

## Intergenerational Transfers and the Proximity of Adult Children to their Parents

Janice Compton  
University of Manitoba  
*compton@cc.umanitoba.ca*

Robert A. Pollak  
Washington University in St. Louis  
*pollak@wustl.edu*

**Draft:** April 1, 2008  
*Preliminary and Incomplete*  
*Please do not cite; Comments welcome*

### Abstract

Using NSFH data, we examine the determinants of close proximity between adult children and their mothers, and the manner in which proximity affects transfers of time and money. We depart from previous literature by focusing solely on proximity rather than co-residence, and by analyzing separately partnered and un-partnered adult children. Regression results suggest that close proximity is more probable under circumstances where the adult children are likely to benefit – when they are young and when they have children. We do not find an increased likelihood of proximity when we would expect proximity to benefit mothers – when she is in poor health or over the age of 75. Time transfers between adult children and their mothers are strongly influenced by proximity. These transfers are economically important: the probability of work force participation and hours of work of partnered women are positively related to close proximity to their mothers or mothers-in-law. Money transfers are higher to adult children who live in close proximity to their mothers if they are the only sibling living near her.

## 1. Introduction

The proximity of adult children to their parents has implications for child care and for long-term care of the disabled elderly. The need for non-parental childcare has increased with non-marital fertility, divorce, and the increasing labor force participation of mothers; the ability of grandparents to provide such care depends on proximity. The need for long-term care of the disabled elderly has increased with their increasing life expectancy; the ability of adult children to provide hands-on assistance to disabled elderly parents depends on proximity. Because adult children may benefit from childcare at early stages, and elderly parents from long-term care at later stages, the balance of benefits and burdens of proximity may vary over the life cycle.

The long-term care literature generally focuses on co-residence rather than proximity. Michael, Fuchs and Scott (1980), Costa (1999), and Ruggles (2007) document the decline in intergenerational co-residence in the United States, although they offer different explanations for its decline. Regardless of the reasons for the decline in co-residence, intergenerational exchanges, to the extent that they take place, are increasingly likely to take place across households than within households. Because proximity is crucial to many types of intergenerational exchanges, the determinants of intergenerational proximity deserve careful analysis.

Economists and demographers generally focus on migration rather than proximity. Although proximity patterns are the result of migration decisions of adult children and their parents, these decisions are usually studied separately and their implications for proximity have only recently been examined. Konrad et al. (2002) and, following their lead, Rainer and Siedler (forthcoming), focus on the migration of siblings, hypothesizing that older siblings move away from their parents to avoid the burden of elderly care. Both of these papers rely primarily on German data, although Rainer and Siedler also consider U.S. data.

Unlike the economics literature, the gerontology literature does address the motives for proximity. Glaser and Tomassini (2000) found that in Italy the adult children's characteristics were a more important determinant of intergenerational proximity than parents' characteristics, but Britain parents' characteristics were more important than those of the adult children.<sup>1</sup> On the basis of this, they conclude that the principal beneficiaries of proximity were adult children and elderly parents in Britain.

In this paper we describe the patterns of intergenerational proximity in the United States, analyze the motives for proximity, and investigate the effect of proximity on intergenerational transfers of time and money and on female labor supply. We focus on the proximity of adult children to their mothers because grandmothers are more likely to provide child care than grandfathers, and because elderly mothers are more likely to receive long-term care from adult children than elderly fathers. This gendered pattern of caregiving arises because elderly spouses typically provide care for each other, and the adult children often provide care for the surviving spouse (see Pezzin, Pollak, and Schone (2007).) In practice, this means that elderly wives typically provide care for their disabled elderly husbands, and adult children often provide care for their disabled elderly mothers. Because women typically live longer than men and because women typically marry older men, the surviving spouse is typically female.

---

<sup>1</sup> The economics literature does not cite Glaser and Tomassini (2000).

We depart from the previous literature by distinguishing sharply between co-residence and proximity, and by analyzing separately partnered and un-partnered adult children<sup>2</sup>. Our regression results suggest that co-residence of adult children and their parents is driven by different variables than proximity, so that treating co-residence as a limiting case of proximity is not supported by the data. Furthermore, theory suggests that there is a discontinuity between co-residence and close proximity because they differ not only in distance but also in cost and privacy. Previous studies of proximity most often consider the distances between adult children and their parents, using the adult child's marital status as a control variable (Glaser and Tomassini (2000), Shelton and Grundy (2000), Lin and Rogerson (1995), Rogerson et al. (1993)). Our decision to treat separately partnered and un-partnered adult children was driven by both theoretical and empirical considerations. Theory suggests that location decisions of partnered adult children are taken jointly with spouses or partner and thus may involve bargaining. Furthermore, with increasing age at marriage and increasing geographical mobility before marriage (e.g., going away to college), mothers and mothers-in-law are less likely to live near each other. When this is the case, a couple's decision to live close to his mother rather than her mother will depend on how each spouse perceives the relative costs and benefits and on the spouses' bargaining power. The need to distinguish between partnered and un-partnered is exemplified by our findings about the proximity of mothers and only children. Looking at all adult children combined, we find -- like Konrad et al. (2002) and Rainer and Siedler (forthcoming) -- that only children live closer to their mothers. When we distinguish between un-partnered and partnered adult children, however, we find that this proximity result is statistically significant for only un-partnered adult children.<sup>3</sup>

We find weak evidence that characteristics of the adult children are more important in determining proximity than the characteristics of the mother, a finding similar to the Italian finding of Glaser and Tomassini (2000). This suggests that in the United States child care rather than elder care provides the primary motive for proximity. Overall, however, the results of the proximity regressions are weak. With the exception of education, there is no attribute of child or mother that consistently affects proximity. Thus, while our analysis of the U.S. data does not sharply contradict the eldercare hypothesis of Konrad et al., it provides no support for it.

While the need for child care and elder care may not be primary determinants of proximity, proximity appears to be a primary determinant of care. To determine who benefits from proximity we consider the extent to which transfers between adult children and their mothers are correlated with proximity. We consider both time transfers and monetary transfers. While time transfers such as the provision of childcare by grandmothers are correlated with proximity, economists are interested in the effect of grandmothers' availability on the labor supply of their adult daughters or daughters-in-law.

---

<sup>2</sup> Partnered adult children include married individuals and those who are currently cohabiting with a member of the opposite sex who was interviewed as 'spouse.' We use "married" and "partnered" interchangeably.

<sup>3</sup> Unlike Konrad et al. (2002) and Rainer and Siedler (forthcoming) we do not find that the eldest sibling lives farther away. Indeed, many specifications suggest that the eldest siblings live closer to their mothers.

## 2. Data

We use data from the National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH). Wave 1 (1987-1988) includes a sample of 13007 households, with an oversampling of blacks, Puerto Ricans, Mexican Americans, single-parent families, families with step-children, cohabiting couples, and recently married couples. The primary respondent was randomly selected among the adults in the household. Both the primary respondent and their spouse or partner answered a complete survey. We use data from the second wave of the survey. Wave 2 is a five-year follow-up of the original survey with interviews conducted in 1992-1994<sup>4</sup>. The survey collects information about the parents of both the respondent and the respondent's partner. Mothers' information includes distance from the respondent, marital status, health status and contact with the respondent. We compare two sub-samples: all un-partnered individuals over age 25 whose mothers are alive and living in the United States (ALUS) and all couples in which both spouses are over the age of 25 and both her mother and his mother ALUS. We use the adult child or couple as the unit of observation in order to link couples to both his mother and her mother.

Rainer and Siedler (forthcoming) analyze the first wave of the NSFH, using the elderly mother as the unit of observation. Because the mothers are asked about each child, Rainer and Siedler were able to utilize information on the adult siblings, including education, marital status, proximity to their mother, and employment characteristics. The drawback of our approach is that our sibling information is limited to distance from the respondent and birth order of the respondent.

## 3. Proximity and Co-residence of Adult Children and their Mothers

Co-residence (distance = 0) would be the limiting case of close proximity if distance were the proper measure. But distance isn't the proper measure. For adult children to co-reside with their parents is qualitatively different from living next door because co-residence and proximity differ in two crucial dimensions: cost and privacy. Hence, there is a discontinuity between co-residence and close proximity.

Our first set of empirical results confirms the need to treat co-residence and close proximity as distinct. Table 1 presents the results of regressions on proximity and co-residence for the full sample, including both un-partnered and partnered adult children. Column (A) shows the coefficients from a Tobit regression in which the dependent variable is distance from mother, treating co-residence as the limiting case of proximity. Column (B) presents the results from a logit regression in which the dependent variable equals one if the individual co-resides with his or her mother. (For the logit regressions, we present the coefficients as odds ratios.) Logit regressions in which the dependent variable equals one if the individual lives in close proximity (i.e., within thirty miles) of his or her mother are shown in the final two columns.<sup>5</sup> Column (C) includes co-residents, column (D) excludes co-residents. Hereafter, we shall say that an adult child lives "close" to the mother if they live within 30 miles of one another but do not co-reside.

