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Es war einmal vor langer langer Zeit in einer weit entfernten Galaxie……..zwei einsam Jedie von der Neugier getrieben und ausgestattet mit SOEP Dataset erforschten sie die unergründlichen Weiten des menschlichen Verhaltensweisen. In dem Dschungel der Daten finden sie auf einmal eine Höhle über der “ Moving out in College” steht. Ein zögern, ein unsicher ausgetauschter Blick und schon marschieren die beiden mit gezückten Lichschwertern(laptops) in da

# Introduction

*‘Both the destination and the timing of young people’s home-leaving are …. crucial in determining later life opportunities.’ (Buck & Scott, 1993)*

Higher education defines the reason and therefore determines the destination for many young people leaving home. On the other hand the number of study courses in Germany increased in the last 10 years by 69% (HRK, 2017) and the dispersion of universities across all German cites gives young people the choice to either stay home or move out to achieve tertiary education. In section 2 we will review several papers, which try to identify the timing of leaving by comparing institutions and social environment across countries. Germany has a rich social welfare system, which tries to provide same possibilities for young people independent of their social background. We assume there have to be other driving factors beyond structural and social environment. Furthermore we hope to prove that these factors not only determine decision process, they are also part of the individual’s human capital, which has impact on their labor outcome, e.g. wage.  Also the action of leaving could be seen as a facet of human capital itself, because it should widen the individual’s social network and therefore endows her with another advantage comparing to the stay home alternative. The German Socioeconomic Panel gives us the chance not only to control for social heterogeneities,  but also identify varieties in personality across the observed individuals. If we could access more detailed information on the households location, which was not possible due to the short time of conducting the research, we could also identify the variety on the dimension of the social structural break each leaving individual faces. This leaves us with the following reduced form of a possible research structure on this question: Starting with a review of the related literature in section 2,  we continue by introducing a basic Roy framework(ROY, 1951) for the decision process, section 4 lays out our estimation strategy, section 5 will describe our results and in the last section we gonna conclude and draw further research possibilities.

# Literature Review

The relevant literature concentrates in principal on varieties in social, institutional and cultural varieties across countries. This field of literature was initiated by (Kiernan, 1986), comparing the age of moving out and the form of residence of young people in six European countries. She finds that young people in Denmark are the first ones to leave, followed by West Germany, France, the Netherlands, Ireland and the UK. Women leaving earlier than men appears across all of these six.

Several papers proof a systematic difference between geographical regions in Europe. (Holdsworth, 2000) compares Britain and Spain and indicates the patterns (Billari, Philipov, & Baizán, 2001) finds looking at cohorts born around 1960 in whole Europe. He states an increase of the leaving age north to south. While the eastern European countries match the tendency of the southern European countries. The median for leaving parental home in Nordic countries is around 20 for southern and eastern European countries around 27. Germany ranks in this data just behind the Nordic countries and on the same stage as France with a median around 22. Across all countries he finds that women leave earlier than men. The reason young people leave home also differs systematically. While in southern countries children leave their parent’s home in a high share for forming a union with their partner and not before finishing education. In the Nordic countries and central European it is vice versa.

(Aassve, Billari, Mazzuco, & Ongaro, 2002)show the same systematic difference by comparing ECHP data. They try to lead this pattern back to the difference in culture but also on the difference in welfare policies.  They divide Europeo in three different welfare regimes:

Southern European Welfare Regime with low level of support for young people. Conservative Continental welfare regimes, which are France and Germany. The third class is defined as Liberal and Social Democratic Welfare Regimes, which include the Nordic Countries and the UK. For the Conservative, Liberal and Social Democratic welfare regime, they can’t proof a significant pattern for family or individual income. While in southern European countries the individual income is highly significant for men and family income for woman. *In anothery paper*(Aassve, Burgess, Chesher, & Propper, 2002)*study US data and find the same reasons for leaving as in southern European countries. Therefore they design a model, similar to the one of job search, to determine the decision of moving out as the successful match on the marriage market. They argue that the income channels through the “good catch effect”(high income individuals get more marriage offers) on the probability to move out earlier.*

(Laferrère & Blanc, 2004) look at the rental assistance reform in France in 1992. The reform included an extension of the assistance from only families with children to all low income households, e.g. students. The number of households  in 1992-1996 rose, compared to same period before the reform, by 3%.  Out of the new formed households the share of households formed by students grew from 15% in the preceding 4 years to 19% in the following years. In (Laferrere, 2004) he argues that this rise has to be interpret with caution, as student numbers increased in the same years due to the increase in young people finishing the High School.

