Contemporary Adolescents: Understanding the Demographic, Social and Economic Changes Shaping Adolescent Life

Report to the Committee on the Neurobiological and Socio-Behavioral Science of Adolescent Development and Its Applications

Monica Kirkpatrick Johnson
Washington State University
October 1, 2018

I. Introduction

This report provides a demographic portrait of adolescence in the United States, a portrait situated within recent and projected population trends, and it examines the major societal changes that are shaping adolescents' lives. In doing so, it considers how adolescents' lives today compare to that of cohorts of adolescents over the past several decades. Where possible, patterns and changes in adolescents' lives are compared across ages, racial/ethnic groups, immigration status, socioeconomic status, gender, gender expression, and sexual orientation. Across the board, information is less available for smaller racial/ethnic minority groups including Asians and Native Americans, as is information on gender expression and sexual orientation.

For the purposes of this report, adolescence is considered to encompass ages 10-26, consistent with the expansion of this socially constructed stage of the life course (Johnson 2015). Both due to data availability and applicability of indicators to various ages (e.g., voting restricted to those over 18), however, the discussion will at times focus on subsets of adolescents by age. Occasionally data is reported for the child population (17 and under) which both overlaps with the focus age for this report and for which trends apparent for children are those for adolescents, lagged by a few years. Where possible, both static and over-time measures are employed. For example, adolescents' family structures can be captured at a moment in time, but also through the number of partner transitions of parents that have accumulated during adolescents' lives.

More broadly, the data available on adolescents' characteristics, environments and behaviors come from piecing together information from a wide range of sources including, the multiple data collection efforts of the Census Bureau, those from state and local government mandatory reporting requirements, national and geographically targeted surveys of adolescents and their families, and surveys of agencies and institutions that serve adolescents (e.g., homeless shelters, colleges and universities). Many sources of data focus on particular topics or an interrelated set of topics and do not contain the range of information desirable to complete this portrait all on their own. Where there is overlap, measurement often differs. Thus, it is through amalgamation that adolescents' lives in changing times are characterized.

II. Current Demographics, Recent Change, and Future Projections

Age, Gender, Nativity, and Race/Ethnicity

According to the Census Bureau, there were approximately 73.5 million adolescents age 10-26 in 2017, representing 22.6% of the U.S. population (U.S. Census Bureau 2018b). Although females outnumber males at older ages, males in this age range constitute a very slight majority (51%) (U.S. Census Bureau

2018b). In the 2010 Census, 56% of 10-24 year olds were non-Hispanic white, 21% were Hispanic (of any race), 14.5% were black or African American, 4.6% were Asian, 2.6% reported two or more races, and less than 1% each were American Indian/Alaskan Native and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (U.S. Census Bureau 2018a). Just over 90% of adolescents are native born; the remainder are a mix of naturalized citizens and both documented and undocumented immigrant non-citizens (U.S. Census Bureau 2012). Over one quarter of children in the United States had at least one foreign-born parent in 2014; 22% were second generation, that is, native born but with at least one foreign-born parent (Child Trends 2014).

Both the size and the composition of the adolescent population have been, and are projected to continue, changing. While in raw numbers the size of the adolescent population has grown recently, it is declining slightly as a proportion of population (U.S. Census Bureau 2018b) and based on a projected continued decline in fertility as well as the continued aging of the population, this trend is likely to continue for several more decades (Colby & Ortman 2014). Immigration is projected to slow a little as well, though the percent foreign-born is expected to rise, albeit more slowly than it has been in recent years (Colby & Ortman 2014). The composition of the population overall, as well as among adolescents, has also become more racially/ethnically diverse; the U.S. population as a whole is expected to become minority majority (i.e. over half belonging to a category other than non-Hispanic white alone) by 2044 (Colby & Ortman 2014). As this is expected to occur more quickly for children under 18, by 2020, the cross-over for the adolescent population ages 10-26 should follow fairly quickly.

Socioeconomic Status

For most adolescents, socioeconomic status is best captured by considering their family's socioeconomic status. Poverty rates for families have been dropping in recent years following the Great Recession, and was 10.3% in 2017 (Fontenot, Semega & Kollar 2018). With the exception of the years in and immediately after the Great Recession (with the poverty rate for families peaking at 13.2% in 2010), along with the recessions of the early 1980s and 1990s (in which poverty rates also peaked over 13%), the percent of families in poverty has hovered between approximately 9.5-11% for decades. Looking further back, poverty rates for families in the late 1950s and early 1960s exceeded 20% and fell substantially in the 1960s and the War on Poverty (Fontenot, Semega & Kollar 2018). Poverty rates vary substantially across racial/ethnic groups, with 6.3% of non-Hispanic white families, 7.7% of Asian families, 16.9% of Hispanic families and 19.0% of black families living below the poverty line in 2017. Single mother families have especially high rates of poverty, at almost 28%; one-third of black and Hispanic single mother families were in poverty in 2017. Finally, although poverty rates are not typically reported specifically for the 10-26 year old population, child (18 and under) poverty rates are routinely compared to adult (18-64) and older adult (65+) groups, and since the early 1980s children have had the highest poverty rates by a substantial margin. In 2017, 17.5% of children lived in poverty, 11.2% of adults, and 9.2% of older adults lived in poverty (Fontenot, Semega & Kollar 2018).

Median household income (in constant dollars) rose from the late 1960s until the late 1990s, but has had periods of plateau and decline since (Fontenot, Semega & Kollar 2018). Median household incomes are vastly different by family structure, with single mother families having the least income and married couple families in which the wife participates in the labor force having the most; median incomes also vary by the race/ethnicity of the householder, with Asians reporting the highest median incomes at over twice the median income reported by the lowest group, blacks (U.S. Census Bureau 2018c).

Another key indicator of family socioeconomic status is the education level achieved by parents. As noted later in this report, education levels have become a stronger factor in both familial and economic outcomes over the past several decades. A long-running survey of high school seniors administered annually since 1976, the Monitoring the Future Study (MTF), provides one window into the education levels of parents of contemporary adolescents (2012, with adolescents largely born in 1994) as well previous cohorts (back to 1976, with adolescents largely born in 1958). At the lowest levels, 23.3% of mothers of the 1976 senior class did not finish high school, and that has dropped to 11.9% of mothers in the 2012 class. At the higher end, the percent of mothers who earned college degrees or higher rose from 16.5% to 40.4% across these two senior year cohorts (Bachman, Johnston & O'Malley 1980, 2014). For fathers, the percent not completing high school dropped from 27.3% to 14.7%; the percent of fathers earning college degrees or more rose from 22.3% to 35.2%. Racial differences are evident, but narrowed over the period. Just over 46% of white mothers of the 2012 senior year cohort completed college or more whereas about 37% of black mothers did; comparable figures for white and black fathers are 41 and 24% (Bachman, Johnston & O'Malley 1980, 2014). If postsecondary enrollment trends (detailed in a later section) continue, adolescents are likely to have more educated parents on average in the future, although family patterns diverging by education level (detailed in the next section) will also shape the distribution of adolescents across families with greater and lesser educational credentials. In addition, while poverty rates and income in the future will depend on both the health of the economy and social policy, there is a clear trend of rising income inequality in the United States for the past four decades (Fontenot, Semega & Kollar 2018).

Gender Expression and Sexual Orientation

Data on gender expression and sexual orientation have not been systematically collected at the national level until recently, and even now it is not commonplace. Recent estimates based on the Center for Disease Control's Behavior Risk Factor Surveillance System indicate 0.7% of 13-24 year old adolescents identify as transgender. While the study of gender nonconforming youth is growing, scholars face measurement challenges (Wiley et al. 2010) and most data collections are small and limited in geographical reach.

Multiple indicators are used to measure sexual orientation, including indicators of sexual identity, sexual attraction, and sexual contact. The overlap in these indicators is far from complete (Kann et al. 2016). For example, not all adolescents reporting sexual attraction to someone of the same sex or who identify as gay/lesbian report having same-sex sexual experiences; not all those reporting same-sex sexual contact identify as gay, lesbian, or bisexual.

In the mid-1990s, data from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health (Add Health) indicated that among 7^{th}-12^{th} graders, 7.4% of boys and 5.3% of girls reported same-sex romantic attractions; boys and girls reports of exclusively same-sex attractions was lower, at .7% and 1.5% respectively (Russell et al 2001). Rates were higher at older grade levels, as reports of no attractions (neither same-sex nor opposite-sex) are more frequent among younger adolescents. 2015 data from the national Youth Risk Behavior Surveys of 9^{th}-12^{th} graders indicate 2% of both male and female adolescents report their sexual identity as gay or lesbian; 2.4% of males and 9.8% of females identify as bisexual (Kann et al. 2016). More males than females (93.1% vs. 84.5%) identify as heterosexual (Kann et al. 2016). Among males, 53.3% report sexual contact only with females, 1.3% only with males, 1.9% with both males and females, and almost half, 43.6% report having had no sexual contact. For females,

42.6% report having sexual contact only with males, 2.1% only with females, 7.4% both males and females, and again nearly half report not having had sexual contact (47.9%) (Kann et al. 2016).

At older ages, analysis from a later data collection of Add Health (when participants were 18-24), indicated 5.5% of males and 12.6% of females having been sexually attracted to someone of the same sex; 12.9% of females and 4.4% of males identified as bisexual/fluid and .6% of females and 1.3% of males identified as homosexual (Wilkinson & Pearson 2013). Data from the 2011-2013 National Surveys of Family Growth (NSFG), indicate that among this same age group (18-24), 19.4% of women and 6.6% of men reported having had at least some same-sex sexual contact (Copen, Chandra, Febo-Vazquez 2016). 22.5% of women and 10.1% of men reported being sexually attracted to people of the same sex (Copen, Chandra, Febo-Vazquez 2016). Within these groups, men were more likely to report being attracted only to other men (2.5%) than women were to only other women (1.0%).

