Moving after separation: The role of location-specific capital

Paper for the 2010 EPC Conference, Vienna

Clara H. Mulder and Michael Wagner

E-mail: c.h.mulder@uva.nl; mwagner@wiso.uni-koeln.de

Abstract

We address the role of location-specific capital – the ties that bind people to a place – in which ex-partners of two-sex couples move after separation or divorce. We use data from the first and second waves of the Netherlands Kinship Panel Study (N = 361) to test hypotheses on the impact of individual home-ownership, prior residential history, and the nearby presence of parents on whether a separated person moves. Who owned the home and whether someone's ex-partner moved in upon partnership formation are of prime importance to whether a separated person moves. Furthermore, separated persons whose parents live nearby and those who have a long history of living in the same municipality have a smaller probability of moving than other separated persons.

1. Introduction

Divorce and separation often have severe consequences for the ex-partners' housing careers, particularly for women (Booth & Amato, 1992; Andreß et al., 2003; Feijten, 2005; Feijten & Mulder, 2005; Feijten & Van Ham, 2007; Dewilde, 2008, 2009). As Feijten and Mulder (2005) and Feijten and Van Ham (2010) have shown, these consequences are still discernible a few years after the separation and even after re-partnering. An important occasion at which post-separation housing quality is determined is formed by the moves made by at least one ex-partner to effectuate the separation, and moves made shortly afterwards, for example to better affordable housing. Many of these moves will lead to a decline in housing quality. In contrast, ex-partners who do not move around the separation do not experience a decrease in housing quality at that time.

Compared with other residential moves, moves after separation are specific in the sense that they frequently do not follow from the individual decision of one separated person but from a negotiation between the two partners about who stays in the home and who leaves. The ex-partner who stays in the home is likely the better-off: in the survey Divorce in the Netherlands, around 30 percent of divorcees who left the home reported they thought the housing outcome of the divorce was to their disadvantage, whereas this was true of only 7 percent of those who stayed. These specific characteristics make moving after separation an interesting research topic. Only a few studies, however, have thus far addressed this issue. These studies have looked into the influence of the age and socio-economic status of the ex-partners, the duration of the partnership, whether the couple had children and who got custody of these children, whether the couple owned the home, whether the couple lived in an urban or less urban area, whether a new relationship of one of the ex-partners was a reason for the separation, and who initiated the decision to separate. Some of the studies focus on the determinants of who leaves the joint home: the male ex-partner, the female ex-partner or both, using information about both ex-partners and about differences between them (Sullivan, 1986; Symon, 1990; Wasoff & Dobash, 1990; Andreß et al., 2003; Mulder & Wagner, forthcoming). Another recent study focuses on the moves of recently divorced people, using information about individual divorcees but not their ex-partners (Gram-Hanssen & Bech-Danielsen, 2008).

To the scarce literature on who moves out after separation, we contribute an investigation of the role of location-specific capital of an individual ex-partner: the ties that bind people to a specific place. To date the influence of location-specific capital on who leaves has not been addressed, even though one study indicates this influence is likely quite strong: from ten in-depth interviews, Gram-Hanssen and Bech-Danielsen (2008) found that, if one of the ex-partners had already lived in the home before the partnership started, that ex-partner remained in the home as a matter of course, even if the partnership had lasted for a considerable number of years. We use data on respondents who divorced or separated shortly before the first wave or between the first and second waves of the Netherlands Kinship Panel Study, and logistic regression analyses of whether these separated persons moved after their separation. Separation is defined as the dissolution of a two-gender co-residential partnership, whereby at least one ex-partner moves out of the joint home. Note that, for convenience, we use the term 'moving after separation' even though some moves might have preceded the actual decision to separate (for example, if one of the partners moved out to try out living apart).

2. Theoretical framework and hypotheses

We build on the theoretical approach proposed by Mulder and Wagner (forthcoming), designed for answering the question who of the two ex-partners is more likely to move out of the joint home: the man, the woman, or both. According to their argumentation, any ex-partner will move for whom the costs of moving are lower than the costs of staying. If this holds for none of the ex-partners, the issue of who moves out is likely resolved using rules of fairness or justice. Such a rule could be that the partner for whom the costs of moving would be less moves out. Additionally, any ex-partner with insufficient resources to bear the costs of paying for the joint home on his or her own will have to move out.

