Published in final edited form as:

J Marriage Fam. 2013 October ; 75(5): 1164–1180. doi:10.1111/jomf.12058.

Coresidence and Geographic Proximity of Mothers and Adult Children in Stepfamilies

Judith A. Seltzer,

Department of Sociology, University of California, 264 Haines Hall, Box 951551, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1551 (seltzerj@ucla.edu)

Jenjira J. Yahirun, and

Population Research Center, The University of Texas, 305 E. 23rd St., Stop G1800, Austin, TX 78712-1699

Suzanne M. Bianchi

Department of Sociology, University of California, 264 Haines Hall, Box 951551, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1551

Abstract

Children who live with or near a parent provide more care and receive more help from parents than geographically distant children. Stepfamily ties may be weaker than ties between biological kin, but little is known about the geographic proximity of step- versus biological kin. The authors used data from the Health and Retirement Study (N = 13,239 mothers and 45,675 biological and stepchildren) to show that stepchildren and stepmothers are less likely to live together, less likely to live nearby, and less likely to move closer than biological children and mothers. When mothers have only stepchildren, they are less likely to have a coresident child or a child nearby than mothers with both step- and biological children. Coresidence and geographic proximity are lower in stepfamilies formed after divorce than after widowhood. The findings are consistent with a legacy of conflict and strain and the likely competing needs of biological and stepmothers.

This paper was presented at the annual meetings of the Population Association of America, March 31–April 2, 2011, Washington, DC, and the Gerontological Society of America, November 14–18, 2012, San Diego, CA.

Supporting Information

Additional supporting information may be found in the online version of this article:

Table S1 Multilevel Logistic Regression Results Predicting at Least One Coresiding Child Versus No Coresiding Children, Mother's Perspective (N = 65,682 Mother Person Years)

Table S2 Multilevel Logistic Regression Results Predicting Some Children Living 10 Miles Away Versus All Children Living > 10 Miles Away, Mother's Perspective (N = 52,005 Mother Person Years)

Table S3 Full Model for Table 6, Panel A: Discrete Time Multilevel Logistic Regression Results for Moving From Coresidence, Children With 2+ Person Year Observations (N = 18,908 Child Person Years)

Table S4 Full Model for Table 6, Panel B: Discrete Time Multilevel Logistic Regression Results for Moving From > 10 Miles Away to 10 Miles Away or Coresidence, Children With 2+ Person Year Observations (N = 133,744 Child Person Years)

Table S5 Full Model for Table 7, Panel A: Multilevel Logistic Regression Results Predicting Coresidence, HRS Cohort of Married or Cohabiting Mothers (N = 62,707 Child Person Years)

Table S6 Full Model Table 7, Panel B: Multilevel Logistic Regression Results Predicting Whether Child Lives 10 Miles Away Versus > 10 Miles Away, HRS Cohort of Married or Cohabiting Mothers (N = 58,382 Child Person Years)

Table S7 Full Model Table 7, Panel C: Discrete Time Multilevel Logistic Regression Predicting Moving From Coresidence, Children With 2+ Person Year Observations, HRS Cohort of Married or Cohabiting Mothers (N = 5,527 Child Person Years)

Table S8 Full Model Table 7, Panel D: Discrete Time Multilevel Logistic Regression Predicting Moving From > 10 Miles Away to 10 Miles Away or Coresidence, Children With 2+ Person Year Observations, HRS Cohort of Married or Cohabiting Mothers (N = 40,407 Child Person Years)

Keywords

coresidence; families in middle and later life; geographic proximity; Health and Retirement Survey; intergenerational relations; stepfamilies

Family members provide much of the support received by the frail elderly in the United States. Wives look after husbands, and when husbands pass away, adult children care for their widowed mothers. Children who live with a parent or live near a parent provide significantly more care than geographically distant children, but relatively little is known about how living arrangements and proximity evolve over time as parents age (Compton & Pollak, 2009). Children may move near a parent to provide care, or geographically proximate children may shoulder more of the responsibilities of care, perhaps as the consequence of earlier, sometimes unrelated decisions. Alternatively, parents may be the ones to move closer to adult children and grandchildren to spend time with them or to continue the downward transfer of resources that characterizes parent-child relationships earlier in life. The importance of ties between parents and adult children who live near each other guides a renewed emphasis on learning about the factors associated with geographic proximity (Sarkisian, Gerena, & Gerstel, 2007).

Knowledge about the proximity of parents and children in stepfamilies is more limited than knowledge of the geography of kinship in general. High rates of divorce and remarriage in recent U.S. cohorts point to the value of investigating how these family disruptions affect relationships in later life. Compared to biological parents, stepparents and children have more tenuous relationships in early life. The weaker bonds between stepparents and children may be due to the strain from the disruption of biological parents' divorce, ambiguity about stepfamily responsibilities, competition between biological and stepparents, or a combination of these factors. A growing body of evidence has indicated that the tenuous bonds between stepparents and children early in life are perpetuated in later life. Parents and adult stepchildren have been shown to be less likely to live together than parents and biological children at the transition to adulthood (White, 1994), and this difference held later in life as well (Pezzin, Pollak, & Schone, 2008). Adults felt less responsible for providing care to elderly stepparents than to biological parents (Coleman & Ganong, 2008). Adult stepchildren were much less likely to help their older parents than were biological children (Pezzin et al.). In addition, parents who had both step- and biological children received less help overall than did parents who had only biological children (Eggebeen, 1992; Pezzin & Schone, 1999).

This article provides new information about mothers' coresidence and geographic proximity to adult biological and stepchildren. We used longitudinal data from the Health and Retirement Study (HRS) to describe differences in coresidence and proximity and whether stepchildren and stepmothers move closer together as children and mothers age. We restricted our attention to mothers because they are more likely than fathers to be a surviving spouse and therefore to need help from children. We considered these outcomes from children's point of view as well as the mother's point of view.

Background

Geographic Proximity

Most elderly parents and adult children live near each other in the United States. Nearly a quarter of elderly parents lived within 1 mile of a child, and 60% had at least one child located within 10 miles, according to data from the 1987–1988 National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH; Lin & Rogerson, 1995). Using data from the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID), McGarry and Wiemers (2010) found that the median distance between unmarried mothers in their 50s and their closest adult child was just over 3 miles. The HRS data also showed that unmarried mothers and adult children lived in close proximity, with about one third of adult children and mothers living within 10 miles of each other (Bianchi, McGarry, & Seltzer, 2010). Other studies have shown that the location of family members also influences where individuals move (Liaw, Frey, & Lin, 2002; Longino, Bradley, Stoller, & Haas, 2008) or makes them reluctant to move away (Spilimbergo & Ubeda, 2004).

Geographic proximity can improve parents' and children's knowledge of each others' needs and facilitate assistance. Geographic mobility that brings the generations closer together or farther apart responds to the needs and resources of both generations. From the perspective of parents' needs, Rogerson, Burr, and Lin (1997) used longitudinal data from the NSFH to show that increases in parents' functional limitations were associated with increased proximity to adult children. Evidence from the Longitudinal Study of Aging also demonstrated the importance of parents' physical health for geographic proximity to children: Declines in health and loss of a spouse were associated with an increase in parents' geographic proximity to adult children (Silverstein, 1995).

Sometimes the needs of adult children drive decisions about proximity. Adult children who were themselves parents often chose to locate near their parents for assistance with child care or help with chores (Compton & Pollak, 2011). Adult children who experienced divorce also benefited from support made more feasible by coresidence or proximity (Michielin, Mulder, & Zorlu, 2008). Past research focused on ties between biological parents and children rather than stepfamily ties, which are likely to be weaker.

