University of Groningen

Co-residence of adult children with their parents

de Valk, Helga A. G.; Bordone, Valeria

Published in:
Journal of ethnic and migration studies

DOI:
[10.1080/1369183X.2018.1485207](https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2018.1485207)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2019

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

de Valk, H. A. G., & Bordone, V. (2019). Co-residence of adult children with their parents: differences by migration background explored and explained. *Journal of ethnic and migration studies*, 45(10), 1790-1812 .
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2018.1485207>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Co-residence of adult children with their parents: differences by migration background explored and explained

Helga A. G. de Valk & Valeria Bordone

To cite this article: Helga A. G. de Valk & Valeria Bordone (2019) Co-residence of adult children with their parents: differences by migration background explored and explained, Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 45:10, 1790-1812, DOI: [10.1080/1369183X.2018.1485207](https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2018.1485207)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2018.1485207>

Published online: 21 Jun 2018.

Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)

Article views: 158

View Crossmark data [↗](#)

Citing articles: 4 View citing articles [↗](#)

Co-residence of adult children with their parents: differences by migration background explored and explained

Helga A. G. de Valk^a and Valeria Bordone^b

^aNetherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute/KNAW/University of Groningen, The Hague, Netherlands; ^bDepartment of Sociology, University of Munich (LMU), Munich, Germany

ABSTRACT

Research on majority populations throughout Europe showed strong attachment and exchange of support between parents and their adult children. Studies on migrant families are limited yet needed in light of the increasing share of older people of migrant origin in European populations. One of the main sources of intergenerational support and care is via coresidence of (older) parents and their adult children. In this paper, we first analyse whether co-residence of adult children with their parents differs between migrants and non-migrants across Europe. Second, we assess the potentially differential effect of resources and socio-demographic factors among the migrant and non-migrant population as well as migrant-specific factors (migrant generation and region of origin). Data on five countries, with different migration patterns and histories, covered in the first wave of the Generation and Gender Survey are used (Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, and the Netherlands). Results show that levels of adult child–parent co-residence do not vary significantly by migrant status but do differ across Europe. Furthermore, we find that socio-demographic factors are important and have a similar association with parent–child coresidence for migrants and non-migrants. Our study does, however, suggest differences in co-residence by region of origin and migrant generation.

KEYWORDS

Immigrants; Europe; intergenerational co-residence; gender and generation survey

Introduction

Intergenerational relationships are found to be crucial across the whole life course, but in later life they are the main source of support and function as a major mechanism of cultural continuity (see also Albertini, Mantovani, and Gasperoni 2019). Although support across generations covers a range of dimensions (Bengtson et al. 2000), one of the main sources of intergenerational support and care is via co-residence. This holds in the early years of life, when parents care for (and in the majority of cases live with) the child, but it is equally important for (older) parents and their adult children.

Research on the majority populations throughout Europe has produced large evidence of strong attachment and exchange of support between parents and their adult

children (e.g. Bordone 2009; Grundy 2006; Hank 2007; Tomassini et al. 2004). Similarly, it was found that co-residence is not only relevant for upward care (i.e. from children to parents) but is also essential in downward support, i.e. the care that older people provide to children and grandchildren in a common household (see literature overviews by Dykstra et al. 2013; Keene and Batson 2010). Intergenerational relations and living with or close to children may become even more important when formal care arrangements are reduced and family members depend more on each other, e.g. in time of austerity across Europe.

Yet, few studies have looked at support within migrant families. Moreover, with the exception of Bordone and de Valk (2016), they have mainly focused on one reception country or one migrant group only (Attias-Donfut and Wolff 2008; Baykara-Krumme 2008; de Valk and Schans 2008; Schans 2008), or primarily refer to migrant families with young children (Boos-Nünning and Karakaşoğlu 2005; Fernández-Reino and González-Ferrer 2019; Nauck 2000; Portes and Rumbaut 2006). Nevertheless, European populations include not only an increasing share of elderly people in general but of people of migrant origin in particular (Lanzieri 2011). This makes it increasingly relevant to gain insight into intergenerational support among migrant families compared to the majority populations (see also Baykara-Krumme and Fokkema 2019).