Across age, females are more heavily represented than males among sexual minorities, particularly in identifying as bisexual or having sexual contact with both males and females. In addition, the percent identifying specifically as gay is higher than specifically lesbian (Russell et al 2001; Copen, Chandra, Febo-Vazquez 2016; Kann et al. 2016).

Without systematic data collection over a longer period of time, it is difficult to document historical changes in patterns of gender expression and sexual orientation. At the same time, growing social acceptance of LGBTQ individuals and relationships (e.g., Powell et al., 2010) would make it reasonable to surmise that adolescents are more likely to report these once highly disapproved of feelings and behaviors on surveys when they are occurring. In addition, it may also enable more young people to behave more freely, increasing the likelihood of sexual and romantic relationships among people of the same sex, and enabling more adolescents to "come out" overall and perhaps at earlier ages. Consistent with this, the percent of adults identifying as transgender is smaller than the percent of adolescents 13-17 and 18-24 doing so (Herman et al. 2017). Similarly, the NSFG data show lower rates of ever having same-sex sexual contact among 35-44 year olds than among adolescents, despite having lived longer and so having more time to have had such experiences. Women and men reporting only opposite-sex attractions also increase across age categories as well (Copen, Chandra, Febo-Vazquez 2016), illustrating a likely pattern of cohort change.

III. Social Changes Affecting Adolescents

Parenting and parent-child relationships

Adolescents' lives have been shaped in important ways by major social changes, including fundamental shifts in families, major technological advances, and changes in the economy, labor market and schooling. This section addresses changes in families, both those in which adolescents are reared and those they form, whereas the next section address work and education. Technological changes impacting adolescents are noted in both. Despite this approach, it is important to recognize these changes are interrelated, as for example, changes in family structure and dynamics are impacted by economic and social resources available to parents, which shift and are distributed differently over time.

Families have changed in both their relationships and compositional structure. Beginning with relationships, family scholars describe the rise of "intensive parenting" in recent decades, an ideology in which childrearing practices are "child-centered, expert-guided, emotionally absorbing, labor-intensive, and financially expensive" (Hays 1996:8). Time use studies tracking the hours parents spend with

children are consistent with this trend; although mothers' time with children initially dipped with their widespread entry into the labor force, it has risen since and now exceeds 1960s' levels (Bianchi, Robinson & Milkie 2006). Married fathers are spending more time with children as well, and both mothers and fathers have specifically increased their time in interactive activities, which include playtime, helping and teaching children, and talking with and reading to children (Bianchi, Robinson & Milkie 2006). Lareau (2003) similarly examines parenting approaches and describes an intensive approach she calls "concerted cultivation," involving the deliberate development of cognitive and social skills through adult-sponsored and supervised activities, often tailored to children's unique interests and talents, intervention in institutions to ensure children's needs are met, and extensive use of reasoning and negotiation in verbal interaction. Lareau's analysis documented a clear social class distinction, with working class and poor families following a logic of "accomplishment of natural growth" instead, and many families do not have the resources to support an intensive parenting approach. Within social class, however, she found great similarity across black and white families.

Adolescents generally report positive and close relationships with their parent(s). For example, based on a multiple item scale tapping adolescents' reports of how often they have fun with their family had fun together, how often they felt understood in their family, how much they wanted to leave, and how much attention their family paid to them, Cavanagh (2008) reports relatively high family connectedness (mean of 3.5 on a 0 to 4 scale); reports of feeling close to parents are high as well (mean of 3.83 on a 0 to 4 scale). Analysis of the National Survey of Children's Health in 2011-2012 finds that two-thirds of parents of adolescents age 12-17 say they can talk to their teen about important issues, with responses varying only slightly by age and racial/ethnic group (Sacks et al. 2014). Only a quarter report knowing only some or none of their teen's friends, though this rate is higher among families below or near poverty (Sacks et al. 2014). Tenth graders themselves report overwhelmingly (90%) in the MTF study that their parents know where they are after school (Sacks et al. 2014). More females than males, more non-Hispanic whites than blacks or Hispanics, and those with two parents are more likely to say their parents know where they are (Sacks et al. 2014). Parental monitoring, like other aspects of parenting, have been shaped by the availability of technology including GPS tracking, home drug tests, and blocking/filtering software for phones and other online capable devices (Nelson 2010).

There is both continuity and change in parent-child relations as children move through adolescence and into adulthood. Shanahan, McHale, Osgood and Crouter (2007) modeled parent child-conflict across 12 years and found that conflict increased as children moved into adolescence, but only for first-born children, suggesting some amount of adjustment for parents after their experience with the first child. Aquilino's (1997) analysis tracking relationships between the teen years (12-18) and late adolescence/early adulthood (18-24) showed modest overall continuity, with higher overtime correlations in closeness and control-conflict compared to shared activities and support of the child. Studies do often show increasing warmth as children make the transition to adulthood (Fingerman et al. 2012).

There is evidence that relationships between parents and children 18 and older have been changing in key ways that reflect both the availability of new technologies (e.g. cell phones and social media) and parenting approaches. Fingerman and colleagues' (2012) analysis of the American Changing Lives Survey found that parents with children aged 18-24 reporting contact more than once per week rose from 51.9% in 1986 to 56.7% in 1994. In her Family Exchanges Study, in 2008, 51.2% of 18-24 year olds reported in-person contact with their parents at least a few times a week, and 62.1% reported talking by

phone at least that often. Students and those from higher socioeconomic status families reported less in-person contact, though students report higher phone contact with parents than did those not in school. Changes in technology have facilitated contact between parents and their college-going children.

Co-residence during these years has also become more common in recent decades, and some scholars argue this is facilitated by changing parent-child relations (Settersten & Ray 2010; Newman 2012). The proportion of 18-24 year olds living with parents dropped dramatically during the 1940s and 1950s only to see rates rise again, slowly; by 2015 rates had largely returned to 1940 levels (Payne 2012, 2016). Over half (56%) of 18-24 year olds in 2015 lived with their parents. Living with parents at these ages is more common for males, those without a bachelor's degree, and second generation immigrants (i.e. native born with immigrant parents); racial/ethnic differences are minimal for this age group, but emerge for those 25 and older (Payne 2012; Fry 2013).

Parental financial support to 18-26 year olds has risen too, at least since the mid-1970s (; Schoeni & Ross 2005; Sage & Johnson 2012; Wightman et al. 2013). There is a strong age pattern for parental financial assistance, with less support provided with advancing age, but the proportion of adolescents reporting that at least some of their support comes from parents has risen at all ages between 19-28; the proportion reporting high levels of support (61% or more of their total support) from parents has risen among 19-22 year olds specifically (Wightman et al. 2013). Levels of financial assistance are strongly patterned by parental socioeconomic status and by the social roles of the young person, including whether they are attending school, are working, have married, and/or have had children; indeed the historical rise in support is explained fully by compositional changes among young people across these social roles (Schoeni & Ross 2005; Wightman et al. 2013).

Family Structure

Turning now to the compositional structure of families, great changes occurred in the latter half of the 20th Century, though at least some key indicators showed more stability in the last decade (Crosnoe & Cavanagh 2010; Manning, Brown & Stykes 2014; Eickmeyer 2017). 60% of children in the 2016 Current Population Survey lived with their two biological married parents, and another 3% lived with two biological cohabiting parents. 9% lived in stepfamilies and 24% lived with a single parent (Eickmeyer 2017). With the marriage rate stabilizing over the past decade, and the divorce rate at a 40 year low, rates of children living in these various family structures may show relative stability into the near future.

These rates portray families in static terms, even as they are tracked over historical periods. An analysis of data from the Survey of Income and Program Participation by the Census Bureau, following children over at least 12, and up to 40, months, found that 18.2% of children experienced at least one family structure transition (exit or entrance of a parent or parent's cohabiting partner) during the period (Laughlin 2014). The percent of children experiencing such a transition differed by family income levels, with the highest rates among those in families falling below the poverty line and the lowest rates among those at 300% or more of the poverty line; black and Hispanic children were also somewhat more likely to experience a family structure transition than were non-Hispanic white children (Laughlin 2014). Cavanagh's (2008) analysis of the family structure histories of 7th-12th graders in the Add Health sample found just over 63% had never experienced a change in family structure. 18% had experienced one change in family structure, 13% experienced two changes, and 5% experienced three or more transitions. Analyzing trends in the number of family structure transitions children experience

cumulatively through age 12, Brown, Stykes and Manning (2016) find little change for non-Hispanic whites and Hispanics between 1995 and 2010, but a rise for black children. This was driven largely by an increase in the percent who experienced any transition in family structure rather than a rise in the number of children experiencing numerous transitions. Black children had the lowest rate of experiencing no family structure transitions from birth to age 12 (Stykes, personal communication).

One ongoing change is the rise in the percent of children living with grandparents. Of children living with grandparents, 80% also have a parent living in the household (Livingston 2013). Even in cases in which the child is cared for primarily by a grandparent, a majority of children also have one or more parents present in the household (Livingston 2013). The likelihood of being cared for primarily by a grandparent is higher for children living in households at or near the poverty level; it is also considerably higher for black children (8%) compared to Hispanic (4%), non-Hispanic white (3%) or Asian (2%) children (39). Family composition and living arrangements for children are also diversifying with the growth of interracial marriage and same-sex marriage.