Coresidence Versus Living Nearby

Sharing a home is an important way that children contribute to parents' care later in life (Choi, 2003) and that parents contribute to their children's economic welfare as they launch them into adulthood (Schoeni & Ross, 2005). Although coresidence offers some of the same benefits as close proximity for caregiving and sharing resources (e.g., a parent may not need a car if a child either coresides or lives nearby to help with errands), coresidence also entails a loss of privacy. Hoyert (1991) and Compton and Pollak (2009) both found that the correlates of coresidence and close proximity differed. Although benefits (and costs) accrued to both generations, as parents grew older and their health declined, the balance shifted, and they appeared to benefit more from coresidence and proximity than did their children (Choi; Speare & Avery, 1993). These findings point to the importance of describing and understanding the long-term patterns of coresidence as well as geographic proximity.

Stepchildren Versus Biological Children; Stepfamilies Versus Intact Families

Biological children and parents have been shown to be emotionally closer, more concerned about each other's well-being, and more likely to share economic interests than stepchildren and parents (see Sweeney, 2010, for a review). The social understanding of obligations between family members who have biological ties to each other was much clearer than the understanding of obligations between stepkin (Coleman & Ganong, 2008). Uncertainty about obligations is greater for stepfamilies formed after divorce or nonmarital childbearing than for stepfamilies formed after a parental death because social and legal institutions often assume that children have only two parents at a time (Mahoney, 2006).

Even when stepchildren have a close relationship with a stepparent, stepchildren may face competing demands for their attention from a biological parent. In a stepfamily formed after a divorce, the stepchild is likely to have two living biological parents, both of whom may have remarried. Therefore, compared to biological children in intact families who have only two parents, stepchildren may have three or four parents whose needs and resources affect their living arrangements and geographic proximity. Just as a stepchild may have both biological and stepparents, a parent may have both biological and stepchildren. The legacy of conflict associated with divorce preceding stepfamily formation and the competing demands of additional family members are likely to reduce coresidence and proximity between stepparents and children. Conflict and competing demands are better explanations for weaker stepfamily ties when the stepfamily has been formed after divorce instead of after the death of a parent.

Because mothers may have both biological and stepchildren, a biological mother–child dyad may be part of a stepfamily when all members' step- and biological ties are taken into account. Whether and how biological and stepchildren combine forces to care for their older parents is not well understood. On one hand, theory suggests that children in stepfamilies are exposed to a disrupted environment that may threaten family solidarity and reduce help that all children provide elderly parents. On the other hand, Pezzin et al.'s (2008) findings suggest that biological children in stepfamilies gave their parents more help than those in intact families to compensate for the low levels of support the parent received from stepchildren. From a mother's or stepmother's point of view, having at least one child nearby to help if needed may be what matters. Thus, stepmothers who also have biological children may not differ from biological mothers in proximity to adult children.

Methodological Issues in Studying Family Geographic Proximity

One factor that limits our knowledge about parent and adult child geographic proximity is lack of data on family networks. Few data sets include information about the geographic proximity of all of a parent's children. Some studies ask about proximity to the nearest child; others ask about a random child. The NSFH, the PSID, and the HRS include information about the proximity of more than one child in the parent's family. Rogerson et al. (1997) used NSFH data to show that the identity of the closest child often varied over time in families with more than one child. Variation over time in geographic proximity was due to changes in parents' and children's needs and resources, suggesting that it is important for research on proximity to adopt a dynamic perspective.

A second factor that has varied across studies, making it difficult to compare findings and accumulate knowledge, is whether geographic proximity is assessed from the parent's or the child's perspective. Whether one looks at intergenerational relationships from a mother's perspective or the point of view of her children depends on one's substantive question. A concern with whether older parents are involved with children and receive help from them points to an analysis from the parent's point of view. Another way of asking about intergenerational caregiving is to pose the question: Do children take care of parents? Framed this way, the question motivates research that uses children as the unit of analysis. Both research questions are important, but few studies have explored differences in conclusions about intergenerational relationships from both a parent and child perspective (Freedman, Wolf, Soldo, & Stephen, 1991, was a notable exception).

In this article, we describe the coresidence and geographical proximity of mothers and children from the perspective of each using data with information on all living children, not just a focal child or the nearest child. From the child's point of view, we ask whether stepchildren are less likely than biological children to live with or near an older mother and whether stepchildren become increasingly disconnected from stepmothers over time. From the mother's point of view, we ask how isolated are mothers who have stepchildren and whether those who have both biological and stepchildren are as isolated as those who have only stepchildren. Finally, we ask whether children who have a stepmother because their biological mother died are likely to live closer to their stepmother than those who have a stepmother due to divorce.

Method

Data

We used longitudinal data from the HRS (<http://hrsonline.isr.umich.edu/>), an ongoing biennial U.S. panel survey that is approximately nationally representative of individuals over age 50. The HRS began in 1992 with individuals born between the years 1931 and 1941 and their spouses or partners, and it has since been supplemented with both younger and older cohorts. Younger cohorts enter the HRS as they reach the eligible age. Older cohorts were incorporated first by combining the Assets and Health Dynamics Among the Oldest Old (AHEAD) Survey of individuals born before 1924 with the HRS. We included the AHEAD cohort beginning in 1998, the first year the data collection for the AHEAD and HRS surveys was combined. A second way older cohorts were included in the HRS was by adding a sample of individuals born between 1924 and 1930 in 1998. We kept the AHEAD and 1924–1930 cohorts in the analysis to increase the number of respondents who are in older age.

We restricted our sample to individuals living in households at the first observation, but sample members were followed if they moved into nursing homes. All data came from the HRS Public Use files and the RAND HRS Data Version L file. We used data from 1992 through 2008. The HRS includes oversamples of African Americans and Hispanics and provides sample weights to adjust for unequal probabilities of sample selection. At each wave, the HRS collects information on all biological and stepchildren of the sample member, including measures of distance between each child's home and that of the parent.

Because the HRS is a sample of older adults, information on respondents' children comes from the reports of the parent generation. The data collected about children come from the household roster, a module on family relationships, and the cover sheet for follow-up interviews. Informants other than the children's parent provide information about the children (e.g., another adult in the household may complete the household roster). The primary source of information is the family respondent. Usually, the family respondent remains the same across survey waves. In married-couple households, the HRS directs questions about family relationships and financial matters to different respondents to reduce respondent burden. In one-person households, the family respondent also provides all other information. Wives and female cohabiting partners are more likely to be family respondents, and husbands are more likely to be the financial respondent, but the gendered division of labor in the survey is not absolute (Soldo & Hill, 1995).

We used two samples in the analysis. The first was a sample of biological and stepmothers age 50 and older and their children. We defined the sample in terms of children reported about from the mother's generation. We began with a sample of 54,580 biological and stepchildren. We deleted 2,246 children (4.1%) because of inconsistencies in the biological or step- designation, missing data on financial information (no financial respondent), children's gender, children's age, and children's geographic proximity to mothers across survey waves. We also excluded all observations in which children's mothers were under age 50 and those whose mothers were missing weights ($n = 4,661$ children, 8.5%). Finally, we excluded all observations in which children were under age 25 ($n = 1,998$ children under age 25 during the entire period of observation, 3.7%). This resulted in a sample of 45,675 children and 13,239 mothers.