# Theoretical Framework

This chapter deals with the theoretical basis of our analysis,  a simple Roy model setup. Introduced by Roy in 1951 the conceptual framework of the generalized Roy model provides the opportunity to explain self selection behavior by unobserved heterogeneity in the agent’s characteristics  (Roy, 1951) . We will use this approach to illustrate the decision process of individuals to leave their parent’s household during tertiary education.  Note that we will follow the notation in  (Heckman & Vytlacil, 2005).

The model relies on different basic assumptions. Firstly we assume that the agent behaves such that he or she maximizes its utility function. Secondly the wage of an agent i has the following form:

$$log(income\_{i}(ω))=μ\_{ω}(X\_{i})+ε\_{i}$$

where $X\_{i}$ is the agent’s characteristics that influences the income via a the function $μ\_{ω}$. The function $μ\_{ω}$ depends on the decision parameter $ω\in \{0,1\}$ that indicates whether the agent has decided to leave the parental household during tertiary education. $ε\_{i}$ is the change in wages independent of the agent’s characteristics. The independent changes $ε\_{i}$ are assumed to be distributed conditional on the agent’s characteristics $X\_{i}$ according to a normal distribution with mean $0$ and variance $σ\_{ε}$. Further on it is assumed that the log wage of an individual enters the utility function directly without any additionally transformation.
It should be obvious that leaving your parental household during tertiary education is associated with costs. This costs can be of monetary form but could also be difficult to translate in monetary values. Additionally we assume that the costs depend on the characteristics of an individual i. Because of this the cost function is valued in utility terms and denoted as a function $C(X\_{i})$. Moreover we will not discuss any functional form of the cost function to keep the framework as simple as possible.
Following this argument the agent i has two different utility states dependent on its decision.

$$\begin{matrix}&Y\_{i,1}&=log(income\_{i}(1))+θ\_{i}−C(X\_{i})\\&&=μ\_{1}(X\_{i})+ε\_{i}+θ\_{i}−C(X\_{i})\\&Y\_{i,0}&=log(income\_{i}(0))\\&&=μ\_{0}(X\_{i})+ε\_{i}\end{matrix}$$

The indices $0$ and $1$ indicate the decision of the agent. The parameter $θ\_{i}$ is the agent’s additional non income related utility she obtains for leaving its parental household. It is assumed that $θ\_{i}∣X\_{i}∼N(δ\_{θ},σ\_{θ})$ with the population mean $δ\_{θ}$ and variance $σ\_{θ}$. Note that $θ\_{i}$ reflects the heterogeneity regarding the utility surplus of leaving the parental household within the population. In addition we assume independence of $θ\_{i}$ and $ε\_{i}$. Composing the two states together leads to the utility $Y\_{i}(ω)$ of the agent as a function of its decision $ω$.

$$Y\_{i}(ω)=ω Y\_{i,1}+(1−ω) Y\_{i,0}$$

Next we consider the agent’s decision process. An agent i decides to leave its parental household if its surplus $S$ by doing so is positive, or in terms of our framework:

$$\begin{matrix}&ω\_{i}&=1\{S=Y\_{i,1}−Y\_{i,0}>0\}&\\&  &=1\{μ\_{1}(X\_{i})−μ\_{0}(X\_{i})+θ\_{i}+^−C(X\_{i})>0\}&\end{matrix}$$

For further analysis we impute that the function $μ\_{ω}(X\_{i})$ is linear in the agent’s characteristics and that the decision to leave leads to a change in income by $γ$.