Location-specific capital and moving after separation
Location-specific capital is a general term for the ties that bind people to a specific place (DaVanzo, 1981). Location-specific capital is important to both the costs of moving and the resources enabling an ex-partner to stay in the home. It increases the cost of moving (DaVanzo, 1981). The more ties someone has to a particular place, or the stronger these ties are, the greater the loss if the ties are severed. Location-specific capital may also serve as a resource enabling the ex-partner to argue it is fair or reasonable he or she should stay, or even to push the other ex-partner out.
We distinguish between two types of location-specific capital: capital fixed in the home itself, and capital associated with a residential location. A highly-specific form of capital fixed in the joint home is the ownership of the home. If one of the ex-partners was the only owner of the home, this partner will face a greater cost of moving out and be in a much better position to claim the home. Furthermore, if one partner can claim to be the one who brought the home into the partnership through living there already before the other partner moved in, this partner may successfully appeal to a rule of fairness because of a greater financial or emotional attachment to the home. We therefore expect single ownership (Hypothesis 1) and having had the partner move into the home (Hypothesis 2) to decrease the likelihood of moving after the separation.
Another important form of location-specific capital is formed by the ties to a location through social networks and familiarity with that location. Not moving facilitates retaining such local ties. Retaining local ties is not impossible after a move, but it would have to be a move close by, so the search area for a new home and therefore the options for finding a place to move to would be restricted. The parents frequently form an important part of a divorcee's social network. If the parents live close by, the cost of moving is likely to be greater.

2

Similarly, a long history in the place of residence is likely to increase the cost of moving. These arguments lead to the following hypothesis (no. 3): Those who have lived in the same place of residence for a long time or whose parents lived close by before the separation are less likely to move after separation. It should be noted that, if a separated person wants to move, the local social network may be helpful in finding a place to move to or provide a temporary place to stay. This help may make it easier to move and partly, or even fully, counterbalance a possible effect of greater costs of moving for those whose parents live nearby.

The impact of location-specific capital might differ between men and women. Women tend to have closer relationships with family members than men (Rossi & Rossi, 1990). The decreasing effect of the nearby presence of parents on the likelihood of moving may therefore be stronger for women than for men.

Other factors to account for
We account for several other factors that are known or likely to influence the probability of moving. A negative effect of age on the likelihood of moving can be expected (Gram-Hanssen & Bech-Danielsen, 2008). People tend to move less with increasing age (e.g. Fischer & Malmberg, 2001), and so we expect the likelihood that at least one partner does not move increases with age. Furthermore, the older a separated person, the greater are the chances that this person is older than the other ex-partner. As Mulder and Wagner (forthcoming) have shown, an older age than the partner decreases the likelihood that someone moves out of the joint home. The negative effect of age might be stronger for women than for men, because age is positively correlated with partnership duration and men are less likely to move out of the joint home with increasing partnership duration (Mulder & Wagner, forthcoming). Level of education is included in the analyses as an indicator of the socio-economic resources needed to afford staying in the joint home. As Gram-Hanssen and Bech-Danielsen (2008) have shown, those with more resources are less likely to move after separation. Unfortunately, the data do not allow us to include indicators of relative resources, even though Mulder and Wagner (forthcoming) provided evidence that age differences and differences in employment between men and women (but not differences in level of education) had an impact on who moved out of the joint home.

We include two indicators of the costs of moving. The first is whether the respondent had custody of the children after the separation. It has repeatedly been found that child custody reduces the likelihood of moving (Andreß et al., 2003; Gram-Hanssen & Bech-Danielsen, 2008). The second is whether the respondent switched to a new partner around the separation. As Mulder and Wagner (forthcoming) argued, switching to a new partner indicates a particularly great interest in the separation and therefore lower costs of moving. Using different data for the Netherlands they indeed found a considerably greater likelihood of moving for those ex-partners whose new relationship was a reason for the separation.

We also account for the respondent's gender. Not only do we want to allow the impact of location-specific capital and possibly other factors to differ by gender, we also want to acknowledge that, all else being equal, women tend to be in a less favorable position than men after separation (Andreß & Hummelsheim, 2009).

3. Data and method

The dataset
We use the first and second waves of the main sample of the Netherlands Kinship Panel Study, conducted in 2002-04 and 2006-07 (NKPS; Dykstra et al., 2005, 2007). The response rate in the first wave was 45 per cent. Of the first-wave respondents, 74 per cent participated in the second wave. The number of separations is rather small in NKPS, but a major

advantage of NKPS is that, unlike other data sets, it contains indicators of location-specific capital. We selected those NKPS respondents who separated recently before the first wave, or between the first and second waves.