The second sample was the subset of these children and mothers first observed in 1992 as part of the original HRS cohort. We restricted the analysis to children and mothers (either biological or stepmothers) who were married to or cohabiting with the child's biological father in 1992, when marital history information was gathered for the HRS cohort, and the father remained alive and married to the child's (step)mother throughout the period of observation. We required the biological father's marital history to determine whether his union with the adult child's biological mother ended by death or divorce. From 12,700 children at least 25 years old, we excluded 124 who were born before the father's first marriage (1.0%) and 180 because of incomplete or inconsistent marriage histories (1.4%), resulting in a sample of 12,396 children and 4,056 mothers. Of the 2,235 stepchildren whose stepmothers were first interviewed in 1992, 15% had experienced the death of their biological mother, and 85% had experienced their biological parents' divorce.

We restricted our attention to mothers for both substantive and methodological reasons. Mothers are more likely than fathers to be a surviving parent, and women's reports about their biological children have been shown to be more complete than men's reports (Pendleton, McCarthy, & Cherlin, 1984, cited in Bloom, 1998; Cherlin, Griffith, & McCarthy, 1983). The HRS design, in which women are more likely to be family respondents, also influenced our decision to focus on mothers. HRS data about biological and step- relationships are more complete for the family respondent's relationship to children than for the relationship of the family respondent's spouse or partner to the children

because the HRS did not always ask about the children's relationship to the spouse or partner. Even when mothers were family respondents, their spouse or partner sometimes reported about the children in a subsequent interview. The mother was the only person who reported about the child over the course of the child's history in the HRS data for 83% of the children in our sample. We gave priority to the mother's report about whether a child was her biological child or stepchild instead of using her spouse's or partner's report about how that child was related to the mother.

In our primary analyses, we examined the association between family structure and coresidence and proximity from three points of view or units of analysis: (a) child person years ($n = 206,172$), (b) children ($n = 45,675$), and (c) mothers ($n = 13,239$). The sample of mothers and all of their children was censored when the mother died. The records for children were separately censored if they died, but their mother remained in the sample if she reported about other children. Three percent of children died during the observation period.

Measurement of Key Variables

We examined two types of outcomes: (a) coresidence and (b) proximity among those who did not coreside. The dependent variables and independent variables that indicate children's characteristics were operationalized differently for the analyses of coresidence and proximity from the child's perspective and from the mother's perspective. From the child's perspective, the dependent variable indicates whether a specific child lived with the (step)mother (coded 1 if they lived together and 0 if they did not) and, if not coresident, whether a given child lived close by (coded 1 if the child and mother lived within 10 miles of each other but did not coreside and 0 if they lived more than 10 miles apart). From the mother's perspective, the coresidence dependent variable is whether the mother lived with any of her adult children. The proximity dependent variable (for those not coresiding with any adult children) is whether at least one of her adult children lived within 10 miles of her. We constructed these variables by combining information from the household roster with reports about how far away children who were not in the household lived from the mother. Coresidence and geographic proximity are updated every 2 years when the respondent is reinterviewed. The question about proximity asks explicitly whether children live within 10 miles of the respondent rather than asking the exact number of miles to children's homes.

The HRS obtains a roster of all children of the family respondent and the spouse or partner. The roster includes each child's biological or step-relationship to the family respondent (mother). We used this information to distinguish step- (= 1) and biological children (= 0) and to identify mothers with only stepchildren, those with step- and biological children, and those with no stepchildren.

All multivariate analyses control for characteristics of mothers and children shown by prior research to be associated with coresidence and geographic proximity. For the analyses from the child's perspective, we control for whether the child was a daughter or son; age (25–34, 35–44, 45–54, 55+ years old); whether the child was married; whether the child was a parent and, if so, number of children; years of education; and employment status (not working, working < 30 hours/week, working 30+ hours/week). The analysis treats all of these as time-

varying characteristics, except child's gender and step-or biological relationship to mother. For the analyses from the mother's perspective, we control for whether the mother had only adult sons, adult sons and adult daughters, or only adult daughters; whether the mother had an adult child age 25–34; whether none, some, or all of the children were married; whether none, some, or all of the children were parents; the number of children borne by all of the children combined (i.e., the number of grandchildren the mother had); whether none, some, or all of the children had 16+ years of education; and whether none, some, or all of the children worked at least 30 hours a week. The composition of characteristics of the mother's children varied over time. The analysis sets these variables as time varying.

Mother's characteristics include the number of functional limitations; age in years; whether the mother was married or cohabiting, versus single; number of children in the family; whether there was a child under age 25 living with the mother; years of education; employment status (not working, working < 30 hours/week, working 30+ hours/week); wealth quintile; and the mother's race/ethnicity (non-Hispanic, non-Black (i.e., White or other race); non-Hispanic Black; Hispanic). Functional limitations are operationalized as in Haas (2008) and include whether the mother had trouble kneeling or crouching, getting up from a chair, sitting for 2 hours, pushing a large object, climbing a flight of stairs, walking one block, walking across the room, bathing, picking up a dime, eating, and dressing. All of the mother's traits are time varying in the analysis except her race/ethnicity.

In analyses of married or cohabiting mothers in the 1992 cohort, we investigate differences between children who had a stepmother because their biological mother died and those who had a stepmother because their biological parents divorced. The models we estimated also control for the biological father's age and number of functional limitations, both indicators of the father's need for help. We could not examine differences between married and cohabiting (step)mothers because only 1% of all child person years were contributed by cohabiting mothers.

Analysis Plan

We first describe how stepchildren and stepfamilies differ from biological children and intact families in coresidence and proximity to mothers. We illustrate the difference between the mother's and child's perspectives. We then describe the characteristics of the person-year data that we use in the multivariate analyses of coresidence and proximity. We use person-level weights in the descriptive tables; multivariate analyses are unweighted. Mothers had multiple children who were observed for multiple waves of data; thus the data are structured so that child person years are nested within individual children, and one or more children can be nested within an individual mother.

To assess the net association between being a stepchild and coresidence and proximity to mothers, we estimate multilevel models that take into account the nested structure of the data. The multilevel models control for unobserved characteristics of individual children and of mothers (families), an important adjustment in light of results from preliminary analyses indicating significant variation both at the child and the mother levels. All variables are entered into the models as fixed effects such that the coefficients from our models can be

interpreted as the average effect across individuals (for the child analysis) and mothers or families (for the mother analysis).

We examine two dichotomous outcomes: (a) coresidence and (b) proximity among those who do not coreside. We first estimate two logistic regressions to describe the baseline living arrangements and proximity: (a) whether the child lived with the (step)mother (1 = coreside) or not (= 0) and (b) whether the child and (step)mother lived within 10 miles of each other (1 = within 10 miles, 0 = more than 10 miles apart) among those who did not coreside. We also estimate these models from the mother's perspective: whether she lived with any adult child (1 = yes) or not (= 0) and, among mothers who did not live with any child, whether she lived within 10 miles of a child (= 1) or more than 10 miles apart (= 0) from all of her children. The multilevel models from the child's perspective take into account unobserved variation among children and mothers (families). From the mother's perspective, the models take into account unobserved variation among mothers (families).

We next investigate whether, compared to biological children, stepchildren who coresided were more likely to leave the parental home and whether stepchildren who lived far away were less likely to move closer to mothers (within 10 miles or into the same household). These models are discrete time event history analyses, also estimated in a multilevel framework. These analyses are restricted to children for whom there are at least two person-year observations ($n = 38,485$ children). These children contributed 198,982 person years, of which 18,908 were coresidence years and 133,744 were years in which a child lived more than 10 miles away from the mother. Although we refer to *person years*, each observation was actually 2 years apart, the time interval between HRS waves. As noted above, all variables are time varying except the child's step- or biological relationship to the mother, gender, and race/ethnicity.