$$μ\_{ω}(X\_{i})=βX\_{i}+ωγ$$

Simply inserting (2) in (4) leads to the following condition that determines the agent’s decision:

$$β^+γ+θ\_{i}−C(X\_{i})+^>0$$

$^$ and $^$ denote the differences in the regarding parameters for each decision state. Decomposing $θ\_{i}$ in its mean $δ\_{θ}$ and a variable parameter $ν\_{i}$ and rearranging (5) leads to

$$ν\_{i}+^>−β^−δ\_{θ}−γ+C(X\_{i})$$

Condition (5) provides the opportunity to check different intuitive assumptions on how the agents behave if different parameters of our model are shifted. With holding all other parameters and assumptions about distributional characteristics constant an increase in $δ\_{θ}$ will potentially increase the number of individuals for which (5) is full filled. In other words, a general increase in utility obtained by leaving the parental household during tertiary education within the population will potentially increase the number of individuals for who (5) holds.
Vice versa an increase of the costs $C(X\_{i})$ will work the other way round so that the number of individuals with (5) holding would decreases. This seems to be an intuitive reaction. If costs for leaving your parental household are rising it could be optimal for the individual to decide to stay.
Last but not least an increase in $γ$, the increase in income associated with leaving your parental household, will also lead to a potentially increase of the individuals that decide to leave their parental household. From this perspective the model seems to be accurate to illustrate intuitive reactions of individuals associated with their decisions.

Since we assumed independence of $θ\_{i}$ and $ε\_{i}$, dividing both sides by $σ\_{θ,^}$ will ensure that the left side of the equation follows a normal distribution with mean $0$ and variance $1$. It follows that the probability that this condition holds is equal to

$$P(moving\_{i}=1)=1−Φ(o)$$

with $o=\frac{−β^−μ\_{θ}−γ+C(X\_{i})}{σ\_{θ,^}}$ and $Φ(\dot{)}$ as the cumulative distribution function of a standard normal distribution.

 Some references: (Heckman, 2001; Roy, 1951)

# Variables and Estimation Strategies

## Variables

Our analysis on the decision is based on several determinants which are derived from evidence in the literature and own anticipation:

**Birth cohorts**

(Holdsworth, 2000) points out that reason and destination of young people leaving home has shifted from leaving for marriage and then co-residing with the spouse, to an demand of young people expiriencing independent living, before building up an union with their future companion.

**Gender**

Across all european countries, policy envoirements and social groups (Billari, Philipov, & Baizán, 2001) and (Aassve, Billari, Mazzuco, & Ongaro, 2002) find that women leave earlier than men. Therefore we need to control for students in Germany as well.

**Household income**

It is very intuivly that the houshold income at the time of moving out, is a driving factor. On the other side has Germany student subsidy programs, which should provide a income independent decision of residency. (Laferrere, 2004) shows the househol income ’s effect ambiguity on the decision of leaving home. While parent’s higher income could result in a less constraint choice of a dwelling, it also can indicate better facilities, i.e. space in the parental home.

**Migration Background**

We control for a Migration background not only because (Billari, Philipov, & Baizán, 2001) and (Aassve, Billari, Mazzuco, & Ongaro, 2002) find different patterns across European countries, but also (Jeong, Hamplová, & Bourdais, 2013) show that immigrants in Canada keep the leaving age tendency of their home country for the first generations, before it disappears.

**Parent’s educational background**

We control for the influence by parental education with dummy variables for the achievement of the highest school diploma in Germany(Abitur). It is well documented in the literature, that  a higher parental education raises the probability of the children to go to college. (Holdsworth, 2000) shows that in Britain as well as in Spain higher education of the father raises the probability of moving out to pursue higher education. For Britain she also proves the impact of the mother’s education, while in Spain it doesn’t have a significant effect.

The variables mentioned above were all subject to studies on the behavior of moving out before. In this paper we use a different approach to explain the decisions of a young adult to move out before college graduation. The approach allows to control for heterogeneity in personality as a driving factor for the decision.  We faced for all following Variables the Problem, that they were measured at different at points in time. For members of our treatment group, i.e. for the people moved out during college, we used the data justifiable to be valid at the time of decision taking. For individuals living at home at the end of their study we used data justifiable to be valid 3 years before ending their education. This rule to choose the adequate point of time was also applied for the household income.

**Big Five**

(Allport & Odbert, 1936)  started with  17,953  personality describing words and reduced them 4,505  personality adjectives. Using factor analysis they loaded these adjectives into five subordinate factors. By convention these are today  Openness to experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness and Neuroticism.