There are a number of important differences across columns. If we consider

---

<sup>4</sup> We did not use the more recent data from the third wave (2002-2004) because the sample for wave 3 was cut drastically and not randomly.

<sup>5</sup> The thirty mile cut-off for defining close proximity was chosen as it corresponds to previous literature (Rainer and Siedler (forthcoming) in particular, as they also use the NSFH data).

only the Tobit regression, we would conclude that there is no relationship between gender and proximity once we control for other factors. However, comparing columns (B) and (D) we see that women are less likely to live with their mothers, but are more likely to live close to their mothers, compared to men. A similar result is found for children: respondents who have children under 12 are less likely to live with their mothers (column (B)), but more likely to live near them (column (D)). The results for age and education are generally consistent across the columns. African Americans are more likely to live close to their mothers, but are not more likely to live with their mothers. Similarly, marital status impacts the probability of co-residence, but not the probability of close proximity. Never married adults are more likely to live with their mothers than respondents who are divorced, widowed or separated or those who are partnered. Marital status does not influence the likelihood of living close to mother (recall that living close means living within 30 miles but not co-residing). Only children are more likely to live with their mothers and more likely to live close to their mothers. Finally, the Tobit regression suggests that eldest children live closer to their mothers, but again the effect of the variable on co-residence and proximity are opposite: eldest children are less likely to live with their mothers, but more likely to live close.

The results for mothers' characteristics also show the need to distinguish between co-residence and proximity. Adult children live farther away from mothers with college degrees, a result driven by a lower probability of close proximity. Co-residence is less likely with mothers in poor health, and more likely with mothers over the age of 75, but neither of these characteristics impact proximity. The effect of mother's marital status is consistent: children are much more likely to co-reside with un-partnered mothers (including divorced and widowed women) and slightly more likely to live in close proximity.

To summarize: pooling adult children who co-reside with their mothers with those who live in close proximity produces misleading result. Using ordered logit and ordered probit models, both Konrad et al. (2002) and Rainer and Siedler (forthcoming) treat co-residence as the limiting case of proximity (distance = 0). These models yield one set of coefficients so that the regressors are constrained to affect moving out and moving away in the same direction. Although this specification may be suitable for German data, it does not appear suitable for U.S. data.

Based on the results of this section, we focus on proximity, excluding co-residents. Co-residence is often studied in conjunction with long-term care but, with the exception of the un-partnered disabled elderly, the incidence of co-residence is low. (SOURCES). Surprisingly, many adult children who co-reside with their elderly mothers have never left home. Using the PSID, Hotz et al. (2007) find that: "...even by age 85, 6.7 percent of widows are living with children who are observed to have lived continuously in their mothers' households, and this arrangement constitutes one-quarter of those children living with their mothers at that time (p. 15)."

#### **4. Proximity of Couples and their Mothers**

Spouses whose mothers live far from one another cannot locate near both sets of parents. The resolution of this co-location problem has implications for child care, long-term care of the disabled elderly, and for women's labor force participation.

Census data provides a first look at this issue. The U.S. Census does not report

distance from mother, but does report the state in which individuals were born. In 2000, 58 percent of all young married couples consisted of spouses born in the same state.<sup>6</sup> (Table 2, top panel) This proportion differs with education. For "power couples" -- couples in which both spouses hold a college degree -- only 46 percent were born in the same state. (We borrow the "power couples" terminology from Costa and Kahn (2000).) For low-power couples -- couples in which neither spouse holds a college degree -- 73 percent were born in the same state. For part power couples in which only the husband has a college degree 54 percent were born in the same state, while for part power couples in which only the wife has a college degree 57 percent were born in the same state. While these figures have remained fairly constant over the past decades, the proportion of power couples within this age group increased from 14 percent in 1980 to over 20 percent in 2000. If these trends continue, we would expect the percent of couples in which both spouses were born in the same state to decline.

The probability that a couple lives in the birth state of one or both spouse also differs with education (table 3, panel 1). In 2000, 55.5 percent of low-power couples lived in the birth state of both spouses, compared with only 35 percent of power couples. The census data show no evidence of a gender effect: an equal percent of couples live in her and in his birth state.

The second panel of table 3 shows the proportion of young couples living in close to and far from their mothers in the NSFH sample. Only 16 percent of power couples live close to (i.e., within 30 miles of) both mothers, while 41 percent of low-power couples live close to both mothers. At the opposite extreme, almost half of power couples live far from both mothers, while only one-fifth of low-power couples live far from both mothers. There is little evidence of any gender effect for most couple types, but part-power couples in which the wife has a college degree are much more likely to live near her mother than near his.

Taking the mothers' locations as fixed, couples whose mothers live far from one another face different proximity choices than couples whose mothers live close to one another. Couples whose mothers live far apart must choose among living near her mother, living near his mother, or living near neither. Couples whose mothers live close to one another must choose between living near both mothers and living near neither. Table 4 shows the proximity of adult children and their mothers along this dimension<sup>7</sup>. The data indicate a strong pull towards close proximity when both mothers live near each other. Almost 80 percent of couples live near both mothers in this case. For un-partnered adult children and for couples, there is again little evidence of a gender effect in proximity.

---

<sup>6</sup> Calculations by authors. The sample includes all couples in which both spouses are aged 25-40 and were born in the United States. In this section when looking at differences by education we focus on couples in which both spouses are aged 25-30 to highlight the recent trends in education, birth state and proximity.

<sup>7</sup> For couples, NSFH reports the distance between the couple and his mother and between the couple and her mother, but not the distance between his mother and her mother. We treat mothers as living close to each other if (a) the couple lives within 30 miles of both mothers, so the mothers live within 60 miles of one another, or (b) the couple does not live within 30 miles of either mother, but the difference between the distances between the couple and his mother and the couple and her mother is less than 30 miles. There are 1453 observations in which mothers are coded as living close to each other. Of these 288 are from group (b).

## **5. Proximity of Adult Children and their Mothers**

### **5.1 Individual regressions**

Table 5 presents the results of proximity regressions that model whether adult children live close to or far from their mothers. The logit regressions are run separately for partnered and un-partnered adult children. We have not included spousal characteristics in these regressions to make them comparable to previous studies. We add spousal characteristics in section 5.2.

The variables that predict proximity suggest that the adult children are more likely than their mothers to benefit from close proximity. Mothers benefit from proximity when they need care – when they are older, in poor health and, un-married. Mother's characteristics are generally not significant, except that un-partnered mothers are more likely to live in close proximity to their un-partnered daughters.

Adult children benefit from proximity earlier in their lives, when they are working and may need childcare. The age coefficients suggest that un-partnered women aged 25-34 are more likely to live close to their mothers compared to their counterparts aged 30 to 45. For un-partnered men, there is no statistically significant difference in the probability of close proximity for the younger two age groups, but the probability declines after age 45. Couples are more likely to live near his parents when they are younger (25-34), and less likely to live near her parents when they are older (45 and up). Un-partnered respondents with young children are 28 percent more likely to live near their mothers than those without children, although the coefficients are not precisely estimated when the sample is split by gender. Couples with children are more likely to live near his mother but, surprisingly, less likely to live near her mother. The results on age and children are consistent with the hypothesis that close proximity occurs when the adult children are most likely to benefit, but the results are not robust.

Education is the most consistent predictor of greater distance between mothers and their non-co-resident adult children. Adult children with college degrees are approximately half as likely to live close to their mothers as adult children with less education. This may be true for four reasons. First, young adults may leave to attend college and not return. Second, as shown in section four, college educated couples are less likely to come from the same state. Without a common hometown, they are more likely to live far from both mothers. Third, the college educated may face a wider labour market and therefore may be more likely to move away for employment. Finally, if college educated adult children are more successful in employment and earnings, the time transfers and monetary transfers from mother may be less important to them. Controlling for children's education, proximity is also less likely if mothers have a college degree. Mothers with college degrees may be more likely to live away from their families. This may affect the location of their adult children through a demonstration effect or by weakening the incentive to remain if there is fewer extended family members in close proximity. Additionally, the mother's education may affect the children's location decisions if it affects the mother's value of time and, hence, her willingness to provide child-care.

Our results confirm the negative effect of siblings on proximity for un-partnered adult children.. Only children are more likely to live closer to their mothers, although this result is significant only for women. We do not find evidence that eldest children are less likely to live in close proximity to their mothers, in fact we find opposite. Un-partnered eldest children are more likely to live close to their mothers.

## 5.2 Couples regressions

The regressions in table 6 are based on couples in which both mothers are alive and living in the United States (ALUS). The first four columns include the full sample of couples and present results of logit regressions in which the dependent variable equals one if the couple lives within 30 miles of his or her mother. These replicate the regressions from table 5, with spousal characteristics added to the regressors. In the fifth column, we limit the sample to couples for whom both mothers live in close proximity to each other. For these couples, the location decision is ‘live near both mothers, or live near neither.’ The final two columns present the results of a multinomial logit regression on the sample of couples whose mothers do not live near each other. For these couples, the decision is ‘live near her mother, live near his mother, or live near neither.’

