6	13.2	33.3	51.0	13.3	10.5
with bath, without central heating	7.5	4.5	4.1	1.6	3.2	9.2	15.9	1.8	2.0
without bath, with central heating	2.2	2.4	1.3	-	-	0.6	1.3	0.5	0.5
without bath, without central heating	0.2	0.6	8.4	0.2	1.1	2.0	2.8	0.1	0.3
Number of rooms									
1	2.4	7.9	19.2	7.7	2.2	14.2	6.4	3.3	6.7
2	24.9	5.3	19.6	15.4	7.8	16.1	24.0	7.3	7.6
3	8.4	3.1	6.0	14.0	5.8	8.5	22.6	5.5	3.8
4 and more	2.2	0.6	0.4	1.4	1.6	5.3	10.0	2.0	0.8
Size of dwelling m^2									
0 - 40	6.0	10.0	24.4	8.7	0.9	16.7	7.5	2.0	5.1
41 - 60	13.8	6.0	13.3	15.0	5.4	16.8	29.1	6.8	5.7
61 - 80	11.6	0.7	3.0	12.1	7.9	5.0	20.3	3.2	1.7
81 and more	5.8	1.6	3.6	1.4	3.1	7.1	13.8	3.9	0.9
Rent. (DM)									
1 - 200	6.1	4.5	7.4	3.8	1.5	6.9	8.7	2.0	4.1
201 - 300	7.4	3.3	15.5	5.3	2.2	13.1	16.9	4.6	7.4
301 - 400	13.6	4.6	7.5	13.8	3.1	9.5	16.3	3.3	5.6
401 and more	10.8	5.5	13.8	11.6	10.5	18.7	14.5	9.3	7.3
Satisfaction with housing costs									
favourable	11.9	7.2	17.1	12.0	2.9	15.3	19.7	7.3	6.3
appropriate	11.6	6.0	13.3	12.8	13.8	24.7	33.2	5.7	7.4
too high	12.7	3.8	16.4	9.8	0.1	8.6	12.9	4.0	3.5
Satisfaction with housing									
very satisfied	20.3	5.2	20.9	28.4	18.3	31.6	60.8	12.5	9.1
satisfied	8.4	5.5	7.6	5.4	0.3	6.2	7.6	2.0	2.0
dissatisfied	7.1	7.6	17.4	3.1	-	6.7	2.2	1.6	2.2

The data is based on waves 1 - 3 of SOP. 1) Those who moved; observed cases n = 92 (estimated weighted population = 826 thousands). 2) Those who remained at the same address; observed cases n = 661 (estimated weighted population = 5,795 thousands).

Table 4
Change in Dwelling Characteristics of One-Person Households

12

housing quality, i.e., the proportion of respondents describing the building as in need of renovation increased after the move. This decline in more general indicators of housing quality (condition of the building, including heating and bath facilities) indicates that an improvement in housing quality is not the principal aim of residential mobility among persons in this age group.

On the other hand, persons in the oldest age group who moved and lived alone for the entire observation period thereby attained an improvement in their housing according to these general indicators of housing quality, 89% of these persons judged the buildings in which their new dwellings were located as not in need of renovation--as compared to only 69% of persons in the youngest age group. Likewise persons in the oldest age group improved the facilities of their dwellings as a result of moving. 95% of these persons had central heating and a bath or shower in their own dwellings, as compared to 74% of those in the youngest age group. Based on these measures of housing quality, persons in the youngest age group acquired dwellings with facilities comparable to the average for the FRG, while those in the oldest age group acquired better than average housing (7).

Over 75% of all stable older one-person households occupied dwellings with two or three rooms in addition to the kitchen and 20% lived in one-room apartments. Only half the youngest one-person households occupied dwellings with two or three rooms, while a third occupied one-room apartments. Among those who moved, those in the youngest age group tended to move to larger dwellings and those in the oldest to smaller dwellings. Economic considerations most likely played a role here; as those moving to smaller dwellings were primarily widows with low monthly incomes.

On the whole, persons in the oldest age group paid higher rents after moving than beforehand. Apparently for these persons a better-equipped dwelling was worth the price; the majority of those who moved judged their new rent to be appropriate. Surprisingly, however, the proportion of persons in this age group who judged their rent as "much too high" was not decreased through residential mobility. Presumably this is related to the supply of afforable smaller dwellings. Studies have shown that dissatisfaction with the rent for a dwelling is primarily a judgement of the rent in relation to available income (Lahmann 1988). Persons who find their rent to be "much too high" are concentrated in the lowest income category and among those persons not in the labor force. Also among the youngest age group the proportion of persons who judge their rent to be excessive is relatively high (9%) owing to the low incomes available to some of these households.

----

(7) In this context it should be mentioned that a well-equipped dwelling is a necessary prerequisite for the existence of a one-person household. These persons need a technically well-equipped and efficient dwelling to reduce the effort associated with housework and thereby acquire the time necessary for labor market and recreational activities.