Adolescents' own Family Formation

Adolescents experiences of forming their own families are changing as well, with marriage (but not necessarily cohabiting unions) and children occurring at older ages. The percent of women aged 20-24 who had ever married dropped from 85% to 46% between 1976 and 2014; it dropped from 75% to 32% among men over the same period (Vespa 2017). After falling during the first half of the 20th Century, the median age of marriage has risen steadily to new historic highs. A majority of first unions are now cohabiting unions and not marriage however, and the median age of first unions has been quite steady over the past several decades (Manning, Brown, & Payne 2014). Examining trends from 1984-2010 for blacks, Hispanics and non-Hispanic whites, Manning, Brown and Payne (2014) report the median age of first marriage has risen in similar ways for all three groups over these decades; the ages of first cohabitation and first union have been similarly steady across groups.

Adolescents are waiting longer to become parents. The teen birth rate, at 26 births per 1,000 women aged 15-19 in 2013, was the lowest it had been in decades; the birthrate among young women aged 20-24 declined to a historic low of 80.4 births per 1,000 women (Guttmacher Institute 2017). The median age at first birth for women was 26.7 in 2015 and has been on the rise for decades (Eickmeyer et al. 2017). Young men enter parenthood on average about 3 years later than do women (Eickmeyer 2016).

Both the timing and rates of fertility vary by socioeconomic background and race/ethnicity. Teen birth rates are higher for black and Hispanic adolescents than they are for non-Hispanic whites and Asians, though rates have fallen across groups (Livingston & Cohn 2010; Wildsmith et al. 2013). Teen birth rates are higher for girls whose mothers have lower levels of education and for those who live in less advantaged neighborhoods (Wildsmith et al. 2013). Births to women in their younger twenties are disproportionately among those from lower socioeconomic status families, disadvantaged minority groups or with lower education levels themselves (Sandefur, Eggerling-Boeck & Park 2005; Osgood et al. 2005; Livingston & Cohn 2010; Martinez et al. 2012). Based on data from 2006-2010, Martinez and colleagues (2012) report that among women aged 20-24, almost 29% of black women, 27% of Hispanic women, and 13% of non-Hispanic white women had ever had a biological child; for men across these groups the percentages who had ever had a biological child were 15%, 16%, and 6% respectively.

Despite delays in both marriage and parenthood, there has been a rise in the share of young people who have children before their first marriage, although a substantial proportion are cohabiting at the time of the birth (Cherlin 2010; Vespa 2017). Nonmarital fertility is closely tied to age and education level. Approximately 94% of births to women 15-19 years old were nonmarital and 78% of those to women 20-24 years old were nonmarital (Martinez et al. 2012). Nonmarital fertility is much higher among men and women with lower levels of education (Martinez et al. 2012).

One of the main themes of change, both in adolescents' families of origin and the ones they are forming, is of "diverging destinies" by educational attainment (McLanahan 2004). As those with higher levels of education are waiting to marry until older ages, but having higher eventual marriage rates, as marriages are increasingly likely to be homogamous by education level, as divorce rates have risen primarily among the lesser educated, and as trends in nonmarital childbearing become more distinct across education groups, children's experiences are increasingly distinguished by their parents' education levels in ways that compound advantage and disadvantage (Cherlin 2010). Their own route to family formation, including the timing and sequencing of marriage and parenthood is then also strongly patterned by their own educational pathways (Sandefur, Eggerling-Boeck & Park 2005; Cherlin 2010). These trends have important implications for the reproduction of advantage across generations and the levels of inequality among adolescents now and into the future.

IV. Economic and Educational Changes Affecting Adolescents

It is hard to overstate the economic changes the U.S. and other countries have undergone since the mid-1970s. Most scholars point to technological advances and globalization, with production and labor moving more freely across borders, as key sources for these changes, which have also been accompanied by a decline in union membership, a rise in temporary and contingent labor, a shift from manufacturing jobs to those in the service and knowledge sectors, and higher returns to cognitive, technical and managerial skills (Goldin & Katz 2008; Cocoran & Matsudaira 2009; Danzinger & Ratner 2010). These changes, in combination with certain policy approaches (e.g., taxation policy; the eroding value of the minimum wage) have led to rising inequality in the U.S. (Morris & Western 1999; Danzinger & Ratner 2010; Fontenot, Semega & Kollar, 2018). Workers with the lowest education levels, those with a high school degree or less, have seen the worst losses, and the greatest gains have been to the most educated and top share of earners (Lemieux 2006; Danzinger & Ratner 2010). Young workers in the U.S. and around the world have been particularly vulnerable during these changes, and have been hardest hit by recessions, including the Great Recession of 2007-2009, in which rates of unemployment underemployment, and precarious work all rose (Bell & Blanchflower 2011; ILO, 2013, 2015). Among the young, those with the lowest education levels faced the highest unemployment and poverty rates (Smeeding et al. 2012; NCES 2015). This section describes the trends and patterns in adolescents' work and educational pursuits amidst these changes.

Employment

Beginning with employment during the high school years, studies indicate that employment during the school year has been declining in recent decades (Smith 2011; Staff et al. 2014; Johnson et al. 2016). Whereas earlier in history most teenagers who were employed were not simultaneously enrolled in school, studies in the 1980s and 1990s concluded that almost all students were employed at some point during the school year (U.S. Department of Labor 2000; Entwisle, Alexander, & Olson 2000). This is no longer the case. Looking specifically at 16-17 year olds, Smith (2011) reports drops in employment

during each major recession since the 1980s, with rates that never fully rebound during non-recessionary years. Analysis of students in the MTF surveys from the 1990s on also indicates an ongoing decline in school-year employment, with overall reductions in the odds of employment, and particularly in the odds of working 20 or more hours per week, a commonly used threshold to define working "intensively" for high school students (Staff et al. 2014; Johnson et al. 2016). Although it has been theorized that teens may be increasingly opting out of school-year employment for greater involvement in extracurricular activities, volunteer work, and focusing more on college admissions, time trends were parallel across groups defined by parent education level as well as educational expectations; they were parallel across racial/ethnic and gender groups as well (Staff et al. 2014). Another line of argument contends that young workers are being crowded out by adults who are increasingly taking jobs once held by teens (Smith 2011). The Bureau of Labor Statistics (2017) reports that summer employment among 16-24 year olds also declined in the 1990s and 2000s, though it has been relatively stable since 2010.

It has become increasingly common to combine employment with schooling during postsecondary education. A Census Bureau analysis of the 2011 American Community Survey indicated that students enrolled in college were more than twice as likely to be employed as were students in high school. About half of college students worked in less than full-time, year-round employment, though almost 20% reported full-time, year-round employment (Davis 2012). Among those 16-24 who were not enrolled in school, labor force participation rates for high school drop outs were much lower than for high school graduates (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2018b).

As with all age groups, unemployment rates for younger workers fluctuate with the overall state of the economy. Regardless of time period, however, 16-19 year olds have the highest unemployment rates, followed by 20-24 year olds (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2018a). In January of 2018, 13.9% of of 16-19 year olds and 7.4% of 20-24 year olds were unemployed, compared to 4.1% of the total population 16 and over. These rates are considerably lower than during and immediately following the Great Recession; unemployment peaked at 27.2% among 16-19 year olds in October of 2009 and October of 2010, and peaked at 16.1% for 20-24 year olds in November of 2010. In comparison, the overall unemployment rate peaked at 10% in October of 2009. Importantly, unemployment rates do not count young people who are out of the labor force but who would work if they could find employment.

The consequences of unemployment for young people can extend beyond the months or years they are out of work, as it limits skill development and the accumulation of work experience at a critical time in the life course. Studies of "scarring" effects indicate that cohorts entering the labor market during recessions suffer long-term effects including lower earnings, lower occupational attainment, and lower job satisfaction (Bell & Blanchflower 2011; Oreopoulous, Von Wachter, & Heisz 2012). The severity and duration of the Great Recession have led to concerns about a "generation at risk" (ILO 2013) or a "lost generation" (Scarpetta, Sonnet, & Manfredi 2010) worldwide.

In addition to unemployment, young workers face other challenges in the new economy. Many young people "flounder" from job to job without moving toward stable employment paying enough for self-sufficiency (Vuolo, Mortimer & Staff 2014). A Pew Research Center survey in 2011, when the economy was officially out of the recession but many people were still struggling, indicated 49% of 18-34 year olds had "taken a job just to pay the bills" and 24% had taken an unpaid job in recent years (Pew Research Center 2012). Only 30% of workers in this age group said their current job is a "career." The percent among 18-24 year olds was only 11% (Pew Research Center 2012).