Again, the strongest results come from the age and education variables. Proximity declines as the age category of the adult children increases. Couples in which one or both spouses have a college degree are less likely to be in close proximity to their mothers. If only the wife has a college degree, the couple is less likely to live near her mother. In the final three columns, in which the proximity decision is jointly considered, her education is not statistically significant. This is consistent with Compton and Pollak (2007) in which we find that the effect of college education on couples' migration behaviour is largely a male effect. Power couples and couples in which only the husband have a college degree are more likely to migrate compared with low-power couples and couples in which only the wife has a college degree.

The sibling variables are not statistically significant. While siblings and birth order may impact proximity for un-partnered adult children, the effect disappears for couples.

The coefficients on the mother's characteristics yield interesting but puzzling results. To the extent that the needs of mothers can be represented by health, age and marital status, our results are contradictory. When we include the health and age of both mothers, we find that the probability of close proximity is *lower* when mothers are in poor health or over the age of 75. This result is contrary to the hypothesis that long-term care provides an incentive for close proximity. We do find, however, that mothers who are not married are twice as likely to live near their adult children.

The couple results also suggest that if his (her) mother is not ALUS, then the couple is more likely to live close to her (his) mother. When both mothers are ALUS, they are likely to live near each other. Couples are more than three times more likely to live near her mother if they live near his mother and vice versa. , indicating that mothers are likely to live near each other. Overall, the proximity results weakly suggest that close proximity is most likely to occur when adult children are most likely to benefit. In section 6 we consider who benefits from proximity more directly, by analyzing the impact of proximity on intergenerational transfers of time and money, and the impact on women's labour supply.



## **6. Proximity and Transfers between Adult Children and their Mothers**

Konrad et al. (2002) and Rainer and Siedler (forthcoming) attribute the positive relationship between proximity and only child status to the mother's future need for care. They reason that adult children value the well-being of their mothers, but do not want to incur the cost of providing care. Only children have an incentive to locate close to their mothers in order to reduce the cost of providing care. When there are two siblings, however, the older sibling can exploit a first-mover advantage. If the older child moves away from home, the remaining sibling will remain to provide care. Rainer and Siedler (forthcoming) link these sibling incentives to the labour market performance of the home region. They argue that the increased distance between first born children and their parents is due to the willingness of eldest children to leave rural areas or areas of high unemployment. When parents live in urban areas or areas with low unemployment, the birth order effect on proximity is no longer observed.

Timing considerations undermine the plausibility of the long-term care explanation. Young adult children migrate decades before their mothers are likely to need care. For mothers' long-term care needs to influence the migration decisions of young adults, they must have very low discount rates. The possibility that the mother will move also reduces the plausibility of the long-term care explanation. Konrad et al. (2002) argue that the migration of elderly German women is sufficiently low that this is a non-issue, but because mobility of the elderly is much higher in the United States than in Germany, the migration of elderly U.S. women cannot be dismissed.

An alternative explanation of proximity emphasizes child care rather than long-term care. More generally, young adult children may remain in close proximity to their mothers if doing so increases transfers of time and money from their mothers. The desires of young adults children for near-term transfers of time and money, especially time transfers associated with child-care, provide a more plausible explanation of proximity than concern with future long-term care needs. This alternative explanation does not deny that the responsibility for long-term care is likely to fall on the adult children in close proximity to their mothers; it only denies that long-term care considerations are likely to be a major consideration in young adults' migration decisions. Mothers, anticipating that their care will eventually be provided by her children living close by, may be more willing to provide transfers of time and money to these children.

Konrad et al. (2002) acknowledge the potential role of reciprocity in the provision of care and therefore in proximity decisions, however, they argue that reciprocity does not explain the observed differences in migration behaviour of first-born children and their siblings. We do not find that first-born American adult children are less likely to live in close proximity to their mothers and therefore the reciprocity hypothesis may better address the patterns observed in the U.S. To determine who benefits from proximity, we now consider the impact of close proximity on intergenerational transfers.

The NSFH provides information on transfers of time and money between adult

children and their parents<sup>8</sup>. For couples, NSFH reports transfers to and from both his parents and her parents. More specifically, NSFH reports transfers given to or received from "mother," "mother and father," and "father." We refer to the sum of "mother" and "mother and father" as transfers between adult children and their mothers, and this sum is the transfer variable we analyze. For time transfers, the data include indicators of whether the un-partnered child or couple report providing the following categories of help to their mother or mother-in-law in the past month: (1) shopping, errands, transportation; (2) housework, yard work, car repairs, other help around the house; (3) advice, encouragement, moral or emotional support. The NSFH also indicates whether the adult children report receiving help in these categories from their mothers or mothers-in-law. For adult children, NSFH reports two additional categories of help received: (4) childcare while working and (5) childcare not while working. The NSFH also reports monetary transfers over \$200 between adult children and their mothers.

Tables 7A and 7B show the percentage of the sample who report giving or receiving help from their mothers. Transfers between mothers and un-partnered children are shown in table 7A while transfers between mothers and partnered children are shown in table 7B<sup>9</sup>. Five interesting patterns emerge from these data. First, and unsurprisingly, transfers of time are more likely when mothers and children live in close proximity. Second, the positive correlation between time transfers holds not only for transfers that requires a physical presence, but also for emotional help. Third, for partnered children the incidence of transfers is related not only to the proximity with one's mother, but also the proximity of the spouse's mother. For example, couples are less likely to receive emotional help from his (her) mother when they live near her (his) mother than when they live near neither mother. Fourth, although gender is not a predictor of proximity, the pattern of transfers is gendered. The incidence of time and money transfers from her mother exceeds that from his mother in almost all categories. This is consistent with the findings of Duflo (2000), who investigated the effect of the South African Old Age Pension that was extended to black South Africans after the end of apartheid. Duflo found that the well-being of grandchildren, especially granddaughters, was strongly related to payments to their maternal grandmothers. Fifth, for both partnered and un-partnered adult children, monetary transfers are much more likely to flow from mother to adult child than the reverse. Caldwell (1978) claims that before the fertility transition net wealth flowed from children to parents, and that only after the fertility transition did this flow reverse and flow from parents to children. Bergstrom (1996), who summarizes the literature, is skeptical of Caldwell's claims on both theoretical and empirical grounds.

## 6.1 Time Transfers

Table 10 shows the regression results for the probability of time transfers from adult children to mothers, and tables 11A and 11B the results for transfers from mothers to couples and un-partnered children, respectively. The results in table 10 indicate that transfers from adult children to mothers are most strongly influenced by proximity, health

---

<sup>8</sup> The survey questions ask about transfers between the respondent and individuals not living in the same household. Therefore, as in the proximity section, the sample here includes all adult children not currently living with their mothers.

<sup>9</sup> In this section we combine partnered children with both mothers ALUS and partnered children with one mother ALUS.

and marital status of the mother, and the education of the couple. The proximity results are (perhaps unsurprisingly) strong. Couples who live within thirty miles of her (his) mother are between five and seven times more likely to provide general help to her (his) mother than are couples who live farther away. Whether or not the couple provides emotional help to her or his mother is also positively affected by proximity, albeit to a lesser degree.

There is a gender effect. Un-partnered males are much less likely to provide both general help and emotional help to their mothers. We also find that eldest sons are less likely to provide general help to their mothers than their younger brothers, but we find no effect for eldest daughters. The incidence of transfers is not affected by the number of siblings living in close proximity to their mother. Adult children living in close proximity to their mother are equally likely to provide general and emotional help regardless of whether or not other siblings live nearby. To test this, we defined three sub-samples: couples who live more than thirty miles from her (his) mother (base case); couples who live within thirty miles of her (his) mother with her (his) siblings also living close; and couples who live within thirty miles of her (his) mother with no siblings also living close. Wald tests show no significant differences between the coefficients of the latter two groups.

Tables 11A and 11B present the results for the probability of time transfers from mothers to couples and un-partnered adult children.<sup>10</sup> The results indicate the same general patterns: proximity has a strong positive effect on the probability of receiving transfers, but the presence of siblings also in close proximity does not affect the results. Mothers are more likely to provide work-related child care to only children, both men and women. Un-partnered eldest children are more likely to receive general help from their mother, but there is no birth order effect among partnered children.

## 6.2. Proximity and Women's Work Hours

We have seen that mothers provide a substantial amount of childcare and that the provision of child care is related to close proximity. In this section, we consider whether these transfers are merely substitutes for other types of child care and whether close proximity of mothers to their adult children affects hours of work. There are a number of reasons to believe that women may have stronger ties to the labour market if they live in close proximity to their mothers. Childcare provided by grandmothers may be preferable, more flexible and less expensive than other types of child care. Even if the adult child relies on another type of primary child-care, grandmothers may provide other types of general or emotional help that enables women to work more. There has been some work on co-residence and labour supply. Using NLSY data, Leibowitz et al. (1992) find a weak effect of co-residence on the labour supply of young new mothers – but the effect of family proximity on women's labour force participation has largely been ignored in the economic literature.