Stable one-person households older than 33 and younger than 54 years of age are generally comprised of persons who have found their place on the labor market. Strick data confidentiality procedures preclude the use of the SOP data for research regarding the distances and places associated with residential mobility. However recent research using other data has shown that the rate of employment-related residential mobility is greatest between the ages of 20 and 24 and thereafter steadily decreases (Wagner 1987). Keeping in mind that the analysis here is limited to households without changes in household composition, one would expect that one-person households in this age group primarily move to improve their housing situation. More than 20% of the persons in this age group said the reason for their move was the purchase of a house or codominium. Moverover, 93% of the respondents in this group were satisfied with their housing after the move. The high level of satisfaction is also linked to an improvement in the housing quality (according to objective measures such as heating and bath facilities) as well as an increase in the average dwelling size. The average rent has increased as well, however it is generally viewed as an appropriate increase. Among the stable one-person households in this age group there is a clear difference in housing quality between those who move and those who remain in the same dwelling. Even though relatively high incomes are found among both groups those who move tend to occupy lower quality housing even after the move than those who remain in the same dwelling.

3.3 The Foundation of One-Person Households

The first distinction to consider by the formation of one-person households is whether or not the process is one of complex or latent mobility, that is, whether or not the person forming the household changes dwellings. Complex mobility is the more common type of formation of one-person households in both the FRG and the US. In the FRG 67% of the one-person households formed during the observation period involved complex mobility, as compared to 62% in the US (see Table 5). As with pure residential mobility among one-person households, the formation of one-person households through complex mobility most frequently involves persons in the youngest age group: in the FRG nearly 90% of the persons who formed one-person households in this manner were younger than 34, in the US 75% of these persons were in this age group. The formation of one-person households through latent rather than complex mobility is more common in the oldest age group--in the FRG and in the US nearly half (48%) of those persons who formed one-person households in this manner were older than 54 years of age.

The clearest difference between the FRG and the US is the greater proportion of one-person households formed by divorce in the US. The formation of one-person households through complex mobility among the youngest age group and the formation of one-person households through latent mobility in the oldest age group contain the largest number of cases and are most suited for a comparison between the two countries. In both instances the proportion of divorced persons is greater in the US than in the FRG.

	Complex Mobility Socio-economic Panel (SOP)			Latent Mobility			Complex Mobility Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) - 1984 Panel			Latent Mobility		
	≥ 54 years	34-53 years	16-33 years	≥ 54 years	34-53 years	16-33 years	≥ 54 years	34-53 years	16-33 years	≥ 54 years	34-53 years	16-33 years
	in percent						in percent					
Age (=100%)	2.3	8.3	89.4	48.8	32.0	19.2	7.2	17.4	75.4	48.7	22.7	28.6
Minority status												
white (=100%)							6.9	17.6	75.5	49.2	21.8	29.0
non-w. (=100%)							9.0	16.8	74.2	46.2	27.5	26.3
Sex												
male	12.1	70.0	55.0	33.6	77.5	54.2	50.2	70.9	60.7	29.9	50.9	65.2
female	87.9	30.0	45.0	66.4	22.5	45.8	49.8	29.1	39.3	70.1	49.1	34.8
Marital status 2)												
married, living apart	12.1	68.5	4.9	-	24.1	20.2	25.0	40.4	12.9	13.3	19.1	17.7
single	-	-	87.4	-	24.4	75.6	8.0	11.1	75.0	6.2	16.1	61.1
divorced	23.7	28.3	7.6	1.5	50.3	4.2	15.3	44.9	11.9	12.0	52.9	19.6
widowed	64.2	3.2	-	98.5	1.2	-	51.7	3.6	0.2	68.5	11.9	1.6
Employment status 2)												
employed	34.4	100.0	69.5	16.2	63.6	95.7	37.3	83.5	73.7	29.3	76.2	86.4
not employed	65.6	-	30.5	83.8	36.4	4.3	62.7	16.5	26.3	70.7	23.8	13.6
Income 2)												
lower tercile	64.2	26.2	43.4	29.9	29.6	37.6	46.1	38.5	35.7	34.9	30.5	37.9
middle tercile	35.8	16.6	26.8	23.4	43.9	21.1	33.4	18.4	33.3	40.3	24.6	20.8
upper tercile	-	57.2	29.8	46.7	26.5	41.3	20.4	43.1	31.0	24.8	44.9	41.4
Weighted population (thousands)	35	129	1,378	370	243	145	365	888	3,840	1,528	712	897
Observed cases	6	17	133	47	25	26	76	192	799	352	165	194

15

1) Formation is the transition from a multi-person household to a one-person household. This transition is considered complex mobility when it occurs in conjunction with a change in address and latent mobility when the person remains at the same address. 2) Marital status after the change in household composition is used. Income and employment status are based on the start of the observation. Alien residents in the FRG are excluded from this table.

The data is based on waves 1 - 3 of the SOP and on waves 1 - 8 of the SIPP panel public release files.

Table 5
Socio-economic Characteristics of One-Person Households
Household Formation 1)

The social processes commonly leading to the formation of one-person house-
holds--children leaving the parental household, divorce and death of a
spouse--vary in their relative importance between the FRG and the US.
This may be seen by considering the type of household individuals lived in
prior to the formation of a one-person household and changes in marital
status that accompany the transition from a multi-person to a one-person
household (see Table 6). Over 40% of the one-person households formed in
the FRG between 1984 and 1986 were established by children leaving the
parental household. In the US this process accounts for only a quarter
of all new one-person households. Death of a spouse also plays a more
important role in the formation of one-person households in the FRG than in
the US--widows and widowers made up 15% of the new one-person households
in the FRG as compared to 10% in the US.