 (Caliendo, Fossen, & Kritikos, 2013) describe the personality traits as follows:

Openness to new experience describes the ability for seeking new experiences and exploring novel ideas. Individuals with high scores should be creative, innovative and curious (McCrae, 1987). It is also strongly correlated to cognitive skills, especially to intelligence related to originality and broad-mindedness (Barrick & Mount, 1991).

Conscientious individuals are described as achievement orientated on one side and on the other as hard workers, efficient and dutiful.

Persons with high scores in extraversion are predicted to be assertive, dominant, ambitious, energetic and seek leadership roles (Judge, Higgins, Thoresen, & Barrick, 1999).

Agreeableness focuses on interpersonal relationship. People with a high score are forgiving and have a trusting nature, though they are very cooperative. A low score would indicate a self-centered and hard bargaining individuals.

Neuroticism or as a opposite pole emotional stability as (Caliendo, Fossen, & Kritikos, 2013) uses it. Neuroticism in his negative interpretation, so low scores, are individuals characterized as self-confident, relaxed and able to tolerance stress. Though they can manage performance pressure, remain optimistic and maintain relationships towards others.

These five factors are measured in the SOEP in a battery of 15 questions. We use the insights of the factor analysis in (Dehne & Schupp, 2007) to identify for each of the five the main three items and their algebraic sign on the trait. For the negative items we reverse the ranking and therefore generate each trait by adding the three items and z-normalize them. In (Cobb-Clark & Schurer, 2012)  and (Elkins, Kassenboehmer, & Schurer, 2017) show that for individuals in their adolescence groups a mean-level consistency for at least 4 years. Therefore we can include in the data set for determining the choice only individuals moving out after 2002 or finishing their studies later than 2006.

 (Caliendo, Fossen, & Kritikos, 2013) discuss the explanatory value of further non-cognitive traits, e.g. Locus of Control and Willingness to take Risk. Using a factor analysis they show their value to explain variety in human capital decisions. Therefore we include those two as well, as they are measured in a similar interval as the big five.

**Locus of Control**

The idea of Locus of control was first introduced by (Rotter, 1966). He uses a two dimensional concept describing the internal locus of control (What happens in my life depends on myself) and the external locus of control (What happens in my life depends on fate, luck and the actions of others).

(Berger & Haywood, 2016) use SOEP data to construct a one dimensional locus of control score using five items of the question battery, namely Question 1, 3, 5, 8  and 10. These items are chosen, because they represent a trade off between internal and external locus of control. They run a factor analysis to prove that there is one latent factor behind these five items and to approve the algebraic sign of them. All except the first are reversed and so a higher score indicates a higher internal and a lower external locus of control. They compare their concept to the ones of   (Pinger, Ruhmer-Krell, & Schumacher, 2016) or  (Caliendo, Cobb-Clark, & Uhlendorff, 2015) and find no significant differences. For more detailed analysis and arguments for choosing exactly these five and not more see the appendix of (Berger & Haywood, 2016). We again use the work of  (Cobb-Clark & Schurer, 2012)  and (Elkins, Kassenboehmer, & Schurer, 2017) to assume a consistency of 2 to 3 years.

**Willingness to take Risk**

## Identification

The main problem we were facing during our analysis was that there is no generated variable that could work as a proxy for our topic of interest in the SOEP.  Therefore we developed the following strategy to identify, if an individual had left his or her parental household during tertiary education,  based on the observation of the individual’s household identifier.

We start by filtering all individual who obtained tertiary education from the bio-education data set provided in the SOEP core data.  In the next step we restrict the data set to individuals for who we know when they graduated from university. This reduces the number of individuals from 12877  to only  2511.

Further we had to ensure that we observed individuals before they decided to leave their parental households. Not only because we want to integrate different covariates based on the parental characteristics but also to ensure it is possible to identify the year of leaving. We did this by restricting the sample again based on the ***$stell***variable that provides information about the relationship to the head of household.  We keep only individuals who we observe as children in their original household  before they graduated.  This leads to a additional decrease so that we remain with 1363 individuals.