Simple cross-tabulations show a positive correlation between women's hours of work and proximity to their mothers (table 12). Thirty-eight percent of partnered adult

---

<sup>10</sup> Transfers of emotional help are not included in the tables for space considerations. The results of these regressions follow the same general patterns as the presented results and are available from the authors on request.

women with young children who do not live near either mother work full time. The proportion of women working full-time increases to 44 percent among those who live near both mothers. Among un-partnered women with young children, no relationship is observed in the cross-tabulations; approximately 48 percent of un-partnered women with young children work full-time, whether or not they live near their mothers.

Regression results are presented in table 13. The sample includes all partnered women aged 25-60<sup>11</sup>. Two sets of regressions are presented – logit regressions on the probability of working zero hours, and Tobit regressions on hours of work. The specification presented in columns A indicate that women who live close to their mother or their spouse’s mother are less likely to be non-workers, although these coefficients are not very precise. The Tobit regression indicate that hours worked are unaffected by close proximity to her mother, while women who live near their spouse’s mother work almost two hours more per week. In the regressions in columns B, we interact close proximity to either mother with the presence of children. Mothers of young children are approximately 20 percent less likely to work zero hours if they live near one or both mothers. The Tobit regression suggests a fairly large effect on hours, with mothers of young children working 3.6 more hours if they live near either mother. In columns C we include separate interactions for mothers of young children living close to her mother and living close to her spouse’s mother. However, this specification yields insignificant results. More informative are the results in columns D in which we limit the sample to women with children less than 12. For this sample, proximity to her mother reduces the probability of working zero hours, but the Tobit results show no effect on hours worked. Proximity to his mother yields much stronger results. For the sample of women with young children, proximity to his mother reduces the probability of working zero hours and increases hours worked by over 3 hours per week. In column E we interact proximity with indicators of mother’s needs. We do not find any evidence that women’s work hours or the probability of not working is affected by the close proximity to mothers who are over age 75 and/or in poor health.

Overall, these results suggest that close proximity to mothers has a positive effect on the working hours of women with young children. This result appears to be slightly stronger when the couple lives in close proximity to his mother than to her mother. Proximity to her mother affects mainly the decision to work or not, while proximity to his mother affects both the decision to work and hours worked.

It is possible that the relationship between working hours and close proximity to one or both mothers is endogenous. The direction of this endogeneity is most likely to reduce the effect of proximity to his mother on hours of work. We expect that unobservable attributes that increase hours of work, such as ambition, may also increase the probability of migration. This would reduce the likelihood of close proximity to her mother, but increase the likelihood of close proximity to his mother.

To account for the potential endogeneity, table 13 presents the effect of distance from her mother and her mother-in-law on work hours using an instrumental variable approach. Wald tests for exogeneity show that for most samples, the correlation between the error terms in the proximity equation and the hours equation is not zero, implying that

---

<sup>11</sup> The same analysis was performed on the un-partnered sample. This data suffers from low sample size and the results are not discussed as the regressions results fluctuated widely with small changes in the included regressors.

the endogeneity concerns are valid. The results still indicate a statistically significant effect of close proximity on work hours, but the size of the effect is small. Increasing distance from her mother by thirty miles lowers the estimated weekly hours of work by 0.38 hours. The effect of proximity to her mother-in-law is now smaller. Increasing the distance from his mother by thirty miles lower the estimated weekly hours by 0.09 hours. Proximity affects work hours for women with children and women whose mother (or mother-in-law) is in good health and younger than 75, but does not effect the work hours for women without children and women whose mothers are in poor health or over age 75.

### **6.3. Proximity and Monetary Transfers**

While it is unsurprising that adult children living in close proximity to their mothers may benefit from transfers of time, it is less obvious that they should also benefit from transfers of money. The summary statistics, shown in tables 7A and 7B do not indicate a strong effect of proximity. In fact, compared to adult children who live far from their mothers, the incidence of money transfers is lower among un-partnered children who live close. Proximity is positively related to the receipt of money transfers for partnered children, but the differences are small.

Tables 14 and 15 present regression results for monetary transfers. Table 14 presents the results for logit regressions on the probability of giving and receiving money transfers. The results show a strong sibling effect on the probability that an adult child receives money transfers from their mother. As with the time transfers, we distinguish between (i) adult children who are the only sibling in close proximity to their mother; and (ii) adult children who live close to their mother along with other siblings. The results of the logit regressions show that close proximity increases the probability of receiving transfers only when the adult child is the only sibling in close proximity to their mother. Tobit regression results, shown in table 15, show that the amount of money transferred to an adult child is higher when that child is the only child living close to their mother. This result is strongest for un-partnered adult children, who are 2.3 times more likely to receive monetary transfers if they are the only child in close proximity to their mother.

These regressions also suggest that partnered eldest children are more likely to receive monetary transfers from their mothers and also receive larger transfers. Finally, the gendered pattern of transfers observed in table 6 is repeated here. Un-partnered men are less likely to receive transfers, and receive less on average, than un-partnered women.

A positive correlation between monetary transfers from mothers to adult children and proximity may be due to a number of factors. Gifts and loans may be compensation for time transfers from adult children to their mothers, although the proximity result holds even after controlling for time transfers. Children who stay close to mom may get along better with mom. In other regressions (not shown) indicators of the relationship between mothers and adult children were included but had low significance levels. Proximity may strengthen the ties between mothers and adult children;. And proximity may make parents more aware of the needs of their children, and allow parents to monitor how the gifts and loans are spent.

Overall, the patterns of time and money transfers between mothers and their

adult children suggest that who benefits from proximity depends on the stage of the life-cycle. Adult children benefit from transfers of time and money when they are younger and have children of their own, and when their mothers are not in poor health. Adult children are more likely to provide transfers when they are older and when their mothers are in poor health and un-married. Close proximity has a strong positive effect on both giving and receiving time transfers and also increases women's work hours. The presence of siblings also in close proximity does not effect the probability of giving or receiving time transfers, but does reduce the probability and amount of money transfers.

## **7. Conclusion**

Using U.S. data, we examine the determinants of close proximity between adult children and their mothers. We depart from previous literature by focusing solely on proximity rather than co-residence and by analyzing separately partnered and un-partnered adult children. Regression results suggest that close proximity is more probable under circumstances where the adult children are likely to benefit – when they are young and when they have children. We do not find an increased likelihood of proximity when we would expect proximity to benefit mothers – when she is in poor health or over the age of 75.

Overall however, the results of the proximity regressions are weak. Education of the adult children and their mothers is the only consistently strong determinant of proximity across the different samples. Transfers between adult children and their mothers may be a weak influence in proximity decisions. Yet, the incidence and level of time and money transfers are strongly influenced by proximity. The pattern of transfers suggests that proximity benefits adult children and their mothers at different stages of the life cycle – adult children receive transfers when they are young and when they have children. These transfers have real economic effects – partnered adult women living in close proximity to their mothers or mothers-in-law are more likely to work and work more hours than those living farther away. Transfers from adult children help their mothers when they are older and when their mothers are in poor health and are unmarried.

An interesting sibling effect occurs with monetary transfers. Adult children who are the only adult children in close proximity to their mother are more likely to receive money transfers from their mother, and they receive larger transfers. Adult children who live in close proximity to their mothers do not receive larger transfers if their siblings also live in close proximity to their mother..

## References

Bergstrom, Theodore C., "Economics in a Family Way," *Journal of Economic Literature*, Vol. 24, No. 4, (December 1996), 1903-1934.

Caldwell, John, "A Theory of Fertility: From High Plateau to Destabilization," *Population and Development Review*, Vol. 4, No. 4, (December 1978), 553-577.

Compton, Janice, and Robert A. Pollak, "Why Are Power Couples Increasingly Concentrated in Large Metropolitan Areas?" *Journal of Labor Economics*, Vol. 25, No. 3, (July 2007), 475-512.

Costa, Dora, "A House of Her Own: Old Age Assistance and the Living Arrangements of Older Nonmarried Women," *Journal of Public Economics*, Vol 72, No. 1, (April 1999), 39-59.

Costa, Dora L. and Matthew E. Kahn, "Power Couples: Changes in the Locational Choice of the College Educated, 1940-1990," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 115, No. 4, (November 2000), 1287-1315.

Duflo, Esther, "Child Health and Household Resources in South Africa: Evidence from the Old Age Pension Program," *American Economic Review*, Vol. 90, No. 2, (May 2000), 393-398.

Glaser, Karen and Cecilia Tomassini, "Proximity of Older Women to Their Children: A Comparison of Britain and Italy," *The Gerontologist*, Vol. 40, No. 6, (2000), 729-737.

Hotz, V. Joseph, Gideon Lukens, Kathleen McGarry, and Emily Wiemers, "Living Arrangements among Elderly Women in the Panel Study of Income Dynamics," mimeo, September 19, 2007.