The first selection comprised those 187 respondents who reported that they had separated from a co-residential partner of the other sex in the year of the interview of the first wave or the year before, regardless of whether they still lived alone or had already found a new partner. The exact duration between the separation and the interview is not known for these Wave 1 respondents, because the time of the separation was only recorded in years. The maximum length was two years if the interview took place at the end of December and the separation took place at the beginning of January in the previous year. The bulk of the interviews (44%) took place in February-May 2003 however, so that the maximum duration was effectively less than 1.5 years in most cases. The restriction to recent separations was necessary, because there was no direct question in the first wave about moving around the separation. Instead, we used information about the most recent move.

The second selection comprised those respondents who reported living with a partner of the other sex in the first wave and reported having separated from that partner in the second wave, regardless of whether they had found a new partner afterwards. From the 5165 respondents living in a two-sex co-residential partnership in the first wave, 174 reported having separated from that partner in the second wave. The average duration between the separation and the Wave 2 interview was 20 months, the maximum was 49 months.

One respondent had to be excluded because of missing information on the dependent variable. Otherwise, there were no missing values on any of the variables. This was because all variables were derived from computer-assisted interviews. The routing of these was such that many questions could not be skipped and had no answer categories 'unknown' or 'refused'. Note, however, that the values of two indicators of location-specific capital were inferred from incomplete information for a small number of respondents (see Variables section).

Men are under-represented in the data. In a sample of people from two-sex former couples and in the absence of gender-specific non-response, one would logically expect to find approximately 50% men and 50% women as respondents in the dataset. In fact, the percentage of men was 41.6 among those who separated recently before Wave 1, and 36.8 among those who separated between the two waves. Recently-separated people were also under-represented. They are likely to be more mobile and therefore difficult to trace. They may also suffer from emotional problems making them less likely to respond. Furthermore, those who moved around the time of separation were also under-represented: among both men and women, a minority reported that they had moved around the time of separation. This cannot be the case if we assume that invariably at least one ex-partner leaves the joint home.

To correct for the response selectivity, we have used case weights for cross-tabulations. For Wave 1, we have used the standard weighting variables that reproduce the distribution in the Netherlands population of individuals according to household type, gender, age, region, and urbanization. For those who reported having separated between Waves 1 and 2, we took the standard weighting variable for Wave 2 (Dykstra et al., 2007) as a starting point. After applying these weights, the share of men was still somewhat too low: around 45% rather than almost 50%. We further adjusted the weights to correct for this under-representation.

A disadvantage of selecting those who separated before Wave 1 is that we have no information about the ex-partner and less information about the couple's housing situation and characteristics of the separation process for those who separated before Wave 1. For example, there are no measures in Wave 1 for location-specific capital fixed in the home. For indicators of capital fixed in the home, we had to rely on the selection of those who separated between Waves 1 and 2. Neither did Wave 1 contain information about the relative resources

of the partners. This information was available for those who separated between Waves 1 and 2, but unfortunately we could not use it in the multivariate analysis because we ran into statistical power problems.

Variables

The dependent variable was whether the respondent moved at the time of the separation. For those who separated before Wave 1, this variable was measured as whether the respondent's last move took place in the year of the separation or the year thereafter (1) or earlier (0). For those who separated between Waves 1 and 2, it was coded 1 if the respondent answered 'I moved' or 'We both moved' to the question who moved out of the joint home at the moment of separation: the respondent, the ex-partner or both.

We used four indicators of location-specific capital. Two of these were only available for those who separated between the first and second NKPS waves: individual homeownership, and whether the partner moved in with the respondent at the time of partnership formation. We used the questions asked in the first NKPS wave about ownership of the current home to construct a four-category variable for home-ownership before the separation: the home was not owned by either partner, it was owned by the couple jointly, it was owned by the respondent only or it was owned by the ex-partner only. Information about whether someone's ex-partner moved in at the start of the partnership was derived from the dates of the start of the partnership and the respondent's last move before the separation. Note that, for those whose partner did not move in, we do not know whether the respondent moved in with the partner or both moved to a new home. The presence of parents nearby was measured as whether at least one parent was known to live in the respondent's municipality of residence before the separation. Another indicator we used was whether the respondent already lived in that municipality at the age of fifteen. For seven respondents we did not know their place of residence before the separation because they moved more than once around the separation. We assumed these respondents had no ties to the location.