In the US, on the other hand, divorce, separation and the dissolution of
households comprised of two unrelated persons were more frequently associated
with the formation of one-person households than in the FRG. The departure
of a distant relative of the head of household (a person other than the
child or spouse of the head of household) accounts for only 5% of the newly
formed one-person households in the FRG. In the US, however, 21% of the
one-person households were formed by a more distant relative of the head of
household. Some of these cases may involve the departure of children brought
into the household by the current partner of the head of household. This
would account for some of the differences between the US and the FRG in the
proportion of one-person households created by children leaving the parental
household. However, only 32% of these "distant relatives" were under the
age of 34 as compared to 92% of children who left the parental household.
Finally, a larger proportion of the one-person household in the FRG (17%)
were formed by persons leaving households that contained more than one other
unrelated person than in the US (7%). The proportion of one-person house-
holds formed by each of these processes and the manner in which this varies
between the FRG and the US clarifies which processes are more or less import-
ant for the formation of one-person households in each country. One should
also consider the significance of the newly formed one-person households
in relation to the number of one-person households existing at the start
of the observation period. The final two columns of Table 6 presents the
estimated number of households formed in this manner as a percentage of
the total estimated number of oneperson households at the start of the
observation period. Taking all of these processes together, total number
of one-person households formed in the FRG during the observation period
equals 30% of the number at the start of the observation period, while in
the US this proportion amounts to over 40%. While the number of one-person
households in each country grew considerably during this time period, the
rate of growth was by no means this high and was, in fact, greater in the
FRG than in the US. However, the increasing number of one-person households
is not simply a function of the formation of one-person households. To
understand this process one must consider the dissolution of one-person
households and transitions to multi-person households as well.

3.4 The Transition to a Multi-Person Household

At this point it is important to recall the distinction made above between
the transition of one-person households into multi-person households and
household dissolution, when all members of the households leave the population.

The socio-economic characteristics of persons in the FRG and the US who stopped living alone and formed a household with other persons are presented in Table 7. In the case of complex mobility transitions to multi-person households predominantly involve persons in the youngest age category in both countries. In the event of latent mobility, whereby a one-person household stays at the same address but becomes a multi-person household, in both countries a greater proportion of persons in the two older age groups are involved. In the US over 30% of the individuals who stopped living alone and remained at the same address were over the age of 53.

As with the formation of one-person households, the transition to multi-person households may occur through one of several distinguishable social processes. A person living alone may marry, a period of marital separation may end, a child may return to the parental household, or a person may begin living with other unrelated persons. In Table 8 four processes leading to the transition to a multi-person household are described and for each country the proportion of changed one-person households attributable to each is presented. The individuals marital status before and after the transition, as well as the individual's relationship to the head of household and other members of the household were used to categorize the observed transition of one-person households.

In both countries approximately one-third of all instances of transition to a multi-person household took place through marriage or the end of a period of marital separation. In the US, 36% of the transitions to multi-person households involved the individual forming a household with relatives other than his or her spouse, whereby over one-third of these involved children returning to the parental household (8). In the FRG the proportion of one-person households dissolved through the formation of a multi-person household with relatives other than one's spouse is only half as large. The principle process leading to the transition to a multi-person household in the FRG was the formation of a two person household with a person (not necessarily of the other sex) not related by blood or marriage--45% of all transitions to multi-person households. In more than 75% of these cases the persons described their relationship as an unmarried couple ("Lebensgemeinschaft"). Changes of this type were less often associated with the transition to a multi-person household in the US (25%). In both countries the number of persons living alone who subsequently formed a household with more than one other unrelated individual only plays a minor role.

----

(8) It may be assumed that an even greater proportion of these cases involved the return of a child to the parental household, that is, when the one-person household being observed was the parent and the new household member was the child. Unfortunately the data sets used for this analysis were not structured so as to easily identify changes in this type.

Process leading to the formation of a one-person household	One-person households formed during the observation period		Weighted number of households formed relative to weighted total of one-person households at the start of the observation period 4)	
	FRG	US	FRG	US
			in percent	
Child leaving parental household 1)	41.0	24.7	12.2	10.0
Separation or divorce	12.2	17.9	3.6	7.2
Death of spouse	14.9	9.8	4.4	3.9
Person leaving household containing two unrelated persons	10.0	19.4	3.0	7.8
Person leaving household with related family members 2)	5.1	21.5	1.5	8.7
Person leaving household with more than two unrelated persons 3)	16.8	6.8	5.0	2.7
Total	100.0	100.0	29.7	40.3
Observed cases	296	1,778		

1) Only when one-person household formed by the child. Cases where a child moves out and a remaining single parent thus becomes a one-person household are treated as "Person leaving household with related family members". 2) The person leaving is related to one or more persons who remain, but is not the child or spouse of the head of household. 3) The person leaving is related to no one in the household though they may be related to one another. 4) The total number of weighted households formed is slightly, less here than in Table 9 due to 5 % of the cases in the FRG and 1% in the US where the process leading to formation could not be precisely identified.

The data is based on waves 1 - 3 of the SOP and waves 1 - 8 of the 1984 SIPP panel public release files.