Konrad, Kai, Harald Kunemund, Kjell Erik Lommerud, and Julio R. Robledo, "Geography of the Family," *American Economic Review*, Vol. 92, No. 4, (September 2002), 981-998.

Leibowitz, Arleen, Jacob Alex Klerman and Linda J. Waite. "Employment of New Mothers and Child Care Choice: Differences by Children's Age," *The Journal of Human Resources*, Vol. 27, No. 1, (Winter, 1992), 112-133.

Lin, Ge and Peter A. Rogerson, "Elderly Parents and the Geographic Availability of their Adult Children," *Research on Aging*, Vol. 17, No. 3, (September 1995), 303-331.

Maddala, G. S., *Limited-Dependent and Qualitative Variables in Econometrics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Michael, Robert T., Victor R. Fuchs, and Sharon R. Scott, "Changes in the Propensity to Live Alone, 1950-1976," *Demography*, Vol. 17, No. 1, (February 1980), 39-53.

Pezzin, Liliana, Robert A. Pollak, and Barbara S. Schone, "Efficiency in Family Bargaining: Living Arrangements and Caregiving Decisions of Adult Children and Disabled Elderly Parents" *CESifo Economic Studies*, Vol. 53, No. 1, (March 2007), 69-96.

Rainer, Helmut and Thomas Siedler, "O Brother, Where Art Thou? The Effects of Having a Sibling on Geographic Mobility and Labor Market Outcomes." IZA Discussion Paper No. 1842. (November 2005), forthcoming, *Economica*.

Rogerson, Peter A., Richard H. Weng, and Ge Lin, "The Spatial Separation of Parents and their Adult Children." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, Vol. 83, No. 4, (December 1993), 656-671.

Ruggles, Steven, "The Decline of Intergenerational Coresidence in the United States, 1850-2000," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 72, No. 6, (December 2007), 964-989.

Shelton, Nicola and Emily Grundy, "Proximity of Adult Children to their Parents in Great Britain," *International Journal of Population Geography*, Vol. 6, No. 3, (June 2000), 181-195.



**Table 1: Co-residence and Proximity: Full Sample**

	(A) Tobit Regression	(B) Logit Regression	(C) Logit Regression	(D) Logit Regression
Dependent Variable	Distance from mother	Binary, equals one if co- reside with mother	Binary, equals one if live close to, or with, mother	Binary, equals one if live close to mother. Excludes co-residents
Sample	Full	Full	Full	Full
<b><u>Adult Child Characteristics:</u></b>				
Female Respondent	21.775 (0.575)	0.796 (0.123)	1.104 (0.163)	1.132* (0.092)
Children less than 12	22.600 (0.569)	0.609*** (0.005)	1.130* (0.096)	1.163** (0.041)
Aged 25-34	-110.7*** (0.009)	2.037*** (0.000)	1.393*** (0.000)	1.331*** (0.000)
Aged 45 +	41.076 (0.400)	0.729 (0.131)	0.819** (0.025)	0.827** (0.036)
College Education	255.2*** (0.000)	0.396*** (0.000)	0.452*** (0.000)	0.473*** (0.000)
African American	-113.4** (0.018)	1.013 (0.932)	1.402*** (0.000)	1.411*** (0.000)
Divorced/Widowed/Separated	107.957* (0.077)	0.558*** (0.000)	0.842 (0.131)	0.986 (0.904)
Married, Spouse's Mother ALUS	174.706*** (0.004)	0.086*** (0.000)	0.721*** (0.004)	0.966 (0.767)
Married, Spouse's Mother not ALUS	204.1*** (0.002)	0.117*** (0.000)	0.766** (0.034)	1.028 (0.833)
Only Child	-205.613** (0.010)	2.806*** (0.000)	1.503*** (0.006)	1.389** (0.031)
Oldest Child	-82.732* (0.055)	0.795 (0.221)	1.161* (0.061)	1.198** (0.025)
<b><u>Mother Characteristics</u></b>				
College Degree	95.409** (0.024)	0.848 (0.336)	0.761*** (0.000)	0.758*** (0.000)
Poor Health	6.453 (0.890)	0.641** (0.030)	0.918 (0.321)	0.960 (0.639)
Not-partnered	-109.9*** (0.003)	3.358*** (0.000)	1.276*** (0.000)	1.149** (0.048)
Over age 75	4.278 (0.921)	1.611*** (0.003)	0.999 (0.993)	0.958 (0.590)
Sample	4659	4659	4659	4354
Censored (Co-residents)	305			

NSFH Sample Wave 2. Includes all partnered and non-partnered adult children over the age of 25.  
Coefficients for columns (B) and (C) are presented as odds ratios with p-values in parentheses.

**Table 2: Couples' Birth State**

	Low- Power Couples	Half-Power: She has college degree	Half-Power: He has college degree	Power Couples	All
Percentage of Couples from same birth state					
2000	63.16	57.63	54.76	45.79	58.13
1990	62.11	55.12	53.75	45.18	57.85
1980	63.9	55.89	54.76	48.61	60.06
Percentage of Sample					
2000	58.63	11.03	9.5	20.83	100
1990	64.31	8.11	11.32	16.26	100
1980	67.08	5.02	13.58	14.32	100

U.S. Census (IPUMS) data. Sample includes all couples in which both spouses are aged 25-40 and born in the U.S.

**Table 3: Couples in Birth State and Couples near Mother by Education**

	Low- Power Couples	Half-Power: She has college degree	Half-Power: He has college degree	Power Couples	All
2000 U.S. Census Data <sup>1</sup>					
Live in the birth state of					
Neither	18.1	22.2	29.3	36.2	23.4
Hers	13.4	13.2	14.6	14.1	13.6
His	13.0	15.0	12.9	15.0	13.6
Both	55.5	49.7	43.2	34.8	49.4
1992-1994 NSFH Data <sup>2</sup>					
Lives within 30 miles of					
Neither mother	20.0	26.2	39.1	48.8	29.2
Her Mother	21.6	27.5	17.9	17.3	20.8
His Mother	17.8	16.5	15.4	17.7	17.3
Both Mothers	40.6	29.8	27.5	16.0	32.8

<sup>1</sup>2000 U.S. Census (IPUMS) data. Sample includes all couples in which both spouses are aged 25-40 and born in the U.S.

<sup>2</sup>NSFH Second Wave. Sample includes all couples in which both spouses are aged 25-40 and both mothers are alive and living in the U.S.

**Table 4: Percentage of Adult Children living near their Mother**

	Live near neither mother	Live near her mother only	Live near his mother only	Live near both mothers	Sample Size
<b><u>COUPLES:</u></b>					
Mothers live in close proximity to each other	20.8			79.2	1453
Mothers do not live in close proximity to each other.	37.5	33.2	29.3		1526
Only his mother is alive in the U.S.	47.5		52.5		746
Only her mother is alive in the U.S.	43.4	56.6			936
<b><u>UNPARTNERED ADULT CHILDREN</u></b>					
Men	43.2		56.8		447
Women	42.1	57.9			1006

NSFH wave two. Near is defined as within 30 miles (excluding co-residents). Sample includes all couples over the age of 25, and all un-partnered adults over the age of 25.

**Table 5: Proximity to Mother, Individual Regressions**

Logit Regression Results	Un-Partnered Adult Children			Partnered Adult Children		
Dependent variable: Close proximity to Mother (30 miles). Excludes co-residents.						
	All	Men	Women	All	His Mother	Her Mother
<b><u>Adult Child Characteristics:</u></b>						
Aged 25-34	1.356** (0.03)	1.273 (0.320)	1.372* (0.070)	1.326*** (0.00)	1.393*** (0.004)	1.187 (0.389)
Aged 45 and over	0.742* (0.06)	0.567* (0.056)	0.822 (0.313)	0.871 (0.21)	1.005 (0.972)	0.578*** (0.006)
Children less than 12	1.283* (0.10)	1.682 (0.272)	1.270 (0.143)	1.128 (0.17)	1.306** (0.011)	0.748* (0.090)
African American	1.527*** (0.00)	1.090 (0.745)	1.731*** (0.001)	1.293** (0.05)	1.241 (0.175)	1.368 (0.161)
College Education	0.469*** (0.000)	0.429*** (0.000)	0.495*** (0.000)	0.475*** (0.000)	0.420*** (0.000)	0.650*** (0.008)
Divorce/Widowed/Separated	1.000 (1.00)	1.096 (0.683)	0.991 (0.955)			
Only Child	1.888** (0.05)	1.405 (0.550)	2.255** (0.044)	1.263 (0.18)	1.147 (0.531)	1.570 (0.124)
Eldest Child	1.295* (0.06)	0.973 (0.913)	1.481** (0.017)	1.171 (0.12)	1.205 (0.118)	1.134 (0.508)
<b><u>Mother Characteristics:</u></b>						
College Degree	0.666*** (0.00)	0.663** (0.073)	0.661** (0.012)	0.815** (0.04)	0.807* (0.065)	0.837 (0.343)
Poor Health	1.009 (0.96)	0.953 (0.870)	1.061 (0.740)	0.936 (0.54)	0.978 (0.871)	0.885 (0.464)
Not-partnered	1.223* (0.09)	1.100 (0.656)	1.317* (0.057)	1.144 (0.12)	1.140 (0.199)	1.194 (0.289)
Over age 75	1.009 (0.95)	1.209 (0.445)	0.906 (0.552)	0.930 (0.47)	0.821 (0.108)	1.168 (0.381)
Her Mother	1.036 (0.78)			1.182** (0.05)		
<b>Sample</b>	1483	447	1006	2871	1973	898

NSFH Sample Wave 2. Sample includes adult children over the age of 25. Coefficients are displayed as odds ratios, with p-values in parentheses.