We repeat all analyses of children reported about in the 1992 subsample of married (step)mothers to investigate how stepchildren who had experienced divorce differ from those whose biological mother died. These analyses also include characteristics of the children's biological father.

All multilevel model estimates are from *gllamm* in Stata, version 12.1. Final estimates are from models using Gaussian quadrature with eight integration points.

Results

Stepchildren, Stepfamilies, and Geographic Proximity

The first row of Table 1 shows the distribution of stepfamily relationships for the three perspectives we considered. Living arrangements and proximity are at the first time the child or mother was observed. From the mother's point of view, being in a stepfamily was relatively common. One in five mothers had at least one stepchild at some point during the observation period. In this sample, 14% of children were stepchildren, and stepchildren contributed 12% of the person years that we observed for child-mother pairs.

The next three panels of Table 1 show the distribution of the geographic proximity variable for the full sample and then separately for those with step- and biological relationships. The unit of analysis makes a significant difference for conclusions about how common coresidence is and whether or not children and mothers lived near each other. From the mother's point of view, 22% of mothers (over age 50) lived in the same household as at least one of their adult children. From the perspective of individual children, only 11% of adult children lived with their mother. About 40% of mothers lived more than 10 miles from all of their children, but 60% of children lived more than 10 miles away from their mother from the child's point of view.

The difference in perspectives also is striking for the comparison of living arrangements for those with step- and biological relationships. About 11% of mothers who had at least one stepchild had an adult child living with them, but fewer than 2% of stepchildren and mothers lived together from the child's point of view. Biological children were much more likely to live with their mother than stepchildren (12.4% vs. 1.7%). Compared to stepchildren, biological children and mothers lived in closer proximity even when they did not live together. Almost 81% of stepchildren lived more than 10 miles from their stepmother, but only about 57% of biological children and mothers lived more than 10 miles apart.

Presented in Table 2 are the characteristics of the sample during all child person years observed for the full sample and separately for child person years of coresidence, proximity within 10 miles, and more than 10 miles away. We report these descriptive statistics in person years for consistency with the units of observation in the multivariate analyses that follow. Sons and daughters each contributed half of the person years. Children were observed when they were middle aged (age 41, on average) and their mothers were a mean age of 67. About 60% of the observations were contributed by married children and married mothers. Nearly three quarters of the person years were years in which the adult child was a parent. Mothers with more offspring contributed more child person years than those with fewer offspring, resulting in a mean of a little over four children. Only 5.5% of the person years were years in which a mother had a child under age 25 living at home. The mean number of functional limitations was just over 2. Mothers were less well educated than children (11.9 vs. 13.6 years). Reflecting their different life stages, 74% of children were employed full time compared to only 21% of mothers. Non-Hispanic Blacks contributed 11% of the person years, and Hispanics contributed nearly 8%. The person years spent coresiding and at the two proximities differ on some characteristics. For example, a smaller percentage of stepchild years occurred in the coresiding state, compared to within 10 miles and more than 10 miles away. We explore this in a multivariate context in the next table.

Step Relationships, Coresidence, and Proximity in a Multivariate Context: A Child's Point of View

The results of a multilevel logistic regression predicting whether adult children lived with a (step)mother are reported in Table 3. The odds of a stepchild and mother coresiding are far less likely than the odds for a biological child (odds ratio = .03). Adult daughters were no more likely than sons to coreside, but a number of other characteristics of children are associated with coresidence. Older children are less likely to live with a mother than

children in the 25- to 34-year age range, when many young adults are still establishing independent lives. Children's family circumstances are associated with coresidence: Married children and those who had children of their own were less likely to live with their mother. Children's education is negatively associated with coresidence. Children employed full time were less likely to coreside than those who are not employed, suggesting that coresidence is a way that mothers help their children rather than children supporting mothers.

The characteristics of the child's mother also are associated with coresidence. The odds of coresidence are greater when the mother has more functional limitations, indicating that mothers' needs matter as well as children's needs. Coresidence with a particular child was less likely when the mother was married or had more children. Mother's education, like child's education, is negatively associated with coresidence. Hispanics and non-Hispanic Blacks were more likely to coreside than non-Hispanic, non-Blacks (the vast majority of whom were White).

We report in Table 4 the results from the multilevel logistic regression predicting whether children lived within 10 miles of the mother versus lived farther away, among children who did not live with their mother. Stepchildren and mothers were less likely than biological children and mothers to live within 10 miles of each other (vs. farther way). The associations between other characteristics of children and mothers and living nearby are similar to those for coresidence. For instance, the more functional limitations the mother had, the more likely it was that the mother and child lived within 10 miles of each other. There are a few exceptions to the similarity with the coresidence results. Daughters and mothers were more likely to live near each other than sons and mothers even though there were no gender differences in coresidence (see Table 3). Compared to adult children who were not parents themselves, adult children who were parents were likely to live closer to mothers than nonparents, perhaps because grandmothers provide child care (Compton & Pollak, 2011).

Step-Relationships, Coresidence, and Proximity From a Mother's Point of View

The relationship of coresidence and geographic proximity to the stepfamily composition variables for the multivariate analysis from the mother's point of view are shown in Table 5. (Results for the full models are presented in online Appendix Tables S1 and S2, available on the *Journal of Marriage and Family* [JMF] website, [http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/\(ISSN\)1741-3737](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/(ISSN)1741-3737)). The results in Panel A of the table indicate that mothers who had any stepchildren were less likely to live with any adult child than mothers who had only biological children. Those who had only stepchildren were even less likely to live with an adult child. The odds of coresidence are only 0.04 for mothers who had only stepchildren (vs. only biological children) compared to 0.31 for mothers who had both step- and biological children (vs. only biological children). The difference between the two types of stepfamilies (those with both biological and stepchildren and those with stepchildren only) is statistically significant ($z = 7.63, p < .001$).

Panel B of Table 5 shows that the odds of living near an adult child are lower for mothers who had both biological and stepchildren than mothers who had only biological children. As with coresidence, those who had only stepchildren were even less likely to have an adult

child nearby. The difference between the two types of stepmothers is also statistically significant ($z = 4.65$, $p < .001$).

Do Stepchildren and Mothers Become Geographically Closer Over Time?

The results of two discrete time event history multilevel logistic regressions from the child's perspective are summarized in Table 6. In Panel A we report estimates of the net association between being a stepchild and moving from coresidence to separate households, and in Panel B we report estimates of the net association between being a stepchild and moving from beyond 10 miles away to within 10 miles or coresidence. The observations for the analysis summarized in Panel A are the person years in which the child and mother coresided and were observed in at least two person years (to determine whether they moved to separate households). The observations for Panel B are person years in which the mother and child were more than 10 miles apart and they were observed at least twice. The table shows the coefficients and odds ratios for the stepchild variable net of the same variables included in Tables 3 and 4. (Full multivariate results are available in online Appendix Tables S3 and S4, [http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/\(ISSN\)1741-3737](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/(ISSN)1741-3737).)

Panel A of Table 6 shows that there is no statistically significant difference in the odds that a stepchild and biological child stop sharing a home with their mother. In contrast, stepchildren and mothers who were already living more than 10 miles apart were less likely than biological children and mothers to move closer together (see Panel B of Table 6).