Table 6
Processes Leading to the Formation of One-Person Households in the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) and the United States (US)

	Socio-economic Panel (SOP)						Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) - 1984 Panel					
	Complex Mobility			Latent Mobility			Complex Mobility			Latent Mobility		
	≥ 54 years	34-53 years	16-33 years	≥ 54 years	34-53 years	16-33 years	≥ 54 years	34-53 years	16-33 years	≥ 54 years	34-53 years	16-33 years
			in percent						in percent			
Age (=100%)	-	18.9	81.1	14.7	22.3	63.0	11.5	16.3	72.2	30.2	29.8	40.0
Minority status												
white (=100%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	11.3	16.5	72.2	30.4	27.7	41.9
non-w. (=100%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	12.8	14.9	72.3	28.7	41.1	30.2
Sex												
male	-	75.7	50.3	31.2	42.2	42.4	32.3	58.2	57.6	24.6	56.3	68.2
female	-	24.3	49.7	68.8	57.8	57.6	67.7	41.8	42.4	75.4	43.7	31.8
Marital status 2)												
married, living together	-	49.6	27.6	4.8	20.2	43.2	19.7	35.7	31.4	16.3	39.7	47.6
married, living apart	-	-	1.4	-	4.2	-	4.7	5.8	3.6	5.3	10.6	0.5
single	-	9.6	69.0	10.9	19.1	52.7	3.6	9.3	56.9	5.0	8.5	43.7
divorced	-	20.7	2.0	-	41.3	4.1	10.5	43.6	8.3	14.6	36.9	8.2
widowed		20.1	-	84.2	15.1	-	61.5	5.8	-	58.8	4.4	-
Employment status 2)												
employed	-	100.0	96.3	5.9	100.0	73.8	25.2	85.5	80.8	37.5	84.5	89.2
not employed	-	-	3.7	49.1	-	26.2	74.8	14.5	19.2	62.5	15.5	10.8
Income 2)												
lower tercile	-	-	28.2	10.9	16.5	33.9	46.0	33.3	34.2	34.8	29.4	18.3
middle tercile	-	30.0	21.3	53.2	4.2	26.2	40.0	21.9	30.3	44.1	21.9	33.9
upper tercile	-	70.0	50.5	35.9	79.3	39.9	14.0	44.8	35.5	21.1	48.7	47.8
Weighted population (thousands)	-	64	277	62	94	267	355	504	2,238	548	542	733
Observed cases	-	12	41	9	15	39	63	100	407	111	100	138

1) This transition is considered complex mobility when it occurs in conjunction with a change in address and latent mobility when the person remains at the same address. 2) Marital status after the change in household composition is used. Income and employment status are based on the start of the observation. Alien residents in the FRG are excluded from this table.

The data is based on waves 1 - 3 of the SOP and on waves 1 - 8 of the SIPP panel public release files.

Table 7
Socio-economic Characteristics of One-Person Households
Transition to a Multi-Person Household 1)

Table 8 also describes the importance of each of these processes of transition to multi-person households relative to the number of one-person households at the start of the observation period. Viewed from this perspective, each of these types of transition is relatively more important in the US than in the FRG. Taken as a whole, the weighted estimate of the number of one-person household is dissolved do to the transition from a one-person to a multi-person household equal to 24% of the weighted estimate of one-person households in the US at the start of the observation period. This proportion is considerably smaller in the FRG, amounting to just over 10% of the total number of one-person households in 1984.

Finally, one must consider persons living alone who left the population during the observation period. Death and institutionalization are the most common causes of household dissolution and, as one would expect, household dissolution occurs most frequently in the oldest age group in both countries. For the purposes at hand, household dissolution is most important as a further component of the aggregate number of one-person households. In this regard household dissolution is of relatively equal importance in the two countries: the weighted estimate of the number of one-person households leaving the population in the FRG amounts to 6%, and in the US 5%, of the weighted estimate of the total number of one-person households at the start of the observation period.

Process leading to the transition to a multi-person household	One-person households changed during the observation period		Weighted number of households changed 2) relative to weighted total of one-person households at the start of the observation period	
	FRG	US	FRG	US
	in percent			
Marriage or end of marital separation	32.4	32.5	3.5	7.9
Formation of household with other family members 3)	17.7	35.8	1.9	8.6
Formation of household with one unrelated person	45.5	25.4	4.9	6.1
Formation of household with more than one unrelated person	4.4	6.3	0.0	1.5
Total	100.0	100.0	10.3	24.1
Observed cases	142	919		

1) Includes only cases of dissolution of one-person households, when the individual forms a household with other persons and not the dissolution of the entire household, i.e., where a person living alone leaves the population through emigration, institutionalization or death. 2) The total number of weighted households dissolved is far lower here than in Table 9, which includes cases of household dissolution. 3) None of whom is the spouse of the person previously living alone.

The data is based on waves 1 - 3 of the SOP and waves 1 - 8 of the 1984 SIPP panel public release files.

Table 8
Processes Leading to the Transition to a Multi-Person Household in the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) and the United States (US)

3.5 The Individual Components of Aggregate Change in the Number of One-Person Households

Using the results presented above it is possible to describe the manner in which the growth in the number of one-person households has taken place in the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany (see Table 9). The increasing number of one-person households can be decomposed into various components: an existing stock of one-person households, minus those one-person households dissolved through death, emigration, institutionalization or transition to a multi-person household, plus newly formed one-person households.

	FRG	**US**
One-Person Households T1	7,891	20,344
New One-Person Households Between T1 and T3	+ 2,464	+ 8,230
Dissolution of One-Person Households Between T1 and T3*	- 1,361	- 6,007
One Person Households T3	8,994	22,567
Percentage newly formed T1 - T3 relative to T1	+31.2	+40.5
Percentage dissolved T1 - T3 relative to T1	-17.2	-29.5
Growth in number of One-person Households T3 relative to T1	+13.9	+10.9

* includes persons leaving the population and transitions to multi-person households.