Postsecondary Education

Employment rates, median earnings, and poverty status have become more strongly linked to education levels over the past 40 years (Lemieux 2006; Goldin & Katz 2008; Pew Research Center 2014; Ma, Pender & Welch 2016). In this context, enrollment in postsecondary education has risen. Data from the National Center for Education Statistics (2016) indicates that the percentage of 18-24 year olds enrolled in degree granting institutions rose from 26.3% in 1975 to 40.5% in 2015. Enrollment in 2-year institutions fluctuateed without a long-term upward trend, but enrolment in 4-year institutions rose from 17.3% of this age group to 29.9% over this period. Growth in enrollment has been stronger for females than males, with a cross-over occurring in 1991 when participation among females began to exceed that of males for the first time. In 2015, 43.2% of females and 37.8% of males age 18-24 were enrolled in higher education. Rates vary by racial/ethnic groups as well, with Asians most likely to attend, followed by on-Hispanic whites, Hispanics, and blacks (54.6%, 43.2%, 36.6% and 34.9% respectively in 2015). Hispanics have seen the most growth in enrollment, with rates recently surpassing the enrollment rates for blacks. Racial/ethnic gaps are smaller among recent high school graduates, and are narrowing over time as well (Ma, Pender & Welch 2016). Finally, rates of postsecondary education vary greatly across states. For the high school class of 2011-2012, Minnesota had the highest rate of postsecondary enrollment at 62% and Washington D.C. had the lowest at 31%. Due to high school dropout, these rates are higher than they would be for the total same-aged population, and high school graduation rates also vary across states (Ma, Pender & Welch 2016).

Those enrolling in postsecondary education have become more likely to take out student loans over time, and for higher amounts. In 1996, 52% of all degree earners borrowed; in 2008 this had risen to 60% and it was 69% in 2012 (Hinze-Pifer & Fry 2010; Fry 2014). Among those who borrowed, the median amount of student debt rose from just over $12,000 for those finishing their degree in 1992-93 to almost $27,000 for those finishing in 2011-2012 (in constant 2013 dollars) (Fry 2014).

Analyses of 2007-2008 bachelor's degree recipients by the U.S. Department of Education (Velez & Woo 2017; Cataldi, Staklis & Woo 2018) indicates that 72% had taken out school loans by 2012, either for their undergraduate degree or for their graduate degree in the years since. As of 2012, 63% still had loan debt (Velez & Woo 2017). Among those employed in 2012, their monthly payments represented 12% of their monthly salaries on average (Cataldi, Staklis & Woo 2018). This is a fairly high debt burden and impedes wealth accumulation. Households headed by a young college graduate (under 40) without student debt have on average seven times the net worth of similar households with student debt, despite having similar incomes (Fry 2014b). For young households without a bachelor's degree, those without loans have accumulated nine times the wealth of those who borrowed, again despite similar income levels (Fry 2014b). Beyond the amount owed for student loans, those holding student debt were also more likely to have credit card and vehicle loan debt.

Both the likelihood of taking out loans and the average amount taken is higher for students attending private institutions (vs. public) and for those earning bachelor's degrees (vs. associate's degrees or certificates) (Hinze-Pifer & Fry 2010). The greatest increase in student borrowing has occurred among graduates from higher income families. Dividing graduates into quartiles based on family income, Fry (2014) reports an increase in the borrowing rate among graduates in the highest quartile from 24% for the class of 1992-93 to 50% for the class of 2011-2012. The middle two income quartiles also increased substantially from 34% to 62% and 45% to 70%. But graduates from the lowest family income quartile, which has higher borrowing rates overall, saw a smaller increase from 67% to 77%. Analysis of

borrowing trends according to parental education levels shows a similar pattern—a substantial increase in the borrowing rate for those whose parents also graduated from college. A gender gap has emerged as well; whereas male and female graduates were roughly equally likely to take out student loans in the earlier period, recent female graduates were more likely to borrow than were recent male graduates.

It is unclear how much rising tuition has played into these trends, as changes in other forms of aid and tax credits complicate the picture (Fry 2014). Changes in the composition of students and the types of institutions attended also matter. Growth in degree earning from those from lower income backgrounds and a rise in attending graduate school, both of which involve higher rates of borrowing, may be involved, as may be the rise in attending for-profit private institutions where again borrowing rates are higher (Fry 2014).

Those who earn degrees are often the focus of analyses of the frequency of student loan utilization and debt burden, as it allows consideration of the total borrowing over the course of earning a degree. It is important to note, however, that many young people take out loans to attend postsecondary education and leave school without finishing their degree.

Changes in the economy, along with associated changes in both the cost of earning a degree and its payoff have made the transition from the teen years to young adulthood a more precarious and high stakes period. Extended time in education and early difficulties in the labor market are tied to the delays in marriage and parenting, as well as the heavier financial reliance on parents, noted earlier (Berlin, Furstenberg & Waters 2010; Settersten & Ray 2010; Settersten, Furstenberg & Rumbaut 2005).

V. Adolescents' Communities

Research on adolescents' neighborhoods and communities has expanded greatly in the past few decades (Crosnoe & Johnson 2011; Johnson 2015). The availability of information on neighborhoods in local studies such as the Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods, and the L.A. Family and Neighborhood Survey, along with national studies such as Add Health, have greatly facilitated this work. Much of this research is concerned with adolescent risk behavior and whether neighborhood qualities foster or inhibit them (e.g., Ainsworth 2002; Sampson et al. 2002; Harding 2003). Studies are increasingly looking to how neighborhood factors combine with those in families, schools, and peer groups to shape adolescent behavior (e.g., Browning et al. 2005; Kirk 2009; Harding 2010). Very little of the published work in this area provides detailed information on adolescent's neighborhoods and communities themselves, nor how they differ across subpopulations of adolescents. Often the only information provided is an overall sample mean and standard deviation for neighborhood characteristics that, in reality, vary greatly across adolescents (e.g., percent non-Hispanic white, poverty rate). Nevertheless, we can piece together a partial portrait through adolescent reports on surveys and national population trends that no doubt shape adolescents' neighborhoods communities.

Neighborhoods and Communities

A continued trend toward urbanization is observable for adolescents over the past 35 years. Data from the MTF surveys, which ask adolescents where they mostly grew up, shows a decline in the percentage of those reporting that they grew up on a farm or in the country, from 24.7% in 1976 to 16.5% in 2012 (Bachman, Johnston & O'Malley 1980, 2014). More adolescents reported over time that they lived in cities, as well as in suburbs of medium sized cities (fewer than 100,000 people). White adolescents are

much more likely to report growing up on farms or in the country than are black adolescents, as well as living in small cities or suburbs; black adolescents report living in medium, large and very large cities more often.

The Census Bureau tracks the rate of living in high poverty areas, which it defines as living in a census tract with a poverty rate of 20% or more, across various demographic groups, including age (Bishaw 2014). Overall, the percentage of people living in high poverty areas rose from 20% in 1990 to 25.7% in 2010. Children's exposure is very similar to that of adults 18-64, though the elderly are less likely than others to live in high poverty areas. People living in the south are more likely to be living in high poverty areas, as are those from disadvantaged minority groups. The rates of living in high poverty areas are between 44% and 50% for Hispanics, blacks, American Indians and those of "some other race," whereas it is 19% for Asians and 25.7% for non-Hispanic whites (Bishaw 2014). Low-income and high poverty neighborhoods have on average higher crime rates, higher exposure to pollution, lower social resources, less green space (e.g., parks) available, and lower accessibility of healthy food (Evans 2004). American cities remain racially and economically segregated, though an examination of the period between 2000 to 2010 found reduced inequality in the economic conditions of neighborhoods across racial/ethnic groups (Firebaugh & Farrell 2016). Moreover, racial neighborhood inequality declined the most in cities were racial residential segregation also declined more (Firebaugh & Farrell 2016).

Residential Mobility

Residential mobility is on the decline in the country as a whole, and rates are at their lowest since the Census Bureau started reporting on it in the late 1940s (Cohn & Morin 2008). Mobility is reported differently across data sources, with some statistics focused specifically on changes of address and others focused on broader changes in geography such as changing census tracts or changing communities. Among 18-29 year olds in a recent survey, 44% report never having left their hometowns, a proportion lower than for older ages, but of course they have had less time for it to have occurred (Cohn & Morin 2008). This age group is much more likely to say they will likely move within the next five years, to the tune of 65% anticipating a move (compared to approximately 40% of adults overall; Cohn & Morin 2008). Looking instead to a change in address over the period of one year, migration rates spike up sharply in the late teen years and remain relatively high through the late 20s (Benetsky, Burd & Rapino 2015). Whereas the migration rate was 15.1% for the total population, based on the American Community Surveys between 2010-2012, the rate was 31.1% for young people aged 18-24. Migration rates varied only slightly by sex, nativity and race/ethnicity for this age group (with rates across categories generally around 27-32%), though Hispanics were less likely to move (24%) and mobility rates were higher at each advancing level of educational attainment (Benetsky, Burd & Rapino 2015).

Looking at residential mobility through the lens of changing census tracts, Crowder and Teachman (2004) estimate girls have had on average just under 2 moves by the time they are 12 years old. They also find that mobility is considerably higher for those who have spent any time in a single parent family and among those who have had three or more changes in family structure than those in stable family types. Among adolescents in 7^{th}-12^{th} grades in the first wave of the Add Health study, 16% report having moved residences in the prior two years (South, Haynie & Bose 2005). Older adolescents, females, black and other race/ethnicity adolescents, those born outside the U.S, and those whose families received public assistance were more likely to have moved; those with more educated parents and those in two-

parent families were less likely to have moved (South & Haynie 2004). One year later, 5.6% of adolescents reported having moved between data collections; 2.2% moved more than once (Metzger et al. 2015). Multivariate analyses indicated moving was associated with family structure changes, lower parental education, and living in lower collective efficacy neighborhoods. Asian adolescents were particularly unlikely to have moved more than once during the year, and nativity was unrelated to the odds of moving with other factors controlled (Metzger et al. 2015).