Whether Stepmothers Entered the Family After a Death or Divorce and Father's Characteristics

The results summarized in Table 7 are based on data from children whose (step)mothers were in the 1992 HRS cohort and married to or cohabiting with the child's biological father. The sample of partnered stepmothers allows us to include two characteristics of biological fathers that indicate the father's likely need for assistance, number of functional limitations and age as well as whether the stepmother joined the family after the child's biological mother died or the biological parents divorced. Cases are censored if either parent died or the union dissolved. The four panels of the table replicate the full analyses with these additional variables. (Detailed results are available in online Appendix Tables S5–S8, [http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/\(ISSN\)1741-3737](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/(ISSN)1741-3737)).

As we found for the full sample, we find that in this subsample stepchildren were less likely than biological children to coreside (Panel A of Table 7) and less likely to live nearby than biological children among those who did not coreside (Panel B). This analysis of change also shows that stepchildren whose parents divorced were more likely than biological children to move from coresidence to a separate household (Panel C), but there is not a significant difference in the odds of departing from coresidence between stepchildren whose biological mother died and biological children. Whether they were in a stepfamily due to divorce or the death of a parent, stepchildren were less likely than biological children to move closer to (step)mothers (Panel D).

The last column of each panel in Table 7 shows the results of the test of differences between stepchildren by reason for being in a stepfamily. Stepchildren who acquired a stepmother

after their biological parents divorced were even less likely to coreside ($z = -2.88, p < .01$) or live near their mother ($z = -9.53, p < .001$) than were stepchildren who acquired a stepmother after the death of their biological mother. Compared to stepchildren whose biological mother died, stepchildren whose parents divorced were more likely to move out of their stepmother's home ($z = 2.67, p < .01$). There is no difference by type of stepfamily (due to divorce or death) in the odds of moving closer to stepmothers among those who lived more than 10 miles away ($z = -1.30, p = .19$).

Finally, biological father's number of functional limitations is positively associated with children's coresidence (Panel A of Table 7) and negatively associated with exits from coresidence (Panel C). Father's age is negatively associated with children's coresidence (Panel A), but it is positively associated with children's moves to closer proximity net of other family characteristics (Panel D). These characteristics of fathers are not associated with closer proximity among parents and children who did not coreside (Panel B).

Discussion

Our study contributes new information about coresidence and proximity of stepmothers and children in later life to show the demographic context in which intergenerational caregiving occurs. We provide strong evidence that the ties of coresidence and proximity are much weaker between stepchildren and stepmothers than between biological children and mothers in later life. Stepchildren and mothers are less likely to live together or in close proximity than biological children and mothers. When they live apart, stepchildren and mothers also are less likely to move closer to each other than biological children and mothers.

Only among adult children and mothers who already lived together is there no statistically significant net difference between a stepchild's and a biological child's odds of moving out of the shared home, although the direction of association is in the expected direction. The lack of difference between step- and biological children in departures from coresidence may occur because the stepchildren and mothers who live together in adulthood are an unusual group; for instance, they may be stepchildren who grew up in the stepmother's home after the biological mother's death. This interpretation is consistent with our finding that children who acquired a stepmother after their father was widowed are similar to biological children in their departures from coresidence.

Stepchildren whose biological parents divorced are even less likely to live with or near stepmothers than stepchildren whose biological mother died. This suggests that the legacy of conflict associated with divorce and potential competition between biological and stepmothers contribute to the disengagement of stepmothers and stepchildren. When parents divorce, they and their children experience the strains of disruption, which may contribute to continued conflict between parents and interfere with parents' ability to respond consistently to children's emotional needs. Children who lack the emotional buffer created by a close bond with both of their parents may be less able to develop emotionally close ties to new stepparents than children with secure attachments to both biological parents after divorce.

Even if they get along well with their stepmothers, offspring whose parents have divorced have two mothers whose needs may compete for the adult (step)child's time and attention. Adult children are likely to feel obliged to help an older stepparent if they view it as reciprocity for helping to raise them (Coleman, Ganong, Hans, Sharp, & Rothrauff, 2005). Because young children are more likely to live with their biological mother than their biological father after divorce, offspring may have particularly weak feelings of obligation to stepmothers. Stepparents who enter a family when the offspring are adults are likely to be especially disadvantaged in this respect.

That other factors also contribute to the tenuous ties between stepchildren and stepmothers is evident from our finding that stepchildren whose biological mothers died are less likely than biological children to live with or near a (step)mother. Stepmothers and children may have weak ties, in part, because they encounter each other after a critical period in childhood when biological mothers and children form close bonds that are reinforced early in life (Faber & Wittenborn, 2010; White, Brinkerhoff, & Booth, 1985), whether the stepfamily was formed after a death or divorce. Our finding of a strong negative effect of divorce—and, to a lesser extent, the death of a parent—on proximity to an older stepmother sets the stage for future research on how the timing of family transitions during childhood affects stepfamily relationships in later life.

The evidence we report in this article almost certainly understates the magnitude of the difference between step- and biological mothers and children, because we were able to observe only the stepchildren whom the stepmother identified in the interview. Children who have lost contact with their biological father, as often happens when parents separate (Seltzer, 2000), are less likely to be reported by their stepmother, who may not even think of them as her stepchildren.

There also is a way in which our description of ties between stepmothers and children paints a worse picture of family ties than is fully accurate. Our data do not include information about the characteristics of the stepchild's biological mother, such as what her needs and resources are, if she is still alive. One mother's stepchildren are another mother's biological children. The stepchildren we observed may have made decisions about where and with whom to live on the basis of their biological mother's needs and resources. Our results showing greater geographic distance in stepfamilies created by divorce than by death of a parent are consistent with the argument that weaker stepchild-stepmother ties are in part a result of stepchildren devoting time to their biological mother. Yet competition from a biological parent does not explain the fact that even those stepchildren without a living biological mother were more geographically distant from their stepmother compared with biological children and their mother. The explanation for weak stepfamily ties is an important topic for research that would benefit from insights from attachment theory and more complete knowledge of kin availability, at least information about all parents and children.

Our use of the full array of a mother's children shows that mothers in these cohorts are not isolated in old age. Three-fifths of mothers either shared a home with an adult child (22%) or lived within 10 miles of one or more children (37%). From the perspective of any given

adult child, less than half either lived with their mother (11%) or within 10 miles of her home (29%). These cohorts of mothers had relatively large families, so they had a greater chance of having an adult child nearby than may be true for recent cohorts of mothers whose fertility is lower. As these mothers with smaller families move into older ages, they may be more structurally isolated from their offspring than the mothers in our analysis. These smaller families also may be more complex in the combination of biological and stepkin than in the past in light of high rates of union dissolution and repartnering. An important question to address in research on how offspring balance responsibilities to older parents and stepparents is how the number of offspring interacts with the step- and biological composition of the offspring to affect intergenerational caregiving. This research also should attend to whether differences between how brothers and sisters approach caregiving carry over into stepsibling relationships in light of the gendered nature of care work.

Because we used information on all of a mother's children, our findings suggest that biological children may compensate, in part, for the low levels of coresidence and proximity of stepchildren (Pezzin et al., 2008). When mothers have both biological and stepchildren, mothers are relatively more likely to have a coresiding adult child and more likely to have an adult child nearby than mothers who have only stepchildren. But mothers with both biological and stepchildren are still much less likely to live with or near any children than mothers with only biological children. Strain and conflict associated with the ambiguity of stepfamily ties for all family members, whether or not a particular dyad is a step relationship, may account for this.