Table 9
Changes in the Population of One-Person Households in the Federal Republic of Germany and the United States

In the FRG the original stock of 7.9 million one-person households in 1984 grew to 8.9 million in 1986. This is the end result of processes of household formation, dissolution and transformation involving a far greater number of households. Nearly 2.5 million new one-person households were formed during this time, while an additional 1.4 million were dissolved: the persons living in these households either began living with other persons or left the population.

The 14% growth in the number of one-person households during this time period in the Federal Republic of Germany did not simply result from the formation of thirteen new one-person households for each hundred already existing. Instead for each hundred existing one-person households thirty new one-person households were formed, while seventeen, some of which were just formed within this time period, were dissolved.

In the US the growth in the number of one-person households between 1983 and 1985 was somewhat slower (11%), but the circulation of individuals within the population of one-person households was relatively higher. The number of new one-person households formed during this period (8.2 million) amounts to over 40% of the total number of one-person households at the start of the time period. However the larger number of newly formed one-person households in the US did not produce a greater growth in the number of one-person households than in the FRG, as the number of one-person households dissolved during this time period was also relatively higher in the US. The proportion of one-person households leaving the population was roughly the same in both countries relative to the number of one-person households at the start of the observation period, 5% in the US and 6% in the FRG. However, the number of one-person households that became multi-person households relative to the number of one-person households at the outset is much greater, 24% in the US and 10% in the FRG.

3.6 Modelling Residential Mobility of One-Person Households in the FRG

A wide variety of techniques have been used to develop models of residential mobility (see Rima and van Wissen 1987, for an overview of models developed in a number of countries). A crucial element of all such models are estimates of the transition rates between states--such as married/not married, same dwelling/new dwelling or living with parents/not living with parents. Even the most sophisticated model is limited by the accuracy with which these transition rates are estimated. The previous descriptive analysis of one-person households in the US and the FRG imply two general considerations that are necessary for an adequate estimate of these transition rates for one-person households. First, the model must address changes in household composition, for these are often associated with a change in dwellings. Secondly, one-person households constitute a heterogeneous population; a model of residential mobility must explicitly accomodate this variety. One-person households vary, most obviously with the age of the person living alone, as to the frequency of changes in household composition and dwelling. One-person households also differ as to the circumstances under which a person began living alone and the likelihood that the person will later begin living with other persons. Finally, they vary in the fit between the current dwelling and the individual along with his or her prospects for continuing to live alone.

The statistical techniques often referred to in the social sciences as event-history analysis seem especially appropriate for the analysis of residential mobility because these models explicitly address the duration spent in a particular state, such as the occupancy of a particular dwelling, and the influence of variables associated with leaving a state. An application of this class of models to the question of residential mobility in the FRG can be found in Wagner (1987). This study illustrates not only the strength of these methods but also the problems associated with this approach for the residential mobility of one-person households. Wagner's study is based on retrospective life history data, including migration and marital histories. As such it concentrates on changes in family status and dwellings as reported by a representative sample of selected birth cohorts--persons all born before 1952. However when one considers that the most mobile one-person households belong to the group of persons aged 33 to 16 in 1984, i.e., born

in 1951 or later, it becomes apparent that a particularly salient part of the current population of one-person households is excluded from this data.

The SOP and SIPP data include event-history data, such as marital and fertility histories, for all respondents; but this data, too, is inadequate. The crucial problem is that the formation of one-person households and the transition to multi-person households often fail to coincide with the catalogue of events included in these event-histories. Marriage accounts, for example, for only about one-third of the transitions to multi-person households in the FRG and the US. Periods of living with an unrelated person play a crucial role in the formation and dissolution of one-person households in both countries, yet such changes in household composition constitute non-events in the retrospective components of these data sets. Retrospective data of this sort is a rich supplement to a traditional panel design, nonetheless it does not provide the information necessary for the study of spells of living alone prior to the start of the observation period. Even if one confines the analysis to one-person households existing at the start of the panel, the problem of left-censoring (the inability to accurately date the formation of one-person households already existing at T1) poses a serious problem for the application of event-history techniques (9).

Analyses of this sort for the FRG will first be possible when a sufficient number of spells of living alone have begun during the course of the SOP. Owing to its larger sample size, analyses of this sort may be possible with the SIPP data, though the panel's design allows only for the analysis of very short periods of living alone. On the other hand, for the analysis of one-person households in the US, the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID) represents a valuable supplement to SIPP, as this panel can provide data on very long spells of living alone. An example of the use of proportional and nonproportional hazard rate models to evaluate the importance of mortgage rates on household mobility using data from the PSID is found in Quigley (1987).