**Table 6: Proximity to Mother, Couple Regressions**

	Full Sample of Couples with both mothers alive				Sample: Mothers live close to each other	Sample: Mothers do not live close to each other	
	Logit Regressions: Proximity to				Logit	Multinomial Logit	
	His Mother	His Mother	Her Mother	Her Mother	Both Mothers	His Mother	Her Mother
<b><u>Adult Child Characteristics:</u></b>							
Aged 25-34	1.54*** (0.00)	1.53*** (0.00)	1.38*** (0.00)	1.30*** (0.00)	1.15 (0.42)	1.01 (0.95)	1.26 (0.13)
Aged 45 and over	0.79** (0.02)	0.82* (0.05)	0.60*** (0.00)	0.59*** (0.00)	0.49*** (0.00)	0.54** (0.01)	0.94 (0.77)
Children less than 12	1.31*** (0.00)	1.27** (0.01)	1.10 (0.26)	1.05 (0.56)	1.13 (0.51)	1.01 (0.94)	1.14 (0.41)
Power Couples	0.47*** (0.00)	0.60*** (0.00)	0.39*** (0.00)	0.46*** (0.00)	0.24*** (0.00)	0.33*** (0.00)	0.45*** (0.00)
Half-Power: He has College	0.67*** (0.00)	0.79** (0.02)	0.52*** (0.00)	0.59*** (0.00)	0.32*** (0.00)	0.45*** (0.00)	0.63*** (0.02)
Half-Power: She has College	0.69*** (0.00)	0.75** (0.02)	0.77** (0.03)	0.82 (0.12)	0.53** (0.01)	0.68 (0.12)	0.75 (0.25)
Black	1.02 (0.90)	0.97 (0.79)	1.12 (0.36)	1.09 (0.52)	1.16 (0.62)	1.73* (0.06)	1.25 (0.47)
She is Only Child	1.10 (0.59)	1.12 (0.50)	1.19 (0.33)	1.23 (0.27)	1.25 (0.61)	1.50 (0.32)	0.71 (0.48)
He is Only Child	1.03 (0.76)	0.99 (0.95)	1.06 (0.57)	1.03 (0.75)	1.34 (0.22)	1.17 (0.43)	1.32 (0.16)
She is Oldest Child	0.85 (0.39)	0.80 (0.24)	1.00 (0.99)	0.95 (0.77)	0.84 (0.61)	0.83 (0.61)	1.44 (0.26)
He is Oldest Child	1.14 (0.21)	1.16 (0.17)	1.12 (0.30)	1.10 (0.39)	1.10 (0.67)	0.76 (0.23)	0.80 (0.31)
<b><u>Mothers Characteristics:</u></b>							
His Mom has College Degree	0.82** (0.02)	0.86* (0.09)	0.80** (0.01)	0.82** (0.03)	0.87 (0.44)	0.80 (0.16)	0.94 (0.67)
Her Mom has College Degree	0.82** (0.03)	0.87 (0.12)	0.76*** (0.00)	0.80** (0.01)	0.77 (0.14)	0.85 (0.33)	0.96 (0.81)
His Mom in Poor Health or over age 75	0.35*** (0.00)	0.32*** (0.00)	0.98 (0.82)	1.00 (0.99)	1.24 (0.26)	1.22 (0.23)	1.05 (0.77)
Her Mom in Poor Health or over age 75	0.82** (0.04)	0.81** (0.03)	0.40*** (0.00)	0.39*** (0.00)	0.98 (0.93)	1.00 (0.98)	0.89 (0.51)
His Mom not Married	1.96*** (0.00)	2.09*** (0.00)	0.88 (0.21)	0.85 (0.12)	1.43 (0.10)	0.98 (0.91)	0.94 (0.75)
Her Mother not Married	0.89 (0.23)	0.84* (0.09)	1.93*** (0.00)	2.04*** (0.00)	0.90 (0.62)	1.00 (0.99)	0.99 (0.94)
Other Mother Deceased	1.81*** (0.00)	3.57*** (0.00)	1.93*** (0.00)	3.55*** (0.00)			
Live near Other Mother		3.22*** (0.00)		3.17*** (0.00)			
Sample	3919		3893		1243	1314	

NSFH Sample Wave 2. Sample includes all couples with both spouses over the age of 25 for whom both mothers are ALUS. Coefficients are displayed as odds ratios, with p-values in parentheses.

**Table 7A : Time and Monetary Transfers, Non-Partnered Sample**

	Full Sample			
	WOMEN		MEN	
	Far	Near	Far	Near
<b>Time Transfers</b>				
<u>Help Received</u>				
(1, 2) General Help	7.02	29.36	7.65	29.66
(3) Emotional Help	65.13	73.43	59.00	65.00
(4) Childcare while working	11.54	29.88	0.00	45.35
(5) Childcare other	12.92	48.82	0.00	46.48
<u>Help Given</u>				
(1, 2) General Help	17.44	63.07	17.57	58.69
(3) Emotional Help	63.95	74.69	57.98	61.86
<b>Monetary Transfers</b>				
Money Received	23.45	20.84	22.31	16.41
Money Given	5.42	6.48	10.40	9.16
Median Amount Received	1000	1000	1000	450
Median Amount Given	500	300	500	350

NSFH Sample Wave 2. Sample includes non-partnered adult children over the age of 25. Sample for childcare categories (4) and (5) includes only those with children under the age of 12. General Help includes shopping, errands, transportation, housework, yard work, car repairs and other help around the house.

**Table 7B: Time and Monetary Transfers, Partnered Children**

Full Sample	Transfers with Her Mother				Transfers with His Mother			
	Far	Near	Near Both	Near Her Only	Far	Near	Near Both	Near His Only
<b><u>Help Received</u></b>								
(1, 2) General Help	6.54	24.52	24.86	24.16	4.23	15.62	15.41	15.88
(3) Emotional Help	41.72	61.02	59.86	62.25	32.63	52.83	49.56	57.07
(4) Childcare while working	5.08	32.91	34.61	30.36	3.67	24.51	24.66	24.26
(5) Childcare other	10.55	44.33	48.00	38.83	7.82	32.87	33.45	31.86
<b><u>Help Given</u></b>								
(1, 2) General Help	12.74	52.60	48.56	56.91	10.06	49.56	48.16	51.37
(3) Emotional Help	46.18	68.90	62.32	75.92	40.31	61.85	55.99	69.46
<b><u>Monetary Transfers</u></b>								
Money Received	9.22	11.03	12.11	9.87	8.13	10.42	10.16	10.76
Money Given	3.86	5.20	5.82	4.53	3.64	4.12	3.84	4.49
Median Amount Received (>0)	1000	1000	800	1000	1000	1000	800	1000
Median Amount Given (>0)	250	250	200	300	250	250	200	290

NSFH Sample Wave 2. Sample includes partnered adult children over the age of 25. Sample for childcare categories (4) and (5) includes only those with children under the age of 12. General Help includes shopping, errands, transportation, housework, yard work, car repairs and other help around the house.