Age was measured in years. Level of education was measured in four categories: up to lower secondary (reference), middle vocational or higher general, higher vocational, and university. We used a three-category variable for whether the couple had joint children and with whom they stayed after the separation: no children or none in either ex-partner's household after the separation; all with the respondent; at least one with the ex-partner. Furthermore, we used information about whether the respondent had a new partner immediately after or even before the separation.

Method

We estimated logistic regression models of whether a respondent moved after the separation. The independent variables for whether the respondent still lived in the same place as at age 15 and whether a parent lived close by were too strongly associated with each other to estimate the effects of these variables in the presence of each other. We therefore ran models with each indicator separately and present the model with the indicator with the greatest effect: whether a parent lived close.

In a first analysis, we only included those respondents who separated between Waves 1 and 2. In this analysis we included both indicators of location-specific capital fixed in the home and the variable for whether a parent lived close. Individual homeownership of the ex-partner perfectly predicted that the respondent moved. We therefore had to exclude the six respondents whose ex-partner was single owner of the home (note that this exclusion also solved a collinearity problem: none of these six respondents had had the ex-partner move in at the start of the partnership). We could, furthermore, not include many control variables, because this resulted in combinations of large effects and large standard errors. For the same reason, we could not run this analysis separately for men and women or include interactions

with gender. After running models with various combinations of control variables, we chose a model with the four indicators of location-specific capital and two important control variables: whether the respondent switched to a new partner, and whether the couple had children who all lived with the respondent. In models with more control variables the standard errors were much larger, but the effect estimates were similar to those in the model we present.

In a second analysis, we used the respondents in both selections. We estimated models for all respondents and for men and women separately. To compare the parameters for men and women, we used seemingly unrelated estimation (Clogg, Petkova & Haritou, 1995; Weesie, 1999). This technique allows for the testing of the null hypothesis that the parameters are the same between models.

4. Results

Descriptive results
The frequencies of the dependent and independent variables are given in Table 1. This table also gives the percentages of respondents who moved after separation in the categories of the independent variables. A first conclusion from this descriptive analysis is that there is a strong association between local ties and moving after separation.

<Table 1 about here>

The location-specific capital fixed in the home itself appears to be of great importance to whether someone moves. The proportion of cases in which a respondent reported that only one partner owned the home was small, but clearly in these cases the homeowner stayed and the other partner moved, as expected. Only one (male) respondent reported moving out of the home he owned, whereas all respondents moved whose ex-partner owned the home. Despite the small numbers in the categories for single ownership, the association with moving out is highly significant. The proportion of cases in which the ex-partner had moved in with the respondent upon partnership formation was somewhat greater than the proportion single owners. The finding is similar to the finding for single ownership: those who already lived in the home before the start of the partnership are much less likely to move. The two indicators of location-specific capital fixed in the home were in fact rather strongly associated with each other. If the respondent was single owner of the home, the ex-partner had moved in with the respondent in more than half of the cases, whereas if the ex-partner owned the home none of the ex-partners had moved in. Conversely, among those who had the ex-partner move in around a quarter was single owner of the home, whereas among those who did not have the ex-partner move in only 4% were single owners.

Ties to the residential location are also strongly associated with whether someone moves. Respondents who had lived in the same area since age 15 or whose parents lived close by were considerably less likely to move after separation. The two types of ties to the location are strongly associated with each other: 83 percent of the respondents who had a long history of living in the same municipality also had at least one of their parents living close and vice versa this was 93 percent. Having at least one parent living close was more strongly associated with who moves than having a long history in the same municipality.

The findings for other variables considered important in moving after separation are similar to those found in previous research for the Netherlands with different data (Mulder & Wagner, forthcoming). Among those who had a new partner around the separation, around two thirds moved after the separation, compared with around one third of those with no new partner. Those respondents with whom the children lived after the separation moved less frequently than those who did not get custody of the children or of only some of them. Those

with higher levels of education were not significantly more likely to move out, as we would have expected. A similar result was found by Mulder and Wagner (forthcoming).