Although previous work (predominantly in the United States) suggests that co-residence of adult children and ageing parents is more common among migrant populations (see e.g. Glick and Van Hook 2002), this is not empirically tested in a comparative way across Europe. In this paper, we first analyse whether co-residence of adult children with their older parents differs between migrants and non-migrants across Europe. We focus on later life stages, when support will likely go both ways between the generations, thus excluding young adults for whom co-residence with their parents potentially has a different dynamic, related to the process of leaving the parental home (see, for recent work on leaving home and living arrangements, Kleinepijper and de Valk 2014; Lennartz, Arundel, and Ronald 2016). Second, we want to assess the potentially differential effect of resources (both economic and socio-demographic) and desire, in terms of cultural norms, to co-reside among the migrant and non-migrant populations. We do so while taking migrant-specific factors and processes of adaptation (identified as the migrant generation and region of origin) into account.

We use data from the Gender and Generation Survey (GGS) in Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, and the Netherlands. We focus on those respondents who are at least 27 years old (the highest mean age at leaving the parental home in the countries considered over the years of the survey) in order to exclude young adults who continue living in the parental home. This would refer to a type of co-residence where overall the child depends on the parents, in which we are not interested here. We focus on the prevalence of co-residence without the aim of analysing who moved in with whom – something the data do not allow us to study. The primary interest of our paper is to see whether adult child–parent co-residence is more common among migrant groups and across migrant generations versus those of the majority group.

Background

Intergenerational support and co-residence

Support relations between parents and children are reciprocal and span the whole life course (Johar, Maruyama, and Nakamura 2015; Rossi and Rossi 1990). Studies have distinguished different types of support between generations focusing on social, emotional, and practical support. One of the ways in which support is given and received is by sharing the same household. Co-residence may also facilitate other types of exchange within the family. Co-residence of adult children with their parents has been explained by two main sets of mechanisms (Dykstra et al. 2013; Keene and Batson 2010). First, it has been linked to the availability of resources and necessity (Grundy 2000). On the one hand, this framework covers the available resources of parents and children and the need to pool (economic) resources. On the other hand, co-residence is linked to the necessity of support between older parents and adult children across the life course (capturing needs linked to different demographic events). This set of factors may have, in principle, the same influence among majority and migrant populations. Because of a compositional effect (i.e. a larger share with lower socio-economic position) among the migrant population, resources are more limited in this group. As a consequence of this, rather than because of resources as such having a different effect, a higher parent–child co-residence may occur among family members of migrant origin than among natives.

The second set of explanations explicitly focuses on the cultural origin of migrants, which may indicate cultural norms to co-reside (Grundy 2000), potentially differing between migrant and non-migrant populations. However, since cultures both at origin and destination are not static, and migration is a selective process, it is essential to study potential cultural differences in conjunction with the aforementioned structural factors (resources and socio-demographic traits).

Resources

With the introduction of pension schemes across Europe, economic independence of older people has increased and resulted in less economic need to reside with children in later life (Grundy 2000). In particular, parents and children with more resources (higher income and educational levels) are more likely to live independently of each other, as is found in Northwestern Europe (Grundy 2000; Seltzer and Friedman 2014; Smits, Van Gaalen, and Mulder 2010). In other parts of Europe, such as the Mediterranean and Eastern European countries, parents and children may still depend more on each other economically and to provide housing (Isengard and Szydlik 2012). Moreover, in times of economic crisis young adults tend to live with their parents longer exactly because of the limited resources that can be used to achieve an independent dwelling (Lennartz, Arundel, and Ronald 2016). However, this seems to be also the case later in the life course and thus also applies to the phase of life our study focuses on, i.e. older adult children and their ageing parents. In particular, when children have less resources as a result of the loss of income or divorce, the likelihood of co-residence with parents increases (Dykstra et al. 2013). Similarly, lower educated people are less likely to live further away from the parents in comparison to their higher educated counterparts who may look for work

that matches their skills even at a greater geographical distance from their parents (Greenwell and Bengtson 1997; Shelton and Grundy 2000).