As indicated above, changes in family structure are linked to residential mobility for younger adolescents. Moving for education and employment are more common for those 18 and older, along with marital disruption among those who have ever married (Benetsky, Burd & Rapino 2015). With respect to the "main reason" movers provide for moving, most movers report housing related reasons (48%), followed by family (30.3%) and employment (19.4%); 18-24 year olds are slightly underrepresented in the category of "housing" reasons (e.g., wanting better or cheaper housing, eviction/foreclosure), and overrepresented in the "other" category, which includes "to attend or leave college" (Ihrke 2014).

Homelessness, Foster Care, and Juvenile Justice System Placements

About 1.4 million children and adolescents ages 6-18 enrolled in school were homeless at the beginning of the 2013-2014 school year (Child Trends 2015a). Three-quarters of those students were "doubled up" in another household, 15% were in shelters, 6% were in hotels/motels and 3% were unsheltered. Homelessness increased with the Great Recession, when 1 in 45 children were homeless annually between 2006 and 2010 (Child Trends 2012). Although their estimate is somewhat dated, Ringwalt and colleagues (1999) report 7.6% of 12-17 year olds in the 1992-93 Youth Risk Behavior Survey were homeless for at least one night in the previous 12 months.

Homelessness is more common among those released from detention or correctional facilities, and those with a history of foster care (Toro, Dworsky & Fowler 2007). As youth "age out" of foster care, varying between 18-21 across states, they are particularly vulnerable to homelessness (Toro, Dworsky & Fowler 2007). LGBTQ adolescents are also overrepresented among homeless youth (Toro, Dworsky & Fowler 2007; Durso & Gates 2012). A survey of agencies working with youth report approximately 26% of clients identify as lesbian, gay or bisexual and 4% as transgender (Durso & Gates 2012). This may be an undercount, as some young people may be reluctant to identify themselves as a sexual minority. Although there is some evidence that racial minorities are also more likely to experience homelessness, the evidence is mixed (Toro, Dworsky & Fowler 2007).

Youth in foster care have been understudied in the social sciences (Foster & Gifford 2005; Wildeman & Waldfogel 2014). In 2015 there were 427,901 children in foster care, with 26% of them among the ages of 11-20 (Child Trends 2017). The number of children placed in foster care has fluctuated historically, with recent numbers falling, but remaining higher than in the early 1980s (Wildeman & Waldfogel 2014). Changes to welfare policy and the rise in female incarceration underlie in these trends (Wildeman & Waldfogel 2014). Fewer than 1% of children enter foster care each year, but looking at the cumulative risk over the course of childhood, approximately 5% of children ever enter foster care (Wildeman & Waldfogel 2014).

With the exception of Asians, children from minority groups are overrepresented in the system (Wildeman & Waldfogel 2014; Child Trends 2017). Among those who had been placed in care before age 13, 20% "age out" of the system (Child Trends 2017). Foster care is available in most states beyond age 18, but most young people leave before that. Remaining in foster care after 18 is associated with a slower transition into parenting, lower risk of homelessness, and a higher rate of employment and enrollment in school (Fryer, Jordan & DeVooght 2017). A recent national survey of state independent living coordinators identified access to affordable and stable housing as one of the key issues facing youth transitioning out of foster care; such housing is critical to young people's ability to pursue employment and schooling, and shapes access to other services (Fryar, Jordan & DeVoght 2017).

Residential placement of adolescent offenders (i.e. for delinquency or status offenses) has been dropping dramatically. The number of youth (under age 21) in residential placement dropped 54% between 2006-2015 to its lowest level since 1997 (Garry 2018). Rates of status offenses were down between 2005 and 2015 (from 5.2 per 1000 to 3.2 per 1000), but rates of delinquency have dropped even more substantially over the same period (from 52.3 per 1000 to 28.1 per 1000); juvenile delinquency rates are at their lowest since the early 1970s (Hockenberry & Puzzanchera 2018). For status offenses, both the rate of cases adjudicated and the rate of out-of-home placement among adjudicated cases has declined; for delinquency cases the percent of cases adjudicated dropped slightly, but the out-of-home-placement rate was quite steady (Hockenberry & Puzzanchera 2018). Thus, the drop in residential placements largely resulted from lowered levels of delinquency overall. It is important to note that about half of juvenile cases are handled informally; among those processed formally, just under two-thirds are adjudicated delinquent and among these only about a quarter involve out-of-home placements (Foster & Gifford 2005; Hockenberry & Puzzanchera 2018).

Residential placement is more common for older adolescents (up through age 17) and for males (who make up 85% of placements) (Garry 2018). Adolescents from disadvantaged minority groups are also overrepresented, especially black youth, and black males in particular (Garry 2018). Hispanic and American Indian youth are also overrepresented amongst this population, and Asian youth have particularly low representation (Garry 2018; Hockenberry & Puzzanchera 2018).

VI. Adolescents' Civic Engagement

Trends are mixed when it comes to adolescents' participation in volunteer work, political activities, and military enlistment. Rates of volunteering have been rising in recent decades for adolescents. Among 8th, 10th and 12th graders in the MTF surveys, 27.1%, 34.4% and 38.8% reported volunteering at least once per month in 2015 (Child Trends 2015b). Volunteering is higher among adolescent females, those with a parent who has finished college, and those who plan to complete a four-year college degree or more (Child Trends 2015b). Rates of volunteering and other forms of civic behavior tend to drop during the early twenties when many young people are no longer participating in educational institutions (Finlay, Wray-Lake, and Flanagan 2010).

Voting behavior (restricted to citizens 18 and over) fluctuates from election year to election year (with notable recent spikes in 1992 and 2008), but 18-24 year olds' voting rates are consistently lower than for older age groups, and have generally declined since the 1960s (File 2014). Lower voting rates may reflect delays in transitioning into adult employment and family roles (Wray-Lake & Hart 2012). Just

over one-third of those 18-24 voted in the 2012 election (File 2014). Females in this age group tend to vote at higher rates than do males (File 2014).

Turning to a broader conceptualization of political engagement, there has been a decline in high school seniors' reports of participating in (or planning to participate in) conventional political activities (i.e. write to public officials, give money to a candidate or cause, work in a political campaign) between 1976 and 2005; rates of alternative forms of political activity (i.e. lawful demonstrations, boycotting) waxed and waned over the period, but was at a relative low in 2005, the last year analyzed (Syvertsen et al. 2011). Much like patterns for adults overall, for whom civic engagement is positively correlated with educational attainment, adolescents who planned to complete four-year college degrees were more civically involved than those with plans for two-year degrees or no higher education, as were those whose parents' had higher levels of education (Syvertsen et al. 2011). Notably, this gap has been growing since the early 1990s (Syvertsen et al. 2011). Wray-Lake and Hart (2012) report a growing gap specifically in voting behavior by education level across cohorts, but not in other conventional political activities (i.e. attending meetings, donating money, working for a campaign or wearing a button for a candidate). Females and minorities are less likely to engage in political activities, although holding socioeconomic status and other demographic characteristics constant, blacks have higher levels of political participation than do whites (Fisher 2012).

The digital age has brought with it newer forms of political engagement (Finlay, Wray-Lake and Flanagan 2010; Smith 2013). In a recent Pew Research Center survey, two-thirds of all 18-24 year olds reported participating in some sort of political activity in social networking spaces in the past 12 months (Smith 2013). Although their rates of participation in traditional forms of political engagement (e.g., attended a meeting, rally, volunteered for campaign, signed a petition, contacted a government official, called a radio/tv show, sent a letter to the editor) mirror rates for adults overall, 18-24 year olds were overrepresented when it came to participation in online political forms of communication. They were much more likely than other adult age groups to post pictures or videos online related to political or social issues, and more likely to send text messages about social or political issues (Smith 2013).

With respect to military service, the end of the draft in 1973 has meant that 18-26 year olds' experiences for all recent cohorts have been as volunteers. Among 18-27 year olds in the Add Health data collection in 2001-2002, 6.2% had served in the military (Spence, Henderson & Elder 2013). Similarly, among the Educational Longitudinal Survey of adolescents who were 10th graders in 2002, 3% of the sample had enlisted by 2006 and 7% had done so by 2012 (MacLean 2014). Although women have become substantially more likely to serve in the military during the all-volunteer era, they make up only 15% of active duty personnel, and are distributed unevenly across the branches of service (Kelty, Kleykamp & Segal 2010). Underrepresentation is both a product of who enlists and differential turnover. Many women who serve face "physical and symbolic violence," which has been shown to contribute to decisions to leave military service (Kelty, Kleykamp & Sagal 2010:185). Although homosexual individuals have always served in the military, they could not do so openly until very recently. In 1993 President Clinton implemented the "don't ask, don't tell" policy, and in 2011 President Obama fully dropped the ban. Debates about military service among transgender individuals continue, and LGBTQ service members' experiences, like women's, include disproportionate harassment and assault (Kelty, Kleykamp & Segal 2010).

The representation of young people in the military by racial/ethnic group has been changing as well. Although blacks have been overrepresented historically in the all-volunteer era, their enlistment

dropped during the 2000s when the U.S was engaged in wars with Iraq and Afghanistan (Kelty, Kleykamp & Segal 2010; MacLean 2014). Hispanic young people have increasingly entered the military recently, more than doubling their share since the early 1990s (Kelty, Kleykamp & Segal 2010). Adjusting for educational qualifications, Hispanics are overrepresented compared with the civilian labor force (Kelty, Kleykamp & Segal 2010). Race/ethnicity and gender also combine in important ways that shape the composition of the armed forces and characterize the transition to adulthood for young people. Whereas women make up a small proportion of service members overall, they make up half of those from minority racial/ethnic groups (Kelty, Kleykamp & Segal 2010). Immigrants, including non-citizens, are allowed to serve, and in fact doing so makes immigrants eligible for expedited citizenship. Immigrants make up 5% of active duty personnel (Kelty, Kleykamp & Segal 2010). There is little research on the subject, but at least one study finds Hispanics more likely to enlist if they are the children of immigrants (Lutz 2008).