Multivariate results
As becomes clear from the logistic regression model for those respondents who separated between NKPS waves 1 and 2 (Table 2), location-specific capital fixed in the home has a great impact on the likelihood of moving. The likelihood of moving was much smaller if the respondent was single owner of the home than if the couple rented the home. The difference between joint owners and renters in the likelihood of moving was estimated to be small and statistically insignificant. Having had the partner move in also decreased the likelihood of moving considerably.

<Table 2 about here>

Ties to the location also have a marked effect on the likelihood of moving. Having the parents living close by has a strong and significant effect in the expected negative direction (Tables 2 and 3). In an alternative model to the one presented in Table 3, having lived in the same municipality since age 15 also had a negative effect (B = -0.811, -0.620 and -0.980 for all respondents, men, and women respectively, with p = 0.002, 0.154, 0.004) but it was not statistically significant for men and the effect was smaller than that of having the parents living close by. The alternative idea that location-specific capital might help separated people to move to a new home is not supported. These findings suggest that ties to a location not just keep many people in the same region, but keep them in the exact same home. As expected, having a parent living close by mattered more for women than for men.

<Table 3 about here>

All else being equal, women seem to be more likely to move than men. We have to be cautious, however, because we cannot rule out the possibility that women who had just moved might be more likely to respond to a survey than men who had just moved. We know that separated men are underrepresented in the data and this might particularly be the case for those who moved, for example because many of them live in temporary accommodation where they are hard to reach. Age had a negative effect on the likelihood of moving, as expected. This effect was not significantly different between men and women. There were no indications that those with more individual resources were less likely to move. On the contrary: we found a positive and marginally significant effect of university education for men. As expected, having a new partner highly increased the likelihood of moving. The likelihood of moving was particularly small if the respondent had custody of all children (Table 2) and great if the ex-partner had custody of some of them (Table 3).

4. Discussion

In this paper we address the issue whether location-specific capital influences the probability of moving from the joint home after the dissolution of a two-sex co-residential partnership. Two sources of location-specific capital appear to be not just influential, but decisive: single ownership of the home before the start of the partnership, and having had the partner move into the home. Apparently, location-specific capital fixed in the home is particularly important in keeping people from moving after separation, or possibly, in pushing the other partner out of the joint home.
Ties to a residential location were also important to moving after separation. It mattered whether the parents lived close by or whether someone had lived in the same place

of residence for a long time, but the influences of these two variables could not be isolated from each other. The results suggested that closeness of the parents mattered more to whether a separated person moved than the residential history. Although we have to be careful interpreting this finding because of the small number of respondents in the analyses and the strong association between these two indicators, it seems to suggest that the actual local presence of family members is a stronger local tie than a long history in a certain place of residence. In line with the idea that women tend to have stronger family ties than men, the presence of parents had a stronger impact for women.

Previous research has documented that, upon marriage, women are more likely to move than men (Mulder & Wagner, 1993). This difference in the likelihood of moving can be explained from the fact that many women are younger than their male partner, leading to a higher probability that the man already lives in a suitable dwelling or has a greater bargaining power in determining the couple's residential location because he has progressed further in his occupational career. The results in this paper suggest that this type of male dominance in residential choice upon partnership formation (the woman moves into his home) is likely to be followed by male dominance in decisions about who leaves the joint home after separation (the woman moves out again). Even though moving after separation is not necessarily always less desirable than staying – some divorcees might prefer a 'clean break' and start a new household in a new home, others may be happy to move in with a new partner – staying is likely desirable for many: it takes less effort, it is not associated with a decrease in housing quality, and it usually provides better opportunities for maintaining local contacts.

The NKPS data are among the only we know that contain information about separation as well as indicators of location-specific capital. The number of observed separated people is small, however. Only after several more NKPS waves – if these become available – the number of separations will be sufficiently large to permit the testing of the hypotheses with greater statistical power. Meanwhile, we think it is desirable to include more indicators of location-specific capital in standard data collections on family relations.

Because of the small number of cases, we could not include many control variables in the models. Specifically, we did not include measures of relative resources or more measures of the interest someone had in the separation apart from whether he or she had found a new partner. For those who separated between NKPS waves, more information is available. Again, after more waves there will be better opportunities to use that information.