Lastly we created  a dummy that indicates whether an individual left his or her parental household by comparing the original household number of the individual with the  wave specific household identifier (***hhnrakt***) in every year until his or her graduation./last year observed in tertiary education  We found that from the 1363 individuals 592 stated to left their parental household during their tertiary education.

SOME WORDS ABOUTS BIAS

# Descriptive Statistics

Choice regression:

Covariates:

·         Gender: (Billari, Philipov, & Baizán, 2001) show the woman move out earlier than men accross european countries

·         Parents\_Edu: It is clear that a higher family income generates a better possibility to move out   (Aassve, Billari, Mazzuco, & Ongaro, 2002)

·         Mig\_back: Familys with migration background, maybe stick more together

·         Personality traits, closest year to moving out (Cobb-Clark & Schurer, 2011; Elkins, Kassenboehmer, & Schurer, 2017)

·         Cognitive skills

·         Locus of Control: max 2 year to moving out, as locus Is only intertemporal stable

·         Risk aversion

Wage regression:

                Cross section with Mincer regression for the year 2015.

                Panel Regression with Mincer Regression

* Fixed effects regression
* Random effects regression
* PooledOLS regression

Closer look at impact of moving out:

Effect on first full time labour income after graduating

(Feingold, 1994)(Heckman, Stixrud, & Urzua, 2006)

# Results

##

## Decision

For our analysis on the decision we restricted our sample to individuals finishing studys at the age of 35 or younger. We argue that otherwise, the condition to move out before finishing becomes otherwise irrelevant.

A very intuitive and obvious result is the age of completing education. The later young adults complete tertiary education the higher propensity they show to not live at home at the time of graduation.

Also we observe trends as they were described in the mentioned literature about patterns appearing across all countries. Throughout all sample sizes and after controlling for all possible covariates we find a significant impact of the birth year for people born after 1979. For children born in the nineties this impact gets even larger, stays highly significant and is completely in line with the trends in recent history described in  (Holdsworth, 2000).

The gender variable has throughout all regressions a positive effect on the probability. This is in line with the findings of (Billari, Philipov, & Baizán, 2001) across all European countries.  The insignificance is due to the correlation of gender with personality traits, which will be discussed later.

For the second regression, we include the social background of each individual. This data is missing only for 78 individuals, so we only face a minor reduction. The variables of the first regressions stay, while the only one of significant effect added is the education of the mother. It stays significant except of one regression, which we not gonna grant any further interpretation.

As Locus of Control, Willingness to take Risk and the Big Five were first measured in the 2000s we exclude the seventies dummy variable for these regressions, because none of the students at time of measuring was born before 1970.  Otherwise we would our analysis would suffer a dummy variable bias. Furthermore our sample consists after including the big five of less than half of the original sample. Including locus of control and willingness to take risk we end up with minimum sample size of 485 individuals. Due to this restriction our further interpretations have to be considered with caution. To interpret the interplay and effect of the non-cognitive skills we discuss them using all the regression they are included. Due to the questioning the treatment and control group only consists of individuals finishing tertiary education. As non-cognitive skills play a major role in education decisions (Heckman, Stixrud, & Urzua, 2006) our individuals have a small variance in their skills. Therefore the interplay between skills have a major impact in the significance of variables like household income and gender depending on the regressions analysed. The literature states a gender gap in the  big five (Weisberg, DeYoung, & Hirsh, 2011), in locus of control (Feingold, 1994) and in willingness to take risk (Dohmen). Therefore the gender dummy gets only significant in the last regression, where the most skills are included and thus the most variance is explained. In this regression the household income is positively significant, which is in line with (Laferrere, 2004). The migration background which has a negative effect through all regressions, also reaches almost a significant level, which matches the insights of (Jeong, Hamplová, & Bourdais, 2013).

The only facet of the big five driving significant the decision to move out is Agreeableness. Again this only becomes significant, after including all explanatory variables, which are able for us to control for. This result seems to be intuitive, as a high score indicates a social compatibility, which is key to adapt in new living arrangements.

## Wage Regression

We run several cross-section and panel regressions in order to see if leaving your parental household during tertiary education influences an individual’s earning .  In both settings we start with a standard Mincer-regression in which we include our decision dummy (Mincer, 1974; Mincer, 1958). Subsequently we augment the standard regression with measures for cognitive and non cognitive skills.