For these reasons another approach was needed to explore our hypothesis that the determinants of residential mobility of one-person households vary according to the type of one-person household under consideration. For this analysis we restricted our sample to persons living alone at the start of the panel and defined the outcome of interest as a dichotomy: moved in the next two years/remained at the same address. Rima and van Wissen (1987) use a logit regression model as one component of their "dynamic household relocation model" for the city of Amsterdam. They derive coefficients for measures of change in household composition and characteristics of the dwelling as predictors of a households "willingness-to-move." They use a different outcome variable (willingness to move/unwilling to move) than ours (moved/remained at the same address), because only cross-sectional data was available. However, those households that had moved in the year prior to the interview were coded as willing to move (regardless of their stated

----

(9) Even under the most herioc of assumptions the retrospective data available in the SOP data provides insufficient information to adequately date the formation of a sizeable portion (13%) of the one-person households existing at the start of the panel.

preference at the time of the interview), "...because then the effect of household, changes in the past year on the willingness to move is measured more precisely." As independent variables they used: age of the head of household, household size at time t, change of household size between time t and time t+1 dwelling size (number of rooms), tenure status of the dwelling (owner/renter) and dwelling type in the SOP data provides (apartment/single family unit). They describe their results as fitting the data well and capturing most of the variance in the dependent variable. All of their coefficients were "significantly different from zero" and have the expected sign, except for their indicator of changes in household structure (an increase in household size). Due to the similarity in the dependent variables and the inclusion of household size among the independent variables and the inclusion of household size among the independent variables, this model appears as a reasonable base model for considering residential mobility among one-person households using the SOP data (10).

Results for a model including the main effects for three independent variables are presented in column 1 of Table 10. The relatively large size and negative sign of the coefficient for the constant reflects the general lack of residential mobility found among one-person households. The positive coefficients for a change in household composition and a small number of rooms in a dwelling indicate that these factors are associated with a change of address, while the negative coefficients attached to persons in large dwellings and in the two oldest age categories indicate a greater likelihood that these persons will remain at the same address. The overall fit of the model is very good. In fact the fit is so good that at the .05 level of significance one can not reject the hypothesis that the expected logits produced by the model are different than those associated with a fully saturated model, a model including all possible interactions between the independent variables.

The normal strategy pursued in the case of a logit model that fits so well is to consider if any of the parameters in the model can be eliminated without a significant decrease in the overall fit of the model. The difference between two models can be tested by subtracting the L^2 values for the two models. The resulting sum is distributed approximately as a chi-square value with df equal to the difference in df's between the two models (Knoke and Burke, 1980). Columns 2 through 4 in Table 10 present the results obtained when each of the independent variables is eliminated from the model. In no case is the resulting increase in the number of degrees of freedom sufficient compensation for the increase in the L^2 ratio to justify excluding a parameter from the original model.

----

(10) We have eliminated two of the variables used by Rima and van Wissen from our model because in the case of one-person households they are so closely correlated with other independent variables: owners are almost exclusively found in the oldest age group, while all single family units fall into the largest category of dwellings occupied by one-person households. Adding these variables does nothing to enhance the model and simply multiplies the number of cells containing few observations.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Constant	-.758	-.928	-.629	-.704
	(.082)	(.072)	(.068)	(.078)
Change from one-person household to multi-person household	.307	-	.245	.493
	(.072)	-	(.068)	(.066)
Number of rooms in dwelling				
1-2	.306	.231	-	.394
	(.082)	(.077)	-	(.079)
3	-.039	-.081	-	-.084
	(.096)	(.093)	-	(.093)
Age				
older than 53	-.362	-.441	-.412	-
	(.072)	(.068)	(.070)	-
34 - 53	-.074	-.073	-.071	-
	(.080)	(.079)	(.079)	-
Likelihood ratio chi-square	5.319	23.297	20.929	54.574
df	12	13	14	14
Difference relative to model 1	-	17.978*	15.610*	49.255*
Chi-square df	-	1	2	2

Based on Waves 1 - 3 of the SOP. N = 997. * indicates a difference from model 1 significant at the .001 level. (standard errors)

Table 10
Logit Models with Dependent Variable: Moved/Remained at Same Address
One-Person Households of All Ages in the FRG

Based on our descriptive analysis of one-person households and the variety of types of persons living alone, it appears somewhat implausible that such a model, despite its good statistical properties, is an adequate representation of the process of residential mobility for one-person households. It seems quite likely that this model fits well for the entire population of one-person households but is inadequate for particular subgroups of this population. To consider this possibility the age group categories used above present a rough but simple categorization of one-person households. Considerable heterogeneity remains within each age group. A more precise analysis would call for theoretically more interesting categories and a more sophisticated and efficient organization of the data regarding the timing of changes. The intent here is not to produce a single, "best" model for each of these age groups. Rather, we hope to demonstrate that by treating subpopulations separately the underlying social processes may be more realistically portrayed.

The results presented in Table 11 use different combinations of variables for each age group to estimate the logits for residential mobility (11). These models do not fit the observed data as well as the previous model. On the other hand, the overall fit of these models (the probability that deviations as large as those observed would occur if the model were the true model) is within the range normally regarded as a good fit. Moreover taking away any of the variables in the models leads to a significantly worse fit, while the fit may be improved only by adding interaction terms that do not lend themselves to meaningful interpretation.

As presented in Table 11, however, the models suggest a number of interpretable results concerning the patterns of residential mobility among one-person households in each age group. To begin with, the decreasing absolute value of the constant term as one goes from the oldest to the youngest age group represents the successively increasing proportion of mobile persons. The transition from a one-person households to a multi-person household, though common in the population at hand, is relatively rare in the oldest age group and among members of our sample was never associated with residential mobility. Thus there is nothing to be gained by including this type of change in household composition in the model for the oldest age group. In the two younger age groups, on the other hand, the transition to a multi-person household is clearly positively related to residential mobility. To consider the possibility that mobility among the older group of persons could represent the lagged response to a change in household composition prior to the start of the observation period, a dummy variable was constructed indicating persons known to have been widowed or divorced in the previous three years. However, there was no clear cut relationship between this variable and residential mobility and it was not included in the model.