**Table 10: Logit Regressions: Probability of Time Transfers from Adult Children to Mothers.**

	PARTNERED ADULT CHILDREN				UN-PARTNERED ADULT CHILDREN	
	TO HER MOTHER		TO HIS MOTHER		TO MOTHER	
	General Help	Emotional Help	General Help	Emotional Help	General Help	Emotional Help
Aged 25-34	1.132 (0.165)	0.813** (0.014)	1.176 (0.100)	0.972 (0.750)	0.775 (0.120)	1.002 (0.988)
Aged 45 +	1.104 (0.418)	1.292** (0.031)	1.116 (0.352)	1.239** (0.044)	1.134 (0.501)	1.606** (0.011)
Wife works full-time/Un-partnered child works FT	0.912 (0.301)	0.772*** (0.003)	0.966 (0.724)	1.010 (0.906)	0.935 (0.697)	0.965 (0.837)
Wife works part-time/Un-partnered child works FT	0.943 (0.586)	1.030 (0.783)	0.844 (0.156)	1.022 (0.840)	0.737 (0.194)	1.163 (0.517)
Child has medical problems	1.061 (0.459)	1.025 (0.749)	1.144 (0.121)	1.123 (0.138)	0.892 (0.416)	0.934 (0.622)
Divorced/Widowed /Separated					0.527*** (0.000)	0.856 (0.285)
Power Couple/Power	1.034 (0.774)	1.729*** (0.000)	1.317** (0.028)	1.861*** (0.000)	1.313 (0.104)	1.667*** (0.002)
Part-Power: Him	0.801** (0.034)	0.917 (0.368)	1.207 (0.150)	1.281** (0.028)		
Part-Power Her	1.208 (0.182)	1.563*** (0.002)	1.045 (0.763)	1.062 (0.642)		
Children Less than 12	0.940 (0.514)	0.949 (0.565)	1.119 (0.264)	0.954 (0.596)	1.015 (0.928)	1.099 (0.567)
Live Close, Sibs live close	5.853*** (0.000)	1.743*** (0.000)	6.614*** (0.000)	1.497*** (0.000)	7.350*** (0.000)	1.842*** (0.000)
Live Close, No sibs close	5.870*** (0.000)	1.599*** (0.000)	7.709*** (0.000)	1.574*** (0.000)	6.199*** (0.000)	2.311*** (0.001)
Only Child	1.269 (0.263)	1.479* (0.087)	1.184 (0.426)	1.002 (0.990)	1.325 (0.447)	0.845 (0.673)
Eldest Child	0.869 (0.206)	0.968 (0.764)	0.644*** (0.001)	0.952 (0.670)	0.753** (0.066)	0.944 (0.705)
Log Household Income	1.060 (0.308)	1.307*** (0.000)	1.023 (0.717)	1.122 (0.044)	1.190** (0.030)	1.214** (0.012)
Mother has college degree	1.027 (0.787)	1.307*** (0.005)	0.850 (0.122)	1.185** (0.069)	0.954 (0.766)	1.068 (0.669)
Mother 75 years+	1.231* (0.074)	0.797** (0.042)	1.048 (0.694)	0.934 (0.516)	1.232 (0.197)	0.918 (0.599)
Mother in Poor Health	1.667*** (0.000)	1.419*** (0.002)	1.152 (0.266)	1.416*** (0.004)	1.792*** (0.001)	1.966*** (0.000)
Mother Not Married	1.482*** (0.000)	1.345*** (0.001)	1.730*** (0.000)	1.419*** (0.000)	1.443*** (0.006)	1.632*** (0.000)
Other Mother Deceased	1.111 (0.275)	1.280** (0.010)	1.165 (0.160)	1.333*** (0.004)		
Male					0.734** (0.039)	0.686* (0.009)
SAMPLE	3598		3242		1314	1310

NSFH Sample Wave 2. Sample includes all adult children over the age of 25 with at least one mother ALUS. General Help includes shopping, errands, transportation, housework, yard work, car repairs and other help around the house. Wald test figures to test the equality of Live Close, Sibs live close to Live Close, No sibs close indicated that these variables are not statistically different from each other in all cases.



**Table 11A: Logit Regressions: Probability of Transfers from Mothers to Partnered Adult Children**

	FROM HER MOTHER			FROM HIS MOTHER		
	General Help	Child Care while working	Child Care, Other	General Help	Child Care while working	Child Care, Other
Aged 25-34	1.875*** (0.000)	2.708*** (0.000)	2.506*** (0.000)	1.474*** (0.002)	2.419*** (0.000)	2.316*** (0.000)
Aged 45 +	0.431*** (0.000)	0.253*** (0.000)	0.165*** (0.000)	0.565*** (0.002)	0.352*** (0.000)	0.426*** (0.000)
Wife works full-time	0.953 (0.646)	2.033*** (0.000)	0.707*** (0.002)	0.649*** (0.001)	1.649*** (0.001)	0.701*** (0.004)
Wife works part-time	0.846 (0.193)	2.247*** (0.000)	0.887 (0.361)	0.670** (0.011)	2.165*** (0.000)	0.957 (0.759)
Child has medical problems	1.170* (0.097)	0.912 (0.418)	0.860 (0.145)	1.268** (0.042)	0.886 (0.366)	0.846 (0.144)
Power Couple	1.270* (0.084)	1.320 (0.113)	1.424** (0.023)	1.717*** (0.001)	1.751*** (0.005)	1.463** (0.026)
Part-Power: Him	0.842 (0.182)	0.863 (0.335)	1.050 (0.713)	1.877*** (0.000)	1.506** (0.042)	2.354*** (0.000)
Part-Power Her	1.240 (0.186)	1.739*** (0.004)	1.389* (0.075)	1.440** (0.064)	1.306 (0.214)	1.294 (0.179)
Children Less than 12	1.486*** (0.001)			1.619*** (0.001)		
Live Close, Sibs live close	3.664*** (0.000)	6.774*** (0.000)	6.207*** (0.000)	3.589*** (0.000)	6.724*** (0.000)	4.870*** (0.000)
Live Close, No sibs close	4.122*** (0.000)	8.560*** (0.000)	7.594*** (0.000)	4.224*** (0.000)	5.325*** (0.000)	4.699*** (0.000)
Only Child	1.217 (0.450)	1.821* (0.062)	1.071 (0.829)	2.320*** (0.001)	1.981** (0.048)	1.608 (0.128)
Eldest Child	1.089 (0.531)	0.894 (0.512)	1.184 (0.253)	0.981 (0.916)	0.867 (0.495)	0.834 (0.309)
Log Household Income	1.116 (0.115)	1.233** (0.018)	1.292*** (0.001)	1.013 (0.878)	1.194 (0.101)	1.358*** (0.001)
Mother has college degree	1.221* (0.072)	1.134 (0.353)	1.261* (0.057)	1.074 (0.597)	0.808 (0.179)	0.919 (0.525)
Mother 75 year+	0.956 (0.773)	1.366 (0.107)	1.180 (0.350)	0.893 (0.536)	0.838 (0.443)	0.891 (0.516)
Mother in poor health	0.525*** (0.000)	0.630** (0.011)	0.553*** (0.000)	0.476*** (0.001)	0.507*** (0.007)	0.490*** (0.001)
Mother Not Married	0.932 (0.514)	0.866 (0.270)	0.951 (0.662)	0.744** (0.036)	0.707 (0.031)	0.789* (0.076)
Other Mother Deceased	1.195 (0.132)	1.040 (0.793)	0.881 (0.354)	0.655** (0.015)	0.995 (0.980)	0.981 (0.902)
Sample Size	3598		2435	3242		2254

NSFH Sample Wave 2. Sample includes partnered adult children over the age of 25. General Help includes shopping, errands, transportation, housework, yard work, car repairs and other help around the house. Coefficients are presented as log odd ratios, with p-values in parentheses. Wald tests were run to test the equality of Live Close, Sibs live close to Live Close, No sibs close indicated that these variables are not statistically different from each other in all cases.

**Table 11B: Logit Regressions: Probability of Transfers from Mothers to Un-Partnered Adult Children.**

	FULL SAMPLE		
	General Help	Child Care while working	Child Care, Other
Aged 25-34	1.883*** (0.001)	0.982 (0.955)	1.429 (0.219)
Aged 45 +	0.548** (0.022)	1.009 (0.990)	3.202* (0.065)
Child works full-time	0.766 (0.196)	6.994*** (0.000)	1.080 (0.808)
Child works part-time	0.861 (0.593)	14.49*** (0.000)	0.653 (0.362)
Child has medical problems	1.351* (0.078)	1.018 (0.960)	1.343 (0.334)
Divorce/Widowed/Separated	0.880 (0.455)	0.914 (0.793)	0.745 (0.322)
Power	1.115 (0.604)	1.570 (0.306)	2.074* (0.093)
Children Less than 12	1.328 (0.135)		
Live Close, Sibs live close	4.892*** (0.000)	8.826*** (0.000)	8.383*** (0.000)
Live Close, No sibs close	3.728*** (0.000)	6.979*** (0.001)	14.663*** (0.000)
Only Child	1.061 (0.906)	5.580* (0.055)	0.735 (0.752)
Eldest Child	1.418* (0.064)	0.708 (0.379)	0.774 (0.470)
Log Household Income	0.874 (0.160)	1.234 (0.287)	1.052 (0.769)
Mother has college degree	1.131 (0.511)	2.445** (0.011)	2.880*** (0.001)
Mother in poor health	0.412*** (0.001)	0.904 (0.827)	0.494* (0.091)
Mother aged 75+	0.582** (0.014)	0.870 (0.737)	0.704 (0.377)
Mother not married	0.935 (0.678)	1.096 (0.760)	0.658 (0.126)
Male	0.953 (0.793)	1.823 (0.265)	0.689 (0.479)
Sample Size	1314	338	

NSFH Sample Wave 2. Sample includes un-partnered adult children over the age of 25. General Help includes shopping, errands, transportation, housework, yard work, car repairs and other help around the house. Coefficients are presented as log odd ratios, with p-values in parentheses. Wald tests were run to test the equality of Live Close, Sibs live close to Live Close, No sibs close indicated that these variables are not statistically different from each other in all cases.