### Cross Section

With exception of the first column we include several control variables like the state of residence, social background information and  information regarding the field in which the individual is employed.

As expected the standard mincer factors, years of education, experience and squared experience have sigvaficant effects throughout every of our regressions. This is conform with the impressive importance of the mincer equation in the human capital literature (Heckman, Lochner, & Todd, 2003) . Even our decision dummy shows positive significance on the 10% level in the first expansion of the standard mincer regression framework. Unfortunately this effect vanishes as soon as we include the control variables. We suppose that two main reasons drive this results.

Firstly there is a selection bias because the decision to leave the parental household is associated with a following up process by the GSOEP.  This makes it potentially more unlikely for a concerned individual to stay in the GSOEP compared to an individual that haven’t left his/her parental household.  Following this argument there could be a smaller share of individuals in the GSOEP that correspond to our topic of interest so that the sample in itself is biased.

Secondly there is an identification bias. As written in chapter 4, we could only identify for a round about 10 percent of  all individuals who obtained tertiary education whether they left their parental household or not. This is mostly because of the fragmentary data from the bioedu data set. Therefore it seems to be likely that our dummy variable is biased.

Additionally both biases could be an explanation for the extreme reduction of the identification group from 1363 to  347 individuals  in the 2015 wave.

The results regarding the personality traits summarized by the big fives are ambigious. Only the coefficients for agreeableness and neuroticism are significant on the 5% level through all regressions in which the big fives are included. We find a negative impact on wages for both factors.  An increase of one standard deviation in agreeableness and neuroticism leads to an decrease in wages of  3%, respectively 2.8% (see Table columns). This seems to be conform with the previous literature’s results.  So the reverse of Neuroticism, emotionally stability has a positive impact on wages in   (Heineck, 2011; Judge, Higgins, Thoresen, & Barrick, 1999; Mueller & Plug, 2006; Nyhus & Pons, 2005) and  (Boudreau, Boswell, & Judge, 2001)., whereas agreeableness is associated with negative impact on wages in  (Mueller & Plug, 2006; Boudreau, Boswell, & Judge, 2001) and (Heineck & Anger, 2010).  Additionally   Conscientiousness is significant at the 10% level in the regression where we expand the mincer framework with the big five factors, even when we add the control variables. However Conscientiousness becomes unsignificant as soon as we integrate more personality related variables like locus of control or risk to our regressions. We argue that the mixed results for the impact of Openness on wages in the economic literature  allows to  more or less ignore the unsignificance of Openness ( (Mueller & Plug, 2006; O’Connell & Sheikh, 2011; Heineck & Anger, 2008; Heineck & Anger, 2010; Heineck, 2011)).  Nonetheless our results for Conscientiousness and Extraversion don’t coincide with thesignificant effects found for both factors in (Heineck & Anger, 2010) and (Judge, Higgins, Thoresen, & Barrick, 1999) . Only (Nyhus & Pons, 2005) and (Heineck, 2011) state non significance for  Conscientiousness respectively  Extraversion. We suggest that this could be because of the way we created the big five variables by just taking the average of the dedicated data/questions.
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Observations &&&&&&&&&
Pseudo R² &&&&&&&&&