Studies on the reasons why older parents and adult children share the same household have indicated that demographic characteristics are key determinants and indicators (Grundy 2000). In particular, in case of parents' poor health co-residence is much more likely (Keene and Batson 2010). Studies so far have not addressed the role of children's health for living together with parents, but we expect the same also for them. Bad health conditions may result in greater care needs, which are more easily fulfilled when sharing the same household. While the geographical proximity of older parents to their children has often been shown to be curvilinear (that is, it decreases for 'young' elders and increases again at higher ages), the relationship between age and co-residence tends to be negatively associated with child age (Hank 2007).

Furthermore, research has indicated that, from the adult child's perspective, having more siblings is likely to have a positive effect on the propensity of living far away from parents and therefore reduces co-residence (Grundy 2000; Michielin and Mulder 2007). In addition, the child's marital and partnership status are found to be important predictors of co-residence, which is more likely for unpartnered than for partnered children (Keene and Batson 2010; Seltzer and Friedman 2014). The latter includes both unmarried as well as single children who were previously in a union (Smits, Van Gaalen, and Mulder 2010). In a similar vein, adult children who have their own children are less likely to reside with their parents than is the case for those who have less own family obligations (Hank 2007; Seltzer and Friedman 2014). Finally, gender is found to be important for levels of co-residence between adult children and their parents. Women are usually considered kin-keepers and more likely to take care of the parents in later life. However, Billari, Philipov, and Baizán (2001) have shown that women tend to leave the parental home earlier than men and are more likely to face more subsequent migrations. Overall it is found that across Europe sons live more often with parents than is the case for daughters (Hank 2007; Smits, Van Gaalen, and Mulder 2010).

We thus expect that adult children with more resources (i.e. higher educational attainment), irrespective of immigrant status, are less likely to co-reside with their older parents (H1). In addition, based on previous evidence on majority populations, we hypothesise that demographic characteristics influence co-residence with the parents and expect that women, those living with a partner, having own children, those with siblings, no health problems, older respondents, and whose parents are in good health are less likely to co-reside (H2). These hypotheses are expected to hold for both migrant and non-migrant populations across Europe.

Cultural differences in desire to co-reside and immigrant populations

So far, few studies have looked at co-residence among immigrant adults with their ageing parents in Europe. Existing studies both in the U.S. and Northern Europe have shown that living arrangements of migrants differ from those of non-migrants at different points in the life course (Burr and Mutchler 1993; Glick and Van Hook 2002; Zorlu and Mulder 2011). Most of the existing literature on the topic, conducted in the United States, generally suggests that migrants' living arrangements differ from those of the non-Hispanic white population, with adult migrants being more likely to live with their parents