The coefficients for the number of rooms in the dwelling at T1 are a good example of the contrast between the age groups. In the two youngest age groups a small dwelling is positively associated with residential mobility. As discussed above, in the younger age groups residential mobility is in the direction of larger dwellings and in the oldest age group toward smaller dwellings. Accordingly, in the oldest age group we find a negative coefficient for persons in the smallest dwellings (these persons have already attained the desired dwelling size) and a positive coefficient for persons in the next largest size dwelling. This is the group of persons moving into smaller quarter. The coefficient for three-room dwellings is negative, as is the coefficient for the variable indicating older one-person households living in one or two family houses as opposed to multi-unit buildings. Presumably persons in the largest of dwellings are relatively immobile because they have the financial resources to continue to occupy such a dwelling. The inclusion of monthly household income in the model failed to capture this relationship, but this is a poor measure of financial resources for persons

----

(11) The number of rooms occupied at the start of the observation period is the only variable common to all models and in each case this variable is coded somewhat differently: for the oldest age group we distinguish between 1 room, 2 room, 3 room and 4 room, or larger (omitted category) dwellings; and for the youngest age group between 2 room or smaller and 3 room or larger (omitted category) dwellings. For the middle age group between 1 room and 2 room or larger (omitted category) dwellings.

in this age group. A variable for whether the dwelling was owned or rented also failed to improve the model, primarily because in this age group nearly all property owners are owners of large dwellings and thus this variable is redundant. Substituting property ownership for either or both indicators of dwelling size only decreases the overall fit of the model.

For persons in the youngest age group we added a variable to consider our hypothesis that mobility among the youngest one-person households is concentrated among those persons who have not yet settled into occupational life. As expected we found a positive relationship between residential mobility and a dummy variable indicating that a person was still in school or occupational training at the start of the observation period. Moreover the overall fit for our model for persons in the youngest age group only became tolerable when we added an interaction term representing persons still in school or occupational training at T1 and living in 2 room or smaller dwellings. Here one can conclude that the relationship with residential mobility decreases when a person has already acquired a more desirable dwelling (in this age group more desirable means larger and not smaller as is the case with older persons) before completing his or her education.

	(1)	(2)	(3)
Age in Years	≥ 54	53 - 34	33 - 16
Constant	-1.516 (.132)	-.642 (.149)	-.206 (.100)
Change from one-person household to multi-person household	-	.435 (.142)	.293 (.087)
Number of rooms in dwelling			
1	-.149 (.254)	.207 (.129)	-
2	.437 (.142)	-	.207 (.102)
3	-.067 (.170)	-	-
1 or 2 family house	-.133 (.102)	-.010 (.132)	-
In school or vocational training at T1	-	-	.077 (.098)
In school or vocational training and in dwelling with $\leq$ 2 rooms at T1	-	-	.179 (.099)
Likelihood ratio chi-square	1.788	2.483	1.394
df	3	4	3
Probability	.618	.648	.707

Based on waves 1-3 of the SOP. n = 997   (standard errors)

Table 11
Logit Models with Dependent Variable: Moved/Remained at Same Address
Separate Model for Each Age Group

4 CONCLUSIONS

The findings presented above demonstrate how the growth in the number of one-person households can be interpreted by examining the social processes that are the constituent elements of this growth. In this context the comparison between the FRG and the US is particularly instructive. In the time period considered relatively more new one-person households were formed in the US than in the FRG. However the increase in the number of one-person households was relatively greater in the FRG than in the US, because relatively more one-person households were being dissolved in the US. Previous research using panel data has emphasized an important point in conjunction with the study of unemployment and poverty: the proportion of persons in a given state depends both on the rate at which people enter and leave the state. This principle also applies to type of households and stages of family life.

Typically one thinks of a young one-person household as a temporary living arrangement between the parental household and the formation of a household with a partner or spouse. However, our finding show that a great number of one-person households are formed, particulary in the United States, through the dissolution of a marriage or partnership. Sociologists of the family have described changing patterns of living-together, marriage, divorce and remarriage as "serial monogamy". The research presented above indicates that one-person households often serve as a stepping stone in the transition from one partnership to the next. On the other hand, the transition from a one-person household to a multi-person household often does not lead to the formation of a partnership but to a reintegration in the parental household. Our results indicate that this trend, noted by others in the US (Heer, Hodge and Felson 1985), is of far less importance in the FRG. The majority of transitions to multi-person households in the FRG lead to the formation of a household with a partner--more often without than with a marriage certificate.

The description of residential mobility among one-person households illustrates an important aspect of the process of residential mobility in general. In the course of their lives persons in the US change dwellings on the average far more frequently than those in the FRG, where the average person thirty years of age or younger has moved three times and those between thirty and sixty-five only four times. Greater residential mobility and more frequent changes in household composition and family status are not independent of one another, for these events in fact often accompany one another. The low rate of residential mobility among young one-person households without changes in household composition in the US provides strong support for this argument. In the absence of changes in household composition housing concerns and, for the youngest of persons, occupational placement are the most important determinants of residential mobility.