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | female | abschlussalter | 70er | 80er | 90er | v\_abitur | m\_abitur | mig | auszugsincome | open | cons | extra | agree | neuro | risk | locus |
| count | 276.0 | 276.000000 | 276.000000 | 276.000000 | 276.000000 | 276.000000 | 276.000000 | 276.000000 | 276.000000 | 276.000000 | 276.000000 | 276.000000 | 276.000000 | 276.000000 | 276.000000 | 276.000000 |
| mean | 0.0 | 27.257246 | 0.257246 | 0.648551 | 0.083333 | 0.438406 | 0.304348 | 0.134058 | 0.145220 | 51.524575 | 43.267943 | 49.524147 | 48.329289 | 47.336647 | 5.318841 | 52.111848 |
| std | 0.0 | 2.766511 | 0.437910 | 0.478290 | 0.276887 | 0.497093 | 0.460967 | 0.341334 | 1.013765 | 9.468405 | 10.657743 | 11.001349 | 9.329814 | 10.190857 | 2.053770 | 8.029654 |
| min | 0.0 | 21.000000 | 0.000000 | 0.000000 | 0.000000 | 0.000000 | 0.000000 | 0.000000 | -1.266237 | 21.913475 | 4.555968 | 16.265535 | 14.688607 | 25.744640 | 1.000000 | 30.799611 |
| 25% | 0.0 | 25.000000 | 0.000000 | 0.000000 | 0.000000 | 0.000000 | 0.000000 | 0.000000 | -0.503271 | 45.847601 | 37.262124 | 42.561835 | 41.959343 | 40.236092 | 4.000000 | 47.282762 |
| 50% | 0.0 | 27.000000 | 0.000000 | 1.000000 | 0.000000 | 0.000000 | 0.000000 | 0.000000 | -0.043518 | 51.357707 | 44.530159 | 51.357569 | 49.596354 | 46.501227 | 6.000000 | 51.403549 |
| 75% | 0.0 | 29.000000 | 1.000000 | 1.000000 | 0.000000 | 1.000000 | 1.000000 | 0.000000 | 0.555408 | 57.591231 | 51.066941 | 57.349664 | 55.594711 | 54.710732 | 7.000000 | 57.323995 |
| max | 0.0 | 35.000000 | 1.000000 | 1.000000 | 1.000000 | 1.000000 | 1.000000 | 1.000000 | 7.998121 | 71.313444 | 62.700246 | 69.467964 | 66.898161 | 73.303842 | 9.000000 | 76.128275 |

### women

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | female | abschlussalter | 70er | 80er | 90er | v\_abitur | m\_abitur | mig | auszugsincome | open | cons | extra | agree | neuro | risk | locus |
| count | 322.0 | 322.000000 | 322.000000 | 322.000000 | 322.000000 | 322.000000 | 322.000000 | 322.000000 | 322.000000 | 322.000000 | 322.000000 | 322.000000 | 322.000000 | 322.000000 | 322.000000 | 322.000000 |
| mean | 1.0 | 26.500000 | 0.204969 | 0.670807 | 0.121118 | 0.468944 | 0.350932 | 0.149068 | 0.227901 | 53.559771 | 46.142961 | 52.302723 | 49.959664 | 52.144710 | 4.720497 | 51.188617 |
| std | 0.0 | 2.559266 | 0.404307 | 0.470651 | 0.326772 | 0.499811 | 0.478004 | 0.356710 | 1.191073 | 9.292905 | 10.411779 | 9.748378 | 9.714576 | 9.709905 | 2.052917 | 8.177667 |
| min | 1.0 | 21.000000 | 0.000000 | 0.000000 | 0.000000 | 0.000000 | 0.000000 | 0.000000 | -1.454740 | 24.657918 | 15.547420 | 22.695779 | 19.204929 | 25.744640 | 0.000000 | 25.115204 |
| 25% | 1.0 | 25.000000 | 0.000000 | 0.000000 | 0.000000 | 0.000000 | 0.000000 | 0.000000 | -0.441182 | 46.921220 | 40.411085 | 45.728974 | 43.051545 | 45.976061 | 3.000000 | 46.676006 |
| 50% | 1.0 | 26.000000 | 0.000000 | 1.000000 | 0.000000 | 0.000000 | 0.000000 | 0.000000 | -0.017913 | 54.112760 | 47.514989 | 51.928395 | 49.864864 | 51.441617 | 5.000000 | 51.284846 |
| 75% | 1.0 | 28.000000 | 0.000000 | 1.000000 | 0.000000 | 1.000000 | 1.000000 | 0.000000 | 0.746445 | 60.335673 | 54.618894 | 60.252215 | 56.579800 | 59.639951 | 6.000000 | 57.021384 |
| max | 1.0 | 35.000000 | 1.000000 | 1.000000 | 1.000000 | 1.000000 | 1.000000 | 1.000000 | 12.017992 | 71.313444 | 62.700246 | 69.467964 | 66.898161 | 76.602746 | 9.000000 | 72.007488 |
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