An important member of the children and (step)mother's network is the mother's husband or cohabiting partner, the children's biological father. Our analyses suggest that, once other characteristics of mothers and children are taken into account, when fathers are in poor health, as measured by number of functional limitations, adult children are more likely to live with them and less likely to move out of their shared home. We found no evidence that father's health increases proximity of adult children, but as fathers age children are likely to move closer to them.

Although we attend to a wider array of family members who influence the living arrangements and proximity of older mothers and offspring than in previous research, the stepfamily differences we describe may still mask important variation among stepfamilies. Whether or not offspring spent part of their childhoods living with the stepmother, how stepmother-child relationships develop over time, and, as we have noted, the age at which a child acquires a stepmother may influence proximity later in life.

In addition, it is important for new research to extend our efforts to investigate coresidence and proximity of stepfathers and adult children. According to recent data (Kreider, 2008), children who grow up in stepfamilies are much more likely to live with their biological mother and a stepfather (79%) than with a stepmother and biological father (21%). When young, children who live with stepmothers have more contact with their nonresident biological mother than children living with stepfathers have with their biological father (Stewart, 1999). This may increase competition between biological mothers and stepmothers

for children's attention later in life, compared to competition between biological fathers and stepfathers.

A limitation of our research is that our analyses of change in coresidence and proximity could not examine whether the adult child or mother moved. Zhang, Engelman, and Agree (2012) found that adult children's moves are more common than moves by elderly parents to increase parent-child proximity. Understanding stepfamilies in later life would benefit from attention to who moves and how family members coordinate or compete over who will take care of aging parents, should the need arise. This research should incorporate information about the quality of relationships biological and stepchildren have with their parents, and who helps whom to shed light on how proximity facilitates caregiving.

Much of the information about family relationships in the HRS has added value when the data are used in a way that is different from how they were collected, for instance, data on mothers versus data on all children in a mother's family. Our study is one of a growing number to use child-level data from the HRS and the AHEAD study to examine between- and within-family differences in intergenerational relationships. This is an important enterprise, because the prevalence and experiences of stepfamily life differ for parents and children. The number of studies that investigate the implications of stepfamilies and families formed by cohabitation for parent-child relationships in old age is limited, in part because the demographic trends that contribute to high rates of repartnering are only now beginning to play out in the cohorts represented in the HRS data. These new types of families create challenges for data collection that were not primary concerns when the HRS was originally designed, as spouses and cohabiting partners are becoming increasingly likely to have children from previous relationships. Compared to the past, it is a more difficult task now for one spouse or partner to report about all of his or her own and the partner's children and to characterize the type of relationship.

The complexity of stepfamilies' and quasistepfamilies' lives creates challenges for programs designed to help infirm older persons remain independent. Programs would benefit from knowledge about how biological and stepparents communicate to offspring, some of whom they share and some of whom are the child of only one partner, about health and their perceived need for care. How step- and half-siblings negotiate care for infirm parents also represents unexplored territory. Research on whether and how siblings in stepfamilies manage parents' care would provide insights for social workers and health care providers who often interact with a primary family caregiver but still must manage potentially competing views of less involved family members.

In this article, we have described the outcome of coresidence and mobility decisions that are at least two sided in the sense that both mothers and children make decisions. There are surely more actors involved, though: other children in the family, spouses, and even children's other (biological) parents. Future research, data collection, and programs to support family caregiving will need to consider this broader network in which individuals make mobility decisions that may be particularly important for health and well-being later in life.

Acknowledgments

Research support came from the U.S. Social Security Administration through the Michigan Research Retirement Center, University of Michigan, subcontract to the University of California, Los Angeles, and the California Center for Population Research, University of California, Los Angeles. The views expressed do not represent the opinions or policies of any of the funding agencies. We thank I-Fen Lin, Kathleen McGarry, Robert Pollak, and Merrill Silverstein for helpful advice; Arturo Harker, Matthew Hill, and Kathleen McGarry for assistance preparing the data; and John Henretta for allowing us to use the HRS family data file that he prepared to check our preliminary results.

References

- Bianchi, S.; McGarry, K.; Seltzer, J. Geographic dispersion and the well-being of the elderly; Michigan Retirement Research Center Working Paper 2010–234, University of Michigan; Ann Arbor. 2010. Retrieved from <http://www.mrrc.isr.umich.edu/publications/papers/pdf/wp234.pdf>
- Bloom DE. Technology, experimentation, and the quality of survey data. *Science*. 1998; 280:847–848. [PubMed: 9599156]
- Cherlin AJ, Griffith J, McCarthy J. A note on maritally-disrupted men's reports of child support in the June 1980. *Current Population Survey Demography*. 1983; 20:385–389.
- Choi NG. Coresidence between unmarried aging parents and their adult children. *Research on Aging*. 2003; 25:385–404.
- Coleman M, Ganong L. Normative beliefs about sharing housing with an older family member. *International Journal of Aging and Human Development*. 2008; 66:49–72. [PubMed: 18429483]
- Coleman M, Ganong LH, Hans JD, Sharp EA, Rothrauff TC. Filial obligations in post-divorce stepfamilies. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*. 2005; 43:1–27.
- Compton, J.; Pollak, RA. Proximity and co-residence of adult children: Description and correlates; Michigan Retirement Research Center Working Paper 2009–215, University of Michigan; Ann Arbor. 2009. Retrieved from <http://www.mrrc.isr.umich.edu/publications/papers/pdf/wp215.pdf>
- Compton, J.; Pollak, RA. Proximity, childcare, and women's labor force attachment; National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper No. 17678; 2011. Retrieved from <http://www.nber.org/papers/w17678>
- Eggebeen DJ. Family structure and intergenerational exchanges. *Research on Aging*. 1992; 14:427–447.
- Faber AJ, Wittenborn AK. The role of attachment in children's adjustment to divorce and remarriage. *Journal of Family Psychotherapy*. 2010; 29:89–104.
- Freedman VA, Wolf DA, Soldo BJ, Stephen EH. Intergenerational transfers: A question of perspective. *The Gerontologist*. 1991; 31:640–647. [PubMed: 1778490]
- Haas S. Trajectories of functional health: The “long arm” of childhood health and socioeconomic factors. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2008; 66:849–861. [PubMed: 18158208]
- Hoyert DL. Financial and household exchanges between generations. *Research on Aging*. 1991; 13:205–225.
- Kreider, RM. Improvements to demographic household data in the Current Population Survey:2007; Housing and Household Economic Statistics Division Working Paper, US. Bureau of the Census; Washington, DC.. 2008. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/population/www/documentation/twps08/twps08.pdf>
- Liaw K-L, Frey WH, Lin J-P. Location of adult children as an attraction for Black and White elderly primary migrants in the United States. *Environment and Planning A*. 2002; 34:191–216.
- Lin G, Rogerson PA. Elderly parents and the geographic availability of their adult children. *Research on Aging*. 1995; 17:303–331.
- Longino CF Jr, Bradley DE, Stoller EP, Haas WH III. Predictors of non-local moves among older adults: A prospective study. *Journals of Gerontology: Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*. 2008; 63B:7–14.
- Mahoney MM. Stepparents as third parties in relation to their stepchildren. *Family Law Quarterly*. 2006; 40:81–108.