A long-standing debate about military service is whether it has disproportionately fallen to young people from lower socioeconomic status families (MacLean 2014). The question is one that goes beyond simply who serves, but also questions such as who serves in what capacity and where, as these differences have much to do with who benefits from their service and who pays the costs, including disability and death. One of the difficulties in adjudicating this issue is that appropriate data have not always been collected by the Department of Defense. Some demographic (e.g., gender, race) and geographic information has been gathered for a long time, but family background was not among in the information collected until the 1990s (MacLean 2014). Much of the research on socioeconomic status relies on measurements of the characteristics of the neighborhoods from which recruits came instead of direct measures of family background, although official data do indicate enlistees are more likely to be high school graduates than is the civilian labor force (Maclean 2014).

Yet nationally representative surveys of adolescents over the past 30-40 years, such as those mentioned above, have enabled scholars to get some purchase on this question. For example, MacLean (2014) examines the cohort of young people who were 10th graders in 2002 over the following decade and finds, descriptively, that those who served in the military came disproportionately from middle class families when looking at parents' education levels and socioeconomic resources; enlistees were less likely to come from both poorer families and affluent families. A multivariate analysis of the Add Health cohort (ages 18-27 in 2001-2002) finds parental education and income positively related to attending college over joining the military, but finds parental education positively associated with joining the military over entering the labor force (Spence, Henderson & Elder 2013). It also finds welfare receipt in the family lowered the odds of military service over employment. In different ways, both studies suggest the channeling of those from the highest and lowest socioeconomic statuses away from military service.

VII. Health and Health Behavior

As agreed, this report does not discuss the topics of adolescent health, nor health risk and health promoting behaviors among adolescents. Starting point resources for learning about these topics are widely available (e.g. Resnick et al. 1997; Frech 2012; Fakhouir et al. 2014; Institute of Medicine 2014; Rosinger et al. 2017; Miech et al. 2018; Schulenberg et al. 2018).

References

Ainsworth, J.W., 2002. Why does it take a village? The mediation of neighborhood effects on educational achievement." *Social Forces* 81:117–152.

Aquilino, William S. 1997. "From Adolescent to Young Adult: A Prospective Study of Parent-Child Relations During the Transition to Adulthood." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 59(3): 670–86.

Bachman, J. G., Johnston, L. D., & O'Malley, P. M. 2014. *Monitoring the Future: Questionnaire responses from the nation's high school seniors, 2012*. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.

Bachman, J. G., Johnston, L. D., & O'Malley, P. M. 1980. *Monitoring the Future: Questionnaire responses from the nation's high school seniors, 1976.* Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.

Bell, D. & Blanchflower, D. 2011. *Young People and the Great Recession*. Discussion Paper No. 5674. Bonn, Germany: Institute for the Study of Labor. Retrieved from http://ftp.iza.org/dp5674.pdf

Benetsky, Megan J., Charlyyn A Burd, and Melanie A. Rapino. 2015. "Young Adult Migration: 2007-2009 to 2010-2012." *American Community Survey Reports*, ACS-31, U.S. Census Bureau, Washington, D.C.

Berlin, Gordon, Frank F. Furstenberg Jr., and Mary C. Waters. 2010. "Introducing the Issue." *The Future of Children* 20(1):3-18.

Bianchi, Suzanne M, John P. Robinson, and Melissa A. Milkie. 2006. *Changing Rhythms of American Family Life*. NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Bishaw, Alemayehu. 2014. "Changes in Areas with Concentrated Poverty: 2000 to 2010." *American Community Survey Reports*, ACS-27. U.S. Census Bureau.

Brown, Susan, J. Bart Stykes, and Wendy D. Manning. 2016. "Trends in Children's Family Instability, 1995-2010." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 78:1173-1183.

Browning C.R., Leventhal T., Brooks-Gunn J., 2005. "Sexual initiation in early adolescence: The nexus of parental and community control." *American Sociological Review* 70:758-78.

Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2017. *Employment and Unemployment among Youth—Summer 2017*. USDL-17-1128.

Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2018a. *College Enrollment and Work Activity of Recent High School and College Graduates--2017*. USDL-18-0635.

Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2018b. Labor Force Statistics from the Current Population Survey. Retrieved from: https://data.bls.gov/pdq/SurveyOutputServlet

Cataldi, Emily Forrest, Sandra Staklis, and Jennie Woo. 2018. "Four Years Later: 2007-08 College Graduates' Employment, Debt, and Enrollment 2012." *Stats in Brief*, NCES 2018-435.

Cavanagh, Shannon E. 2008. "Family Structure History and Adolescent Adjustment." *Journal of Family Issues* 29(7): 944-980.

Cherlin, Andrew J. 2010. "Demographic Trends in the United States: A Review of Research in the 2000s." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 72(3): 403-419.

Child Trends. 2012. "When the Bough Breaks: The Effects of Homelessness on Young Children." Retrieved from: https://www.childtrends.org/publications/when-the-bough-breaks-the-effects-of-homelessness-on-young-children

Child Trends. 2014. *Immigrant Children*. Retrieved from: https://www.childtrends.org/indicators/immigrant-children

Child Trends. 2015a. *Homeless Children and Youth: Indicators of Child Well-Being.* Retrieved from: https://www.childtrends.org/indicators/homeless-children-and-youth

Child Trends. 2015b. *Volunteering: Indicators of Child Well-Being.* Retrieved from: https://www.childtrends.org/indicators/volunteering

Child Trends. 2017. Foster Care Facts in the U.S. Retrieved from: https://www.childtrends.org/publications/foster-care-facts-in-the-u-s

Cohn, D'Vera and Rich Morin. 2008. *American Mobility: Who Moves? Who Stays Put? Where's Home?* Pew Research Center, Social & Demographic Trends Report. Retrieved from http://pewsocialtrends.org

Colby, Sandra L. and Jennifer M. Ortman. 2014. "Projections of the size and Composition of the U.S. Population: 2014-2060." *Current Population Reports*, P25-1143, U.S. Census Bureau, Washington, DC.

Corcoran, Mary, and Jordan Matsudaira. 2009. "Is Stable Employment Becoming More Elusive for Young Men?" Pp. 45-66 in Ingrid Schoon and Rainer K. Silbereisen (Eds), *Transitions from School to Work: Globalization, Individualization and Patterns of Diversity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Crosnoe, Robert, and Shannon E. Cavanagh. 2010. "Families with Children and Adolescents: A Review, Critique, and Future Agenda." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 72(3): 594-611.

Crosnoe, Robert, and Monica Kirkpatrick Johnson. 2011. "Research on Adolescence in the 21st Century." *Annual Review of Sociology* 37:439-460.

Danziger, Sheldon and David Ratner. 2010. "Labor Market Outcomes and the Transition to Adulthood." *The Future of Children* 20(1):133-151.

Davis, Jessica. 2012. School Enrollment and Work Status: 2011. *American Community Survey Briefs* No. 11-14.

Durso, L.E., and G.J. Gates. 2012. *Serving Our Youth: Findings from a National Survey of Service Providers Working with Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Youth who are Homeless or At Risk of Becoming Homeless.* Los Angeles: The Williams Institute with True Colors and The Palette Fund.

Eickmeyer, Kasey J. 2017. "American Children's Family Structure: Two Biological Parent Families. Family Profiles, FP-17-15. Bowling Green, OH: National Center for Family & Marriage Research. http://www.bgsu.edu/ncfmr/resources/data/family-profiles/eickmeyer-two-biological-parnet-families-fp-17-15.html

Eickmeyer, Kasey J. 2016. "Over 25 Years of Change in Men's Entry into Fatherhood, 1987-2013." Family Profiles, FP-16-10. Bowling Green, OH: National Center for Family & Marriage Research. http://www.bgsu.edu/ncfmr/resources/data/family-profiles/eickmeyer-fatherhood-25years-change-age-entry-fp-16-10.html

Eickmeyer, Kasey J., Krista K. Payne, Susan L. Brown, & Wendy D. Manning. 2017. "Crossover in the Median Age of First Marriage and First Birth: Thirty-Five Years of Change. Family Profiles, FP-17-22. Bowling Green, OH: National Center for Family & Marriage Research. https://doi.org/10.25035/ncfmr/fp-17-22

Entwisle, D. R., Alexander, K. L., & Olson, L. S. 2005. "Urban teenagers: Work and dropout." *Youth and Society* 37:3–32.

Evans, Gary W. 2004. "The Environment of Childhood Poverty." *American Psychologist* 59(2):77-92.

Fakhouri THI, Hughes JP, Burt VL, et al. 2014. *Physical activity in U.S. youth aged 12–15 years, 2012*. NCHS data brief, no 141. Hyattsville, MD: National Center for Health Statistics.

File, Thom. 2014. "Young-Adult Voting: An Analysis of Presidential Elections, 1964-2012." *Current Population Survey Reports*, P20-572. U.S. Census Bureau, Washington, DC.

Fingerman, Karen L., Yen-Pi Cheng, Lauren Tighe, Kira S. Birditt and Steven Zarit. 2012. 'Relationships Between Young Adults and Their Parents' in *Early Adulthood in a Family Context*, edited by Alan Booth, Susan L. Brown, Nancy S. Landale, Wendy Manning and Susan M. McHale. New York: Springer.