**Table 12: Proximity and Women's Work Hours**

Regular Hours of Work	Partnered Adult Women with Children Less than 12				Non-Partnered Women with Children Less than 12	
	Live near neither	Live near her mother	Live near his mother	Live near both	Does not live near Mother	Live near mother
Zero	39.0	35.8	34.2	32.7	39.9	35.9
Part-time (1-34)	23.3	22.0	20.9	23.0	11.6	16.3
Full-time (35+)	37.7	42.2	45.0	44.3	48.4	47.8
Sample Size	947	598	548	913	121	258

NSFH Wave 2. Sample includes all adult women between the ages of 25 and 60.

**Table 13: Regressions: Effect of Proximity on Women’s Labor Force Behavior**

	Logit Regressions: Dependent variable equals one if work hours equal zero.					Tobit Regressions: Dependent variable equals work hours				
	A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E
Live near her mother	0.878* (0.072)	0.965 (0.688)	0.971 (0.824)	0.858* (0.076)	0.946 (0.700)	1.182 (0.223)	-0.122 (0.915)	0.498 (0.757)	1.199 (0.342)	0.802 (0.653)
Live near his mother	0.888 (0.103)	0.975 (0.777)	1.061 (0.657)	0.814** (0.016)	0.963 (0.804)	1.995 (0.039)	0.691 (0.545)	-0.021 (0.990)	3.31*** (0.008)	1.137 (0.548)
Children less than 12	2.127*** (0.000)	2.465*** (0.000)	2.481*** (0.000)		2.432*** (0.000)	-11.60*** (0.000)	-13.85*** (0.000)	-13.21*** (0.000)		-12.98*** (0.000)
Near either mother* kids		0.786* (0.059)					3.612** (0.032)			
Near her mother * kids			0.879 (0.395)		0.890 (0.447)			0.872 (0.652)		0.723 (0.710)
Near his mother * kids			0.789 (0.125)		0.811 (0.178)			2.908 (0.137)		2.631 (0.182)
Her mother in poor health or over age 75	0.943 (0.434)	0.952 (0.511)	0.944 (0.446)	0.936 (0.460)	0.914 (0.358)	0.040 (0.968)	-0.082 (0.936)	0.022 (0.983)	0.154 (0.908)	0.419 (0.746)
His mother in poor health or over age 75	0.985 (0.835)	0.996 (0.961)	0.987 (0.861)	0.937 (0.450)	0.909 (0.319)	0.231 (0.815)	0.058 (0.953)	0.205 (0.836)	0.807 (0.524)	1.239 (0.330)
Near her mother * poor health/elderly					1.078 (0.617)					-0.950 (0.640)
Near his mother * poor health/elderly					1.220 (0.170)					-2.496 (0.197)
Sample Size	4379	4379	4379	2971	4379	4379 1420	4379 1420	4379 1420	2971 1057	4379 1420

NSFH Wave 2. Sample includes all partnered adult women between the ages of 25 and 60. Coefficients for the logit regression are presented as log odd ratios, with p-values in parentheses. Regressions included controls for age, age squared, spouse’s hours of work, an indicator for medical problems, race, education (power, half power her, half power him) and marital status of the mother.

**Table 13: Tobit Regressions, Controlling for Endogeneity of Proximity.**

IV Tobit	Partnered Women					
	Sample	Her Mother Effect of Distance from Her Mother on Work Hours ( $\beta$ )	Wald Test of Exogeneity  Chi2(1) Prob>Chi2	Sample	His Mother Effect of Distance from His Mother on Work Hours ( $\beta$ )	Wald Test of Exogeneity  Chi2(1) Prob>Chi2
Full Sample	3146	-0.0128*** (0.0080)	6.8*** (0.009)	3011	-0.0031** (0.0170)	4.37** (0.037)
With Children	2193	-0.0139** (0.0160)	5.38** (0.020)	2140	-0.0042*** (0.0080)	5.31** (0.021)
Without Children	953	-0.0016 (0.7650)	0.08 (0.775)	871	0.0006 (0.7670)	0.09 (0.762)
Mom in Good Health, Mom less than 75	2464	-0.0128** (0.0110)	6.28** (0.012)	2322	-0.0032** (0.0360)	2.52 (0.112)
Mom in Poor Health or older than 75	682	-0.0155 (0.4730)	0.46 (0.497)	689	-0.0031 (0.2060)	1.81 (0.178)

NSFH Wave 2. Sample includes all partnered adult women between the ages of 25 and 60. Other covariates in the hours equation include indicators for age, age squared, hours of work of partner, medical problems, black, education, children and geographic region. Other covariates for the proximity equation include indicators for age, age squared, medical problems, black, education, mothers education, children, health and age of mother, mother's marital status, only child, birth order, proximity to other mother.

**Table 14: Logit Regressions: Probability of Monetary Transfers**

	Partnered Adult Children				Un-Partnered Adult Children	
	Receive from Her Mother	Give to Her Mother	Receive from His Mother	Give to His Mother	Receive from Mother	Give to Mother
Close to Mother, No siblings close	1.194** (0.04)	1.428 (0.20)	1.401* (0.09)	0.720 (0.39)	2.313*** (0.001)	1.501 (0.253)
Close to Mother, Siblings Close	0.830 (0.26)	1.037 (0.85)	0.930 (0.62)	1.105 (0.64)	1.107 (0.566)	0.824 (0.463)
Mother aged 75+	1.086 (0.669)	1.209 (0.467)	0.994 (0.973)	0.915 (0.743)	0.586** (0.024)	1.468 (0.207)
Mother in Poor Health	0.752 (0.151)	1.439 (0.120)	0.999 (0.995)	0.747 (0.415)	0.875 (0.501)	1.133 (0.659)
Mother not Married	0.957 (0.77)	1.501** (0.03)	0.839 (0.22)	1.528** (0.04)	0.463*** (0.000)	1.433 (0.138)
Only Child	1.732** (0.05)	1.052 (0.91)	1.390 (0.28)	0.843 (0.76)	0.633 (0.321)	1.618 (0.346)
Oldest Child	1.602*** (0.01)	1.224 (0.35)	1.404** (0.02)	1.313 (0.28)	1.135 (0.488)	0.629 (0.131)
General Help (1,2) Transfer to Mother	1.571*** (0.00)		1.038 (0.79)		0.905 (0.564)	2.051** (0.012)
Emotional Help (3) Transfer to Mother	1.319** (0.06)		1.333** (0.04)		1.390* (0.059)	1.114 (0.676)
General Help (1,2) Transfer from Mother		1.539** (0.05)		0.982 (0.95)		1.363 (0.212)
Emotional Help (3) Transfer from Mother		1.150 (0.46)		1.222 (0.31)		
Men					0.724* (0.072)	1.363 (0.212)
Wald Tests: Chi2 (1)	2.71	1.27	4.17	1.18	8.4	2.63
Prob > Chi2	0.09	0.260	0.041	0.277	0.004	0.105
Sample Size	2689		3011		1310	1312

**Table 15: Tobit Regressions: Amount of Monetary Transfers**

	Partnered Adult Children		Un-Partnered Adult Children
	Amount Received from Her Mother	Amount Received from His Mother	Amount Received from Mother
Close to Mother, No siblings close	1634.4 (0.16)	1469.4 (0.12)	2742.0*** (0.008)
Close to Mother, Siblings Close	-961.1 (0.27)	469.7 (0.47)	110.3 (0.875)
Mother aged 75+	-934.5 (0.362)	198.7 (0.827)	-1622.8* (0.070)
Mother in Poor Health	-32.9 (0.978)	-1302.6 (0.144)	-1.1 (0.999)
Mother not Married	217.0 (0.79)	-452.0 (0.50)	-2636.4*** (0.000)
Only Child	3037.7** (0.05)	477.0 (0.76)	-1435.3 (0.421)
Oldest Child	1733.2* (0.08)	653.4 (0.38)	1336.6* (0.060)
General Help (1,2) Transfer to Mother	1996.5** (0.02)	-131.6 (0.85)	95.8 (0.888)
Emotional Help (3) Transfer to Mother	1231.1 (0.12)	733.0 (0.23)	861.4 (0.203)
Women			-1906.1*** (0.007)
F-Test: F-Stat (1, 3378)	4.61	1.05	6.75
Prob > F	0.0319	0.3066	0.0095
Sample Size	2689	3011	1310
Sample Not Censored	288	341	239

<sup>1</sup> Monetary transfers are defined as gifts and/or loans valued at more than \$200. Includes gifts such as a car, furniture, jewelry or stocks, as well as gifts of money. NSFH Sample Wave 2. Other covariates include age of adult child, wife's work status (part-time or full-time), whether either spouse has medical problems, education of couple, education of mother, household income, children less than 12, whether. Coefficients are displayed as odds ratios, with p-values in parentheses.