Acknowledgements

References
Andreß, H.-J., Borgloh, B., Gullner, M., & Wilking, K. (2003). *Wenn aus Liebe rote Zahlen werden. Über die wirtschaftlichen Folgen von Trennung und Scheidung*. Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Andreß, H.-J., & Hummelsheim, D. (2009). When marriage ends: Results and conclusions. In H.-J. Andreß & D. Hummelsheim (Eds.), *When marriage ends. Economic and social consequences of partnership dissolution* (pp. 361-383). Cheltenham, UK. Northampton, USA: Edward Elgar.

Booth, A., & Amato, P. R. (1992). Divorce, residential change, and stress. *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage, 18*(1), 205-214.

Clogg, C. C., Petkova , E., & Haritou, A. (1995). Statistical methods for comparing regression coefficients between models. *American Journal of Sociology, 100*, 1261-1293.

DaVanzo, J. (1981). Repeat migration, information costs, and location-specific capital.

Population and Environment, 4, 45-73.

Dewilde, C. (2008). Divorce and the housing movements of owner-occupiers: A European comparison. *Housing Studies, 23*(6), 809-832.

Dewilde, C. (2009). Divorce and housing: a European comparison of the housing consequences of divorce for men and women. In H.-J. Andreß & D. Hummelsheim (Eds.), *When marriage ends. Economic and social consequences of partnership dissolution* (pp. 263-285). Cheltenham, UK. Northampston, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Dykstra, P. A., Kalmijn, M., Knijn, T. C. M., Komter, A. E., Liefbroer, A. C., & Mulder, C. H. (2005). *Codebook of the Netherlands Kinship Panel Study, a multi-actor, multi-method panel study on solidarity in family relationships, Wave 1*. The Hague: Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute (NKPS Working Paper No. 4).

Dykstra, P. A., Kalmijn, M., Knijn, T. C. M., Komter, A. E., Liefbroer, A. C., & Mulder, C. H. (2007). *Codebook of the Netherlands Kinship Panel Study, a multi-actor, multi-method panel study on solidarity in family relationships, Wave 2*. The Hague: Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute (NKPS Working Paper No. 6).

Feijten, P. (2005). Union dissolution, unemployment and moving out of homeownership. *European Sociological Review, 21*(1), 59-71.

Feijten, P., & Mulder, C. H. (2005). Life-course experience and housing quality. *Housing Studies, 20*(4), 571-587.

Feijten, P., & Van Ham, M. (2007). Residential mobility and migration of the divorced and separated. *Demographic Research, 17*(Article 21), 623-654.

Feijten, P., & Van Ham, M. (2010). The impact of splitting up and divorce on housing careers in the UK. *Housing Studies, 25*(4), 483-507.

Fischer, P. A., & Malmberg, G. (2001). Settled people don't move: On life course and (im-)mobility in Sweden. *International Journal of Population Geography, 7*, 335-371.

Gram-Hanssen, K., & Bech-Danielsen, C. (2008). Home dissolution: What happens after separating? *Housing Studies, 23*(3), 507-522.

Mulder, C. H., & Wagner, M. (1993). Migration and marriage in the life course: A method for studying synchronized events. *European Journal of Population, 9*(1), 55-76.

Mulder, C. H., & Wagner, M. (forthcoming). Union dissolution and mobility: Who moves from the family home after separation? *Journal of Marriage and Family*.

Rossi, A. S., & Rossi, P. H. (1990). *Of human bonding: Parent-child relations across the life course*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Sullivan, O. (1986). Housing movements of the divorced and separated. *Housing Studies, 1*(1), 35-48.

Symon, P. (1990). Marital breakdown, gender and home ownership: The owner-occupied home in separation and divorce. In P. Symon (Ed.), *Housing and divorce* (pp. 110-138). Glasgow: University of Glasgow.

Wasoff, F., & Dobash, R. E. (1990). Moving the family: Changing housing circumstances after divorce. In P. Symon (Ed.), *Housing and divorce* (pp. 139-166). Glasgow: University of Glasgow.

Weesie, J. (1999). Seemingly unrelated estimation and the cluster-adjusted sandwich estimator. *Stata Technical Bulletin, 52*, 34-47.