Finlay, Andrea, Laura Wray-Lake and Constance Flanagan. 2010. "Civic Engagement during the Transition to Adulthood: Developmental Opportunities and Social Policies at a Critical Juncture."

Pp. 277-305 in Lonnie R. Sherrod, Judith Torney-Purta and Constance A. Flanagan (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Civic Engagement in Youth*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Firebaugh, Glen, and Chad R. Farrell. 2016. "Still Large, but Narrowing: The Sizable Decline in Racial Neighborhood Inequality in Metropolitan America, 1980–2010." *Demography* 53:139-164.

Fisher, Dana R. 2012. "Youth Political Participation: Bridging Activism and Electoral Politics." *Annual Review of Sociology* 38:119-137.

Fontenot, Kayla, Jessica Semega, and Melissa Kollar. 2018. "Income and Poverty in the United States: 2017." U.S. Census Bureau, *Current Population Reports*, P60-263. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC.

Foster, E. Michael, and Elizabeth J. Gifford. 2005. "The Transition to Adulthood for Youth Leaving Public Systems." Pp. 501-533 in *On the Frontier of Adulthood: Theory, Research, and Public Policy*, edited by Richard A. Settersten, Frank F. Furstenberg and Ruben G. Rumbaut. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Frech, Adrianne. 2012. "Healthy Behavior Trajectories between Adolescence and Young Adulthood." *Advances in Life Course Research* 17(2): 59–68.

Fry, Richard. 2013. "A Rising Share of Young Adults Live in their Parents' Home." Pew Research Center, Washington DC.

Fry, Richard. 2014a. "The Changing Profile of Student Borrowers." Washington, D.C.: Pew Research Center's Social and Demographic Trends project, October.

Fry, Richard. 2014b. "Young Adults, Student Debt and Economic Well-being." Washington, D.C.: Pew Research Center's Social and Demographic Trends project, May.

Fryar, Garet, Elizabeth Jordan, and Kerry DeVooght. 2017. Supporting Young People Transitioning from Foster Care: Findings from a National Survey. Child Trends. Retrieved from: https://www.childtrends.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/SYPTFC-Findings-from-a-National-Survey-11.29.17.pdf

Goldin, Claudia and Lawrence Katz. 2008. *The Race between Education and Technology*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.

Guttmacher Institute. 2017. "U.S. Rates of Pregnancy, Birth, and Abortion Among Adolescents and Young Adults Continue to Decline." Retrieved from https://www.guttmacher.org/news-release/2017/us-rates-pregnancy-birth-and-abortion-among-adolescents-and-young-adults-continue

Harding D.J., 2003. "Counterfactual models of neighborhood effects: The effect of neighborhood poverty on dropping out and teenage pregnancy." *American Journal of Sociology* 109:676-719.

Harding, D.J., 2010. *Living the Drama: Community, Conflict and Culture among Inner-City Boys.* University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Hays, Sharon. 1996. *The Cultural Contradictions of Motherhood*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Herman, J.L., Flores, A.R., Brown, T.N.T., Wilson, B.D.M., & Conron, K.J. 2017. *Age of Individuals who Identify as Transgender in the United States*. Los Angeles, CA: The Williams Institute.

Hinze-Pifer, and Richard Fry. 2010. "The Rise of College Student Borrowing." Washington, D.C.: Pew Research Center's Social and Demographic Trends project, November.

Hockenberry, Sarah, and Puzzanchera, Charles. 2018. *Juvenile Court Statistics 2015*. Pittsburgh, PA: National Center for Juvenile Justice.

Ihrke, David. 2014. "Reasons for Moving: 2012-2013." *Current Population Reports*. P20-574. U.S. Census Bureau, Washington, DC.

Institute of Medicine. 2014. *Investing in the health and well-being of young adults*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.. Retrieved from http://iom.edu/Reports/2014/Investing-in-the-Health-and-Well-Being-of-Young-Adults.aspx

International Labour Organization (2013). *Global employment trends for youth 2013.* Geneva, Switzerland: International Labour Office. Retrieved from http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---dcomm/documents/publication/wcms_212423.pdf

International Labour Organization (2015). *World employment social outlook – Trends 2015.* Geneva, Switzerland: International Labour Office. Retrieved from http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---dcomm/---publ/documents/publication/wcms_337069.pdf

Kann, Laura, and Colleagues. 2016. "Sexual Identity, Sex of Sexual Contacts, and Health-Related Behaviors Among Students in Grades 9–12 — United States and Selected Sites, 2015." *MMWR Surveillance Summaries* 65(9): 1-202.

Johnson, Monica Kirkpatrick. 2015. "Adolescence, Sociology of." Pp. 115-120 in *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Science 2nd Edition,* edited by James D. Wright. Oxford: Elsevier.

Johnson, Monica Kirkpatrick, Jeremy Staff, Megan E. Patrick and John E. Schulenberg. 2016. "Adolescent Adaptation Before, During, and in the Aftermath of the Great Recession in the United States." *International Journal of Psychology*.

Kelty, Ryan, Meredith Kleykamp, and David R. Segal. 2010. "The Military and the Transition to Adulthood." *The Future of Children* 20(1):181-207.

Kirk, D.S., 2009. Unraveling the contextual effects on student suspension and juvenile arrest: The independent and interdependent influences of school, neighborhood, and family social controls. Criminology 47: 479–520.

Lareau, Annette. 2003. *Unequal Childhoods : Class, Race, and Family Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Laughlin, Lynda. 2014. "A Child's Day: Living Arrangements, Nativity, and Family Transitions: 2011 (Selected Indicators of Child Well-Being)." *Current Population Reports*, P70-139, U.S. Census Bureau, Washington, DC.

Lemieux, T. 2006. "Postsecondary education and increased wage inequality." *American Economic Review* 96:195-199.

Livingston, Gretchen. 2013. "At Grandmother's House We Stay: One-in-Ten Children Are Living with a Grandparent." Pew Research Center, Washington, DC.

Livingston, Gretchen, and D'Vera Cohn. 2010. "The New Demography of American Motherhood." Pew Research Center, Social & Demographic Trends Report. Retrieved from http://pewsocialtrends.org

Lutz, Amy. 2008. "Who Joins the Military? A Look at Race, Class, and Immigration Status." *Journal of Political and Military Sociology* 36(2): 167-188.

Ma, Jennifer, Matea Pender and Meredith Welch. 2016. "Education Pays 2016: The Benefits of Higher Education for Individuals and Society." College Board.

MacLean, Alair. 2014. "The Class War Debate: The Volunteer Military during the Conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan." Report prepared for the Marguerite Casey Foundation. Seattle, WA.

Manning, Wendy D., Susan L. Brown, and Krista K. Payne. 2014. "Two Decades of Stability and Change in Age at First Union Formation." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 76:247-260.

Manning, Wendy D., Susan L. Brown, and J. Bart Stykes. 2014. "Family Complexity among Children in the United States. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 654(1):48-65.

Martinez, Gladys, Kimberly Daniels, and Anjani Chandra. 2012. "Fertility of Men and Women Aged 15-44 Years in the United States: National Survey of Family Growth, 2006-2010." *National Health Statistics Reports* No. 51. Hyattsville, MD: National Center for Health Statistics.

McLanahan, Sarah. 2004. "Diverging Destinies: How Children and Faring Under the Second Demographic Transition." *Demography* 41:607-627.

Miech, Richard A., Lloyd D. Johnston, Patrick M. O'Malley, Jerald G. Bachman, John E. Schulenberg and Megan E. Patrick. 2018. *Monitoring the Future national survey results on drug use, 1975-2017: Volume I, Secondary school students*. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan.

Metzger, Molly W., Patrick J. Fowler, Courtney Lauren Anderson, and Constance A. Lindsay. 2015. "Residential Mobility during Adolescence: Do even 'Upward' Moves Predict Dropout Risk?" *Social Science Research* 53:218-230.

Morris, M., & Western, B. (1999). Inequality in earnings at the close of the twentieth century. *Annual Review of Sociology, 25,* 623-657.

National Center for Education Statistics (2015). Unemployment rates of persons 16 to 64 years old, by age group and educational attainment: Selected years, 1975 through 2013. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d13/tables/dt13_501.80.asp

National Center for Education Statistics. 2016. Percentage of 18- to 24-year-olds enrolled in degree-granting postsecondary institutions, by level of institution and sex and race/ethnicity of student: 1970 through 2015. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d16/tables/dt16_302.60.asp

Nelson, Margaret. 2010. *Parenting Out of Control: Anxious Parents in Uncertain Times*. New York: NYU Press.

Newmann, Katherine S. 2013. *The Accordion Family: Boomerang Kids, Anxious Parents, and the Private Toll of Global Competition.* Beacon Press.

Oreopoulos, P., von Wachter, T., & Heisz, A. 2012. "The short- and long-term career effects of graduating in a recession." *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics,* 4*,* 1–29.

Osgood, D. Wayne, Gretchen Ruth, Jacquelynne S. Eccles, Janis E. Jacobs, and Bonnie L. Barber. 2005. "Six Paths to Adulthood: Fast Starters, Parents without Careers, Educated Partners, Educated Singles, Working Adults, and Slow Starters." Pp. 320-355 in Richard A Settersten Jr., Frank F. Furstenberg Jr., and Ruben G. Rumbaut, *On the Frontier of Adulthood: Theory, Research and Public Policy*. Chicago. University of Chicago Press.