- McGarry, K.; Wiemers, E. Aging, care-giving, and proximity to mother; Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Population Association of America; Dallas, TX. 2010 Apr.
- Michielin F, Mulder CH, Zorlu A. Distance to parents and geographical mobility. *Population, Space and Place*. 2008; 14:327–345.
- Pezzin LE, Pollak RA, Schone BS. Parental marital disruption, family type, and transfers to disabled elderly parents. *Journals of Gerontology: Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*. 2008; 63B:349–358.
- Pezzin LE, Schone BS. Parental marital disruption and intergenerational transfers: An analysis of lone elderly parents and their children. *Demography*. 1999; 36:287–297. [PubMed: 10472494]
- Rogerson PA, Burr JA, Lin G. Changes in geographic proximity between parents and their adult children. *International Journal of Population Geography*. 1997; 3:121–136.
- Sarkisian N, Gerena M, Gerstel N. Extended family integration among Euro and Mexican Americans: Ethnicity, gender, and class. *Journal of Marriage and Family*. 2007; 69:40–54.
- Schoeni, RF.; Ross, KE. Material assistance received from families during the transition to adulthood. In: Settersten, RA., Jr; Furstenberg, FF., Jr; Rumbaut, R., editors. *On the frontier of adulthood: Theory, research, and public policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 2005. p. 396-416.
- Seltzer, JA. Child support and child access: Experiences of divorced and nonmarital families. In: Oldham, JT.; Melli, MS., editors. *Child support: The next frontier*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press; 2000. p. 69-87.
- Silverstein M. Stability and change in temporal distance between the elderly and their children. *Demography*. 1995; 32:29–45. [PubMed: 7774729]
- Soldo BJ, Hill MS. Family structure and transfermeasures in the Health and Retirement Study: Background and overview. *Journal of Human Resources*. 1995; 30:S108–S137.
- Speare A Jr, Avery R. Who helps whom in older parent–child families. *Journal of Gerontology*. 1993; 48:S64–S73. [PubMed: 8473707]
- Spilimbergo A, Ubeda L. Family attachment and the decision to move by race. *Journal of Urban Economics*. 2004; 55:478–497.
- Stewart SD. Nonresident mothers' and fathers' social contact with children. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 1999; 61:894–907.
- Sweeney MS. Remarriage and stepfamilies: Strategic sites for family scholarship in the 21st century. *Journal of Marriage and Family*. 2010; 72:667–684.
- White, L. Stepfamilies over the life course: Social support. In: Booth, A.; Dunn, J., editors. *Stepfamilies: Who benefits? Who does not?*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum; 1994. p. 109-137.
- White LK, Brinkerhoff DB, Booth A. The effect of marital disruption on child's attachment to parents. *Journal of Family Issues*. 1985; 6:5–22.
- Zhang Y, Engelman M, Agree EM. Moving considerations: A longitudinal analysis of parent–child residential proximity for older Americans. *Research on Aging*. 2012 Advance online publication.

Table 1

Percentage Step-Relationships and Geographic Proximity by Family Relationship for Three Universes: Mothers, Children, and Child Years Observed

Variable	Mothers ^a	Children	Child-person years
Percentage step-relationships	19.5	14.0	12.2
Geographic proximity			
Total sample			
Coresiding	22.3	10.9	7.8
Lives 10 miles	37.4	29.0	29.7
Lives >10 miles	40.3	60.2	62.5
Total (%)	100.0	100.0	100.0
Unweighted <i>N</i>	13,239	45,675	206,172
Step-relationships ^b			
Coresiding	11.0	1.7	1.0
Lives 10 miles	37.2	17.4	15.4
Lives >10 miles	51.8	80.9	83.6
Total (%)	100.0	100.0	100.0
Unweighted <i>n</i>	1,899	6,292	25,166
Biological relationships ^c			
Coresiding	24.3	12.4	8.7
Lives 10 miles	37.5	30.9	31.7
Lives >10 miles	38.2	56.8	59.6
Total (%)	100.0	100.0	100.0
Unweighted <i>n</i>	11,340	39,383	181,006

Note: Percentage distributions are weighted. Children were age 25 and older. Mother's and children's coresidence and proximity are at first observation.

^aFrom the mother's point of view, the location of all children is defined as follows: Mothers who had at least one adult child who is coresiding, mothers who had at least one adult child who lives within 10 miles away and no children who coreside, mothers who had all adult children living more than 10 miles from them.

^bMothers with at least one stepchild at first observation; *children* and *child years* refer to stepchildren.

^cMothers with only biological children at first observation; *children* and *child years* refer to biological children.

Table 2
 Characteristics of Child Person Years for Adult Children, All Person Years, and by Coresidence and Proximity

Variable	All years		Coresiding years		10 Miles years		> 10 Miles years	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Child's traits, child level								
Relationship to mother								
Biological child	87.8		98.5		93.7		83.7	
Stepchild	12.2		1.6		6.3		16.3	
Female	49.9		47.9		51.5		49.3	
Mean age	41.1	9.9	38.0	10.5	40.7	9.6	41.7	9.9
Married	61.8		18.7		66.2		65.0	
Parent	72.6		47.9		78.7		72.7	
Mean number of child's children	1.7	1.5	1.0	1.4	1.9	1.5	1.7	1.5
Mean years of education	13.6	2.4	13.1	2.5	13.2	2.3	13.8	2.4
Child's hours worked								
Not working	18.2		27.7		17.0		17.6	
<30 hours	7.9		11.1		7.8		7.5	
30+ hours	74.0		61.2		75.2		74.9	
Mother's traits, family level								
Mean number of limitations	2.3	2.5	2.6	2.8	2.3	2.6	2.2	2.5
Mean age	66.6	10.1	65.4	10.7	66.3	9.9	66.9	10.1
Married or cohabiting	58.5		43.9		57.7		60.7	
Mean number of children	4.3	2.4	3.7	2.3	4.2	2.3	4.4	2.5
Race/ethnicity								
Non-Black non-Hispanic	81.0		69.5		80.1		82.9	
Black non-Hispanic	11.1		16.9		12.3		9.9	
Hispanic (all races)	7.9		13.7		7.6		7.3	
Mean years of education	11.9	3.1	11.5	3.4	11.7	2.9	12.1	3.1
Labor force status								
Not working	70.9		66.2		70.5		71.8	
<30 hours	7.7		8.8		8.2		7.3	

Variable	All years		Coresiding years		10 Miles years		> 10 Miles years	
	M or %	SD	M or %	SD	M or %	SD	M or %	SD
30+ hours	21.4		25.1		21.3		20.9	
Child <age 25 at home	5.5		8.9		5.9		4.9	
Wealth quintile (defined for person years)								
0-20	20.0		25.4		20.3		19.2	
21-40	20.0		23.4		21.7		18.8	
41-60	20.0		19.7		20.8		19.7	
61-80	20.0		18.3		19.4		20.5	
81-100	20.0		13.3		17.8		21.8	
Unweighted N	206,172		15,986		62,358		127,828	

Note: Percentage distributions and means are weighted.