As the final section of the paper emphasizes, different types of one-person households exhibit different patterns of residential mobility. While we found no relationship between the transition to a multi-person household and residential mobility in the oldest age group, in the two younger age groups a change in household composition was positively associated with a change in household composition exhibited by different types of households is necessary to improve the accuracy of models of residential mobility. To the extent

that housing and labor market policies are aimed at the allocation of persons to specific areas the housing needs of young one-person households, the most mobile type of household, are worthy of special attention. Obviously this implies a sufficient number of adequate and affordable dwellings in the appropriate locations. Less obviously, however, attention must also be paid to the future housing needs of such persons; for many of these persons living alone is only a temporary situation, followed by marriage or the formation of a household with an unrelated person. Nothing is gained if persons are successfully attracted to an area, but they are then forced to move elsewhere because they are unable to find appropriate housing for a multi-person household.

The findings presented above, in part, rest on a relatively small number of observations. However they provide the foundation for more exact models of changes of household composition involving one-person households and the related processes of residential mobility. Fortunately the SIPP and SOP panel projects are such that these preliminary results may be built upon and research in this direction may be continued. The topical modules in the 1984 SIPP panel concerning migration and marital history promise a wealth of additional data. The ongoing nature of the SOP panel--data from the fourth wave will soon be available and the fifth wave is currently being collected--will alleviate some of the sample size problems associated with the study of changes in household composition in the FRG. Over the course of the panel, cases of the formation of one-person households and the transition from one-person households to multi-person households accumulate. Assuming that the processes involved have themselves not changed, observations from different points in time may be combined allowing for more detailed analysis. Finally, we hope our work will encourage others to undertake comparative panel research. Individual-oriented longitudinal data such as that offered by SIPP and SOP, and the software and hardware necessary to work with such data, have only recently become available. By drawing attention to the similarities and differences between processes in more than one society, a comparative approach can be a great aid in making sense of the wealth of information offered by data of this type.

REFERENCES

DUNCAN, Greg J. (1985), "A Framework for Tracking Family Relationships Over Time", Journal of Economic and Social Measurement, 13, 237-244.

HANEFELD, Ute (1984), "The German Socio-Economic Panel", 1984 Proceedings of the Social Statistics Section, Washington, DC, 117-123.

HEER, David M., HODGE, Robert W. and FELSON Marcus (1985), "The Cluttered Nest: Evidence that Young Adults are More Likely to Live at Home Now than in the Recent Past", Sociology and Social Research, 436-441.

HUGHES, James W. (1980), "Demographic and Economic Change: Implications for Mobility", 59-78 in CLARK, W.A.V., and MOORE, ERIC G. (eds.), Residential Mobility and Public Policy, Beverly Hills, London: SAGE Publications.

KALTON, Graham, and LEPKOWSKI, James (1985), "Following Rules in SIPP", Journal of Economic and Social Measurement, 13, 319-330.

KALTON, Graham (1985), "Handling Wave Nonresponse in Longitudinal Surveys, unpublished manuscript, University of Michigan.

KNOKE, David, and BURKE, Peter J. (1980), Log-Linear Models, Beverly Hills: SAGE Publications.

LAHMANN, Herbert (1988), "Wohnen", forthcoming in H.J. KRUPP and JUERGEN SCHUPP (eds.), Lebenslagen im Wandel: Daten 1987, Frankfurt/New York: Campus Verlag.

LITTLE, R., and DAVID, M. (1983), "Weighting Adjustments for Non-response in Panel Surveys", Bureau of the Census Working Paper.

McMILLEN, David B. and HERRIOT, Roger (1985), "Toward a Longitudianl Definition of Households", Journal of Economic and Social Measurement, 13, 349-360.

QUIGLEY, John M. (1987), "Interest Rate Variations, Mortgage Prepayments and Household Mobility", The Review of Economics and Statistics, 53, 636-643.

RENDTEL, Ulrich (1987), "Methodische Konzepte fuer die Hochrechnung von Panel-Daten", Vierteljahrshefte zur Wirtschaftsforschung, Heft 4.

RIMA, Annemarie, and van WISSEN, L.J.G. (1987), A Dynamic Model of Household Relocation, Amsterdam: Free University Press.

ROUSSEL, Louis (1983), "Les menages d'une personne: l'evolution recente", Population, 38, 995-1016.

SPIEGEL, Erika (1986), Neue Haushaltstypen, Frankfurt/New York: Campus Verlag.

STATISTISCHES BUNDESAMT (1987), Fachserie 1: Bevoelkerung und Erwerbstaetigkeit, Reihe 3: Haushalte und Familien 1985, Stuttgart, Mainz: Kohlhammer.

U.S. BUREAU OF THE CENSUS (1984), Current Population Reports, Series P-70, No. 1, "Economic Characteristics of Households in the United States: Third Quarter 1983", Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. BUREAU OF THE CENSUS (1985), Current Population Reports, Series P-70, No. 5, "Economic Characteristics of Households in the United States: Third Quarter 1984", Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. BUREAU OF THE CENSUS (1987a), Statistical Abstract of the United States 1987, Washington, DC: U.S Government Printing Office.

U.S. BUREAU OF THE CENSUS (1987b), Survey of Income and Program Participation User's Guide, Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

WAGNER, Michael (1987), "Raeumliche Mobilitaet im Lebensverlauf", forthcoming PhD-Dissertation at the Free University of Berlin.

WITTE, James (1988), "Haushalt und Familie", forthcoming in H.J. KRUPP and JUERGEN SCHUPP (eds.), Lebenslagen im Wandel: Daten 1987, Frankfurt/ New York: Campus Verlag.