Payne, Krista K. 2012. Young Adults in the Parental Home, 1940-2010 (FP-12-22). National Center for Family & Marriage Research. Retrieved from http://ncfmr.bgsu.edu/pdf/family_profiles/file122548.pdf

Payne, Krista K. 2016. Young Adults in the Parental Home, 2007-2015. Family Profiles FP-16-16. Bowling Green OH: National Center for Family & Marriage Research. http://www.bgsu.edu/ncfmr/resources/data/family-profiles/payne-young-adults-parental-home-2007-2015-fp-16-16.html

Pew Research Center. 2012. "Young, Underemployed and Optimistic: Coming of Age, Slowly, in a Tough Economy." Pew Social and Demographic Trends. Retrieved from: http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2012/02/09/young-underemployed-and-optimistic/

Pew Research Center. 2014. "The Rising Cost of Not Going to College." Retrieved from: htp;://pewsocialtrendsorg/2014/02/11/the-rising-cost-of-not-going-to-college/

Powell, Brian, Catherine Bolzendahl, Claudia Geist, and Lala Carr Steelman. 2010. *Counted Out: Same-Sex Relations and Americans' Definitions of Family*. Russell Sage Foundation.

Resnick, M. D., Bearman, P. S., Blum, R. W., Bauman, K. E., Harris, K. M.; Jones, J., Tabor, J., Beuhring, T., Sieving, R. E., Shew, M., Ireland, M., Bearinger, L. H., and Udry, J. R. 1997. "Protecting adolescents from harm: Findings from the National Longitudinal Study on Adolescent Health." *JAMA, The Journal of the American Medical Association* 278(10):823-832.

Ringwalt, Christopher L., Jody M. Greene, Marjorie Robertson, and Melissa McPheeters. 1998. "The Prevalence of Homelessness Among Adolescents in the United States." *American Journal of Public Health* 88 (9): 1325–29.

Rosinger A, Herrick K, Gahche J, Park S. 2017. *Sugar-sweetened beverage consumption among U.S. youth, 2011–2014*. NCHS data brief, no 271. Hyattsville, MD: National Center for Health Statistics.

Russell, Stephen T., Hinda Seif and Nhan L. Truong. 2001. "School outcomes of sexual minority youth in the United States: evidence from a national study." *Journal of Adolescence* 24:111-127.

Sacks, Vanessa, Kristin Anderson Moore, Alyssa Shaw, & Paula Mae Cooper. 2014. "The Family Environment and Adolescent Well-Being." *Child Trends Research Brief* #2014-52. Downloaded from childtrends.org, July 27, 2018.

Sage, Rayna Amber, and Monica Kirkpatrick Johnson. 2012. "Extending and Expanding Parenthood: Parental Support to Young Adult Children." *Sociology Compass* 6(3):256-270.

Sampson, R.J., Morenoff, J.D., Gannon-Rowley, T., 2002. "Assessing "neighborhood effects": Social processes and new directions in research." *Annual Review of Sociology* 28, 443–478.

Sandefur, Gary D., Jennifer Eggerling-Boeck, and Hyunjoon Park. 2005. "Off to a Good Start? Postsecondary Education and Early Adult Life." Pp. 292-319 in Richard A Settersten Jr., Frank F. Furstenberg Jr., and Ruben G. Rumbaut, *On the Frontier of Adulthood: Theory, Research and Public Policy*. Chicago. University of Chicago Press.

Scarpetta, S., Sonnet, A., & Manfredi, T. (2010). *Rising youth unemployment during the crisis: how to prevent negative long-term consequences on a generation?* (OECD Social, Employment and Migration Paper n. 106). Paris, France: OECD Publishing. Retrieved from http://www.oecd.org/employment/youthforum/44986030.pdf

Schoeni, Robert F. and Karen E. Ross. 2005. 'Material Assistance From Families During the Transition to Adulthood.' Pp. 396–416 in *On the Frontier of Adulthood: Theory, Research, and Public Policy*, edited by Richard A. Settersten, Frank F. Furstenberg and Ruben G. Rumbaut. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Schulenberg, John E., Lloyd D. Johnston, Patrick M. O'Malley, Jerald G. Bachman, Richard A. Miech, and Megan E. Patrick. 2018. *Monitoring the Future National Survey Results on Drug Use, 1975-2017: Volume II, College Students and Adults Ages 19-55*. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan.

Settersten, Richard A. and Barbara E. Ray. 2010. Not Quite Adults: Why 20-Somethings are Choosing a Slower Path to Adulthood, and Why It's Good for Everyone. New York: Bantam Books.

Shanahan L., McHale S.M., Osgood D.W, Crouter A.C. 2007. Conflict frequency with mothers and fathers from middle childhood to late adolescence: within- and between-families comparisons. *Developmental Psychology* 43:539–50

Smeeding, T. M., Thompson, J. P., Levanon, A., & Burak, E. 2012. "Poverty and income inequality in the early stages of the Great Recession." In D. Grusky, B. Western, & C. Wimer (Eds.), *The Great Recession* (pp. 82-126). New York: Sage.

Smith, Aaron. 2013. Civic Engagement in the Digital Age. Retrieved from: http://pewinternet.org/Reports/2013/Civic-Engagement.aspx

Smith, C. L. (2011). *Polarization, immigration, education: What's behind the dramatic decline in youth employment*? Working paper in the Finance and Economics Discussion Series, Divisions of Research and Statistics and Monetary Affairs, Federal Reserve Board, Washington, D.C.

Spence, Naomi, J., Kathryn Henderson, and Glen H. Elder Jr. 2013. "Does Adolescent Family Structure Predict Military Enlistment? A Comparison of Post-High School Activities." *Journal of Family Issues* 34(9):1194-1216.

South, Scott J. and Dana L. Haynie. 2004. "Friendship Networks of Mobile Adolescents." *Social Forces* 83(1):315-350.
South, Scott J., Dana L. Haynie, and Sunita Bose. 2005. "Residential Mobility and the Onset of Adolescent Sexual Activity." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 67:499-514.
Staff, Jeremy, Johnson, Monica Kirkpatrick, Patrick, Megan E., & Schulenberg, John E. 2014. "The Great Recession and recent employment trends among secondary students in the United States." *Longitudinal and Life Course Studies,* 5(2), 173-188.
Syvertsen, Amy K., Laura Wray-Lake, Constance A. Flanagan, D. Wayne Osgood, and Laine Briddell. 2011. "Thirty Year Trends in U.S. Adolescents' Civic Engagement: A Story of Changing Participation and Educational Differences." *Journal of Research on Adolescence* 21(3): 586-594.
Toro, Paul A., Amy Dworsky, and Patrick J. Fowler. 2007. "Homeless Youth in the United States: Recent Research Findings and Intervention Approaches." National Symposium on Homelessness Research. Retrieved from: https://www.huduser.gov/portal/publications/homeless/p6.html
U.S. Census Bureau. 2012. "Population by Sex, Age, Nativity, and U.S. Citizenship Status: 2012." Current Population Survey, Annual Social and Economic Supplement.
U.S. Census Bureau. 2018a. "Annual Estimates of the Resident Population by Sex, Age, Race, and Hispanic Origin for the United States: April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2017." Retrieved August 14, 2018.
U.S. Census Bureau. 2018b. "Annual Estimates of the Resident Population by Single Year of Age and Sex for the United States: April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2017." Retrieved August 8, 2018.
U.S. Census Bureau. 2018c. "Selected Characteristics of Families by Total Money Income in: 2017." Current Population Survey, 2018 Annual Social and Economic Supplement. Retrieved from: https://www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/demo/income-poverty/cps-finc/finc-01.html
U.S. Department of Labor. (2000). *Report on the youth labor force*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
Velez, Erin Dunlop, and Jennie H. Woo. 2017. "The Debt Burden of Bachelor's Degree Recipients" *Stats in Brief*, National Center for Education Statistics No. 2017-436.
Vespa, Jonathan. 2017. "The Changing Economics and Demographics of Young Adulthood: 1975-2016." *Current Population Reports*, P20-579, U.S. Census Bureau, Washington, DC.
Vuolo, M., Mortimer, J. T. & Staff, J. 2014. "Adolescent precursors of pathways from school to work." *Journal of Research on Adolescence* 24*:*145-162.
Wightman, Patrick, Megan Patrick, Robert Schoeni, and John Schulenberg. 2013. "Historical Trends in Parental Financial Support of Young Adults." *Population Studies Center Research Reports*, No. 13-801.
Wildeman, Christopher, and Jane Waldfogel. 2014. "Somebody's Children or Nobody's Children? How the Sociological Perspective Could Enliven Research on Foster Care." *Annual Review of Sociology* 40:599-618.
Wildsmith, Elizabeth, Megan Barry, Jennifer Manlove, and Brigitte Vaughn. 2013. Teen Pregnancy and Childbearing." Child Trends Adolescent Health Highlight. Publication # 2013-5. Retrieved from childtrends.org, July 27, 2018.
Wilkinson, Lindsey, and Jennifer Pearson. 2013. "High School Religious Context and Reports of Same-Sex Attraction and Sexual Identity in Young Adulthood. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 76:180-202.
Wray-Lake, Laura, and Daniel Hart. 2012. "Growing Social Inequalities in Youth Civic Engagement? Evidence from the National Election Study." *PS: Political Science and Politics 45:*456-461.
Wylie, Sarah A., Heather L. Corliss, Vanessa Boulanger, Lisa A. Prokop, and S. Bryn Austin. 2010. "Socially assigned gender nonconformity: A brief measure for use in surveillance and investigation of health disparities." *Sex Roles* 63:264-276.