Table 3

Multilevel Logistic Regression Results Predicting Coresidence by Child and Mother Traits ($N = 206,172$ Child Person Years)

Variable	OR	Coeff.	SE
Child's traits, child level			
Stepchild ^a	0.03	-3.40***	0.15
Female ^a	1.02	0.02	0.06
Age (base: 25–34)			
35–44	0.43	-0.85***	0.05
45–54	0.35	-1.05***	0.08
55+	0.41	-0.89***	0.12
Married	0.06	-2.83***	0.05
Parent	0.51	-0.68***	0.07
Number of child's children	0.83	-0.18***	0.02
Years of education	0.93	-0.07***	0.01
Employment (ref.: not working)			
<30 hours	0.96	-0.04	0.06
30+ hours	0.37	-0.99***	0.04
Mother's traits, family level			
Number of functional limitations	1.08	0.07***	0.01
Mother's age	0.99	-0.01*	0.004
Married or cohabiting	0.41	-0.89***	0.05
Number of children	0.76	-0.28***	0.01
Child < age 25 at home	1.87	0.62***	0.07
Years of education	0.94	-0.06***	0.01
Employment (ref.: not working)			
<30 hours	1.10	0.09	0.07
30+ hours	1.35	0.30***	0.05
Race/ethnicity (ref.: non-Black non-Hispanic) ^a			
Black non-Hispanic	1.79	0.58***	0.09
Hispanic (all races)	3.43	1.23***	0.11
Wealth quintile (ref.: 0–20)			
21–40	1.02	0.02	0.05
41–60	0.99	-0.01	0.06
61–80	0.88	-0.12	0.07
81–100	0.66	-0.41***	0.08
Constant	4.04	1.40***	0.33
Log likelihood		-33,000.0	

Note: All traits are time varying unless noted. OR = odds ratio; Coeff. = coefficient; ref. = reference.

^aTime-invariant trait.

*
 $p < .05$.

 $p < .001$.

Table 4

Multilevel Logistic Regression Results Predicting Whether Child Lives 10 Miles Away Versus > 10 Miles Away ($N = 190,186$ Child Person Years)

Variable	OR	Coeff.	SE
Child's traits, child level			
Stepchild ^a	0.09	-2.37***	0.08
Female ^a	1.31	0.27***	0.04
Age (ref.: 25–34)			
35–44	0.72	-0.32***	0.03
45–54	0.65	-0.43***	0.05
55+	0.66	-0.41***	0.07
Married	0.94	-0.06*	0.03
Parent	1.53	-0.43***	0.04
Number of child's children	0.99	-0.01	0.01
Years of education	0.84	-0.17***	0.01
Employment (ref.: not working)			
<30 hours	1.09	-0.08	0.04
30+ hours	1.07	-0.07*	0.03
Mother's traits, family level			
Number of functional limitations	1.03	0.03***	0.01
Mother's age	0.97	-0.03***	0.003
Married or cohabiting	0.92	-0.08*	0.04
Number of children	0.94	-0.06***	0.01
Child < age 25 at home	1.16	0.15**	0.05
Years of education	0.92	-0.09***	0.01
Employment (ref.: not working)			
<30 hours	1.15	0.14**	0.04
30+ hours	1.11	0.10**	0.03
Race/ethnicity (ref.: non-Black non-Hispanic) ^a			
Black non-Hispanic	1.63	0.49***	0.09
Hispanic (all races)	0.63	-0.46***	0.11
Wealth quintile (ref.: 0–20)			
21–40	1.19	0.17***	0.04
41–60	1.14	-0.13**	0.04
61–80	0.11	-0.10*	0.05
81–100	1.04	0.04	0.05
Constant	29.10	3.37***	0.26
Log likelihood		-80,306.4	

Note: All traits are time varying unless noted. Odds ratios (ORs) and coefficients (Coeff.) were estimated for children who do not live with their (step)mother. ref. = reference.

^aTime-invariant trait.

*
 $p < .05$.

**
 $p < .01$.

 $p < .001$.

Table 5

Odds Ratios and Coefficients for Stepfamily Composition From Multilevel Logistic Regressions Predicting Whether Mother Has Any Adult Child Coresiding and Whether Mother Has Any Child Within 10 Miles

	OR	Coeff.	SE	Test of difference ^a
A. Coresidence with any adult child ^b				
Mother has: Biological children only (ref.)				
Step- and biological children	0.31	-1.17***	0.08	***
Stepchildren only	0.04	-3.24***	0.26	
B. Whether any adult child lives 10 miles away versus all children who live > 10 miles away ^c				
Mother has: Biological children only (ref.)				
Step- and biological children	0.28	-1.27***	0.08	***
Stepchildren only	0.13	-2.01***	0.15	

Note: Models control for characteristics of all of a mother's adult children, including gender composition, age, marital status, parental status, number of (grand)children, education, and employment status. Mother's characteristics controlled for include number of functional limitations, age, union status, number of children, whether an adult child under age 25 lives with the mother, education, employment status, wealth, and race/ethnicity. The step- and biological composition variable considers children of all ages and varies over time. The proximity model was estimated for mothers who do not live with any adult children. OR = odds ratio; Coeff. = coefficient; ref. = reference.

^aTest of difference between coefficients for step- and biological children versus stepchildren only.

^b $n = 65,682$ mother person years.

^c $n = 52,005$ mother person years.

 $p < .001$.

Table 6

Odds Ratios and Coefficients From Discrete Time Multilevel Logistic Regressions of Two Types of Changes in Proximity

	OR	Coeff.	SE
A. Change from coresidence to separate households ^a			
Child is stepchild (ref.: biological child)	1.10	0.09	0.12
B. Change from > 10 miles apart to 10 miles apart or coresidence ^b			
Child is stepchild (ref.: biological child)	0.51	-0.67***	0.04

Note: Models control for child's and mother's characteristics as in Tables 3 and 4. OR = odds ratio; Coeff. = coefficient; ref. = reference.

^a
n = 18,908 child person years.

^b
n = 133,744 child person years.

p < .001.

Table 7

Selected Coefficients and Odds Ratios From Multilevel Logistic Regressions Predicting Coresidence and Proximity of Adult Child and (Step)Mother, HRS Cohort of Married or Cohabiting Mothers

Variable	OR	Coeff.	SE	Test of difference ^a
A. Whether child coresides ^b				
Biological child (ref.)				
Stepchild due to divorce	0.03	-3.57***	0.23	**
Stepchild due to death	0.12	-2.12***	0.46	
Father's functional limitations	1.04	0.04*	0.02	
Father's age	0.95	-0.05***	0.01	
B. Whether adult child lives 10 miles away versus > 10 miles away ^c				
Biological child (ref.)				
Stepchild due to divorce	0.04	-3.22***	0.13	***
Stepchild due to death	0.35	-1.05***	0.21	
Father's functional limitations	1.01	0.01	0.01	
Father's age	1.01	0.01	0.01	
C. Change from coresidence to separate households ^d				
Biological child (ref.)				
Stepchild due to divorce	1.79	0.58**	0.21	**
Stepchild due to death	0.59	-0.53	0.37	
Father's functional limitations	0.95	-0.05**	0.02	
Father's age	0.99	-0.01	0.01	
D. Change from > 10 miles apart to 10 miles apart or coresidence ^e				
Biological child (ref.)				
Stepchild due to divorce	0.45	-0.80***	0.09	<i>ns</i>
Stepchild due to death	0.58	-0.55**	0.18	
Father's functional limitations	1.00	-0.003	0.01	
Father's age	1.03	0.02**	0.01	

Note: Models control for child's and mother's characteristics, as in Tables 3 and 4. The results presented in the top two panels of the table are from multilevel logistic regressions; the results presented in the bottom two panels are from discrete time multilevel logistic regressions. OR = odds ratio; Coeff. = coefficient; ref. = reference.

^aTest of difference between coefficients for stepchild after divorce versus stepchild after death.

^b*n* = 62,707 child person years.

^c*n* = 58,382 child person years.

^d*n* = 5,527 child person years.

^e*n* = 40,407 child person years.

**p* < .05.

***p* < .01.

****p* < .001.