Table 1: Frequencies of variables (N and % in sample, all, men and women; unweighted) and percentage moved after separation by independent variables (% weighted, Chi square and Cramer's V of cross-tabulation of independent variable by whether respondent moved unweighted)

	N	% in sample			% Moved
		All	Men	Women	
Moved after separation					
No	223	61.9	67.6	58.0	
Yes	137	38.1	32.4	42.0	
Gender (*Chi²* = 3.371, *df* = 1, *p* = 0.066, *V* = 0.097)					
Man	148	41.1			35.1
Woman	212	58.9			43.0
Homeowner (*Chi²* = 17.894, *df* = 3, *p* = 0.000, *V* = 0.321)					
None	66	37.9	39.1	37.3	36.1
Respondent	13	7.5	10.9	5.5	7.7
Partner	6	3.4	1.6	4.5	100.0
Both	89	51.1	48.4	52.7	50.0
Partner moved in (*Chi²* = 12.907, *df* = 1, *p* = 0.000, *V* = 0.272)					
No	147	84.5	84.4	84.5	47.9
Yes	27	15.5	15.6	15.5	14.3
Parents close (*Chi²* = 13.530, *df* = 1, *p* = 0.000, *V* = 0.194)					
No	242	67.2	68.2	66.5	45.4
Yes	118	32.8	31.8	33.5	28.1
In same municipality as at age 15 (*Chi²* = 6.823, *df* = 1, *p* = 0.009, *V* = 0.138)					
No	227	63.1	66.2	60.8	44.4
Yes	133	36.9	33.8	39.2	31.5
Ties to location (*Chi²* = 12.285, *df* = 2, *p* = 0.002, *V* = 0.185)					
None	219	60.8	63.5	59.0	44.7
One	31	8.6	7.4	9.4	48.0
Both	110	30.6	29.1	31.6	27.8
Level of education (*Chi²* = 4.674, *df* = 3, *p* = 0.197, *V* = 0.114)					
Up to lower secundary	106	29.4	24.3	33.0	35.9
Middle vocational/higher general	126	35.0	38.5	32.5	42.5
Higher vocational	89	24.7	26.4	23.6	35.6
University	39	10.8	10.8	10.8	48.6
New partner (*Chi²* = 10.741, *df* = 1, *p* = 0.001, *V* = 0.173)					
No	311	86.4	85.1	87.3	35.1
Yes	49	13.6	14.9	12.7	64.0
Joint children (*Chi²* = 12.007, *df* = 2, *p* = 0.002, *V* = 0.183)					
No children	203	56.4	65.5	50.0	37.2
All with respondent	100	27.8	10.8	39.6	30.4
Some with ex	57	15.8	23.6	10.4	58.6

Note: The mean age in the sample is 37.69 (40.39 for men; 35.81 for women). It is 34.71 for those who moved after separation, and 38.46 for those who didn't move is (weighted values).

Table 2. Logistic regression of whether respondent moved around the time of separation: Separations between NKPS Waves 1 and 2 only

	B	p>|z|
Homeowner (ref. none)		
Respondent	-2.096	0.062
Both	0.135	0.733
Partner moved in	-1.791	0.011
Parents close	-0.885	0.025
New partner	0.853	0.075
All children with respondent	-1.299	0.002
Constant	0.327	0.382
Log likelihood	215.76	
Chi² (6)	11.01	
Significance model	0.004	
Nagelkerke R square	0.086	
N	168	

Table 3: Logistic regression of whether respondent moved around the time of separation (all, men, women)

	All		Men		Women		Difference
	B	p>|z|	B	p>|z|	B	p>|z|	p>|z|
Parents close	-1.131	0.000	-0.473	0.280	-1.678	0.000	0.033
Woman	0.607	0.021					
Age	-0.034	0.006	-0.030	0.134	-0.035	0.030	0.849
Level of education (ref. up to lower secondary)							
Middle vocational/higher general	0.143	0.639	0.403	0.452	0.162	0.686	0.728
Higher vocational	-0.231	0.487	0.542	0.328	-0.768	0.082	0.059
University	0.186	0.664	1.182	0.085	-0.485	0.396	0.068
New partner	0.839	0.014	0.650	0.191	1.039	0.033	0.567
Children with whom (ref. none)							
All with respondent	-0.330	0.257	-1.029	0.213	-0.198	0.562	0.314
Some with ex	1.147	0.001	0.834	0.054	1.525	0.012	0.364
Constant	0.532	0.398	-0.073	0.943	1.421	0.060	
Log likelihood	-212.45		-85.50		-121.00		
Chi² (9¹, 8²)	53.43		15.50		46.42		
Significance model	0.00		0.05		0.00		
Pseudo R square	0.11		0.08		0.16		
N	360		148		212		

1. Model for all respondents, 2. Separate models for men and women