(Glick and Van Hook 2002; Keene and Batson 2010; Taylor et al. 2010). In a recent study on Spain, Bueno and de Valk (2016) found the same results for a range of Latin American migrant groups. Previous studies have suggested that levels of co-residence differ according to cultural preferences regarding intergenerational relations, support, and co-residence (Angel and Tienda 1982; Giuliano 2006; Steinbach 2013). The older parents in our study countries predominantly belong to the labour migrant groups of the 1950s and 1960s. These were mainly low-skilled migrants coming from the Mediterranean and North African regions. Migration to the Netherlands and Belgium was dominated by recruitment in Morocco and Turkey, while by far the largest recruitment by Germany and Austria was in Turkey (Steinbach 2013; Van Mol and de Valk 2016). In France, and to a lesser extent also in the Netherlands and Belgium, migration in that period was influenced by migration from former colonies (in the French case mainly from North Africa). Throughout the past decades all Northwestern European countries, including Switzerland and Austria, have also received substantial shares of European migrants, who also contribute to the migrant populations in the study countries (for a more detailed overview of the migration history to Northwestern Europe, see Van Mol and de Valk 2016). As mentioned before, in Europe we find co-residence to be more common in Southern and Eastern Europe, regions from which many migrants in our study countries originate, than in Northwestern and Central Europe (Austria). Overall, origin regions outside Europe are also characterised by strong family relations emphasising intergenerational care norms, according to which children are expected to take care of ageing parents. In many cultures in Asia, Latin America and Africa, norms and values in relation to family stress the mutual responsibility of parents and children in which children are expected to care for older parents (Gurak and Kritz 2010; Kagitçibasi 2005; see also Albertini, Gasperoni, and Mantovani 2019). As a result, intergenerational co-residence is therefore still more common than is the case in Northwestern and Central Europe (Kagitçibasi, Ataca, and Diri 2005; Nauck 2000; Ruggles and Heggeness 2008; Schans 2008). Based on previous research, we thus expect that immigrant adults are more likely to reside with their parents than is the case for non-migrants in our study countries (even after controlling for compositional effects) (H3a).

At the same time, studies on migrant adaptation processes have indicated that differences between migrants and non-migrants diminish over time (Gordon 1964; Rumbaut 2015). Immigrants and their descendants will gradually incorporate the dominant norms of the host country and adapt to its institutional setting. This effect is likely to happen already within one generation: those who reside longer and are thus exposed longer to the country of residence will be more likely to resemble those of non-migrant origin. So over many generations, migrants should increasingly resemble the non-migrant population of the country they live in due to socialisation into the society of residence. Intermarriage with a native is often used as an indicator for the level of exposure to the country of residence and thus used as a proxy for potential adaptation. The underlying assumption is that migrants have a specific set of cultural values, including those regarding intergenerational co-residence, but will gradually adapt to those of the country they settle and live in (Burr and Mutchler 1993, 2003; Gordon 1964). We thus expect that, as a result of adaptation processes, levels of co-residence among those of migrant background (2nd and 2.5 generations) will take an intermediate position between natives and immigrants (H3b). By including migrants' region of origin as well as the migrant generation

(second-generation children of immigrants may differ from those who are socialised elsewhere and then migrate), we indirectly study the extent to which migrant-specific factors are relevant (since we control for compositional effects, the residual effects are potentially migrant/migration-related).

Diversity across Europe

In a context in which independent living of elderly parents has become the norm, it is found that adult children and their parents co-reside less (Grundy 2000). With changing norms and values in most Northwestern European countries with regard to family and demographic behaviour, more emphasis has been put on individualisation, which is also reflected in a higher incidence of individuals' living alone across Europe (Dykstra et al. 2013; Reher 1998). Although overall intergenerational co-residence has become less common, it persists across European countries, with variations due to differences in housing and care systems (Iacovou and Skew 2011; Isengard and Szydlik 2012). Welfare state arrangements, including the housing market and care arrangements, may be important for decisions on co-residence. Overall, we expect these contextual factors to be of similar importance for migrants and non-migrants. Although we acknowledge that migrants may face additional barriers and discrimination, potential cross-national differences in this regard are difficult to capture (especially with GGS data). Nevertheless, previous comparative work on older people's living arrangements in our study countries points to very similar patterns of elderly people's living alone or in a multi-generation household (see e.g. Attias-Donfut, Ogg, and Wolff 2005). Therefore, we do not formulate a specific hypothesis on the differences in co-residence across the five countries observed in our study.

Having said that, we acknowledge that in the countries studied here adult children and their older parents are likely to have close relationships. Even though both generations may prefer not to live together, they may choose “intimacy at a distance” (Rosenmayr and Köckeis 1965). Intergenerational geographic proximity may thus substitute co-residence (Seltzer and Friedman 2014) and be an important way of organising (structural) support between parents and adult children (Dykstra et al. 2013). Some studies on the U.S. suggest this may be in particular the case for parents who are in poor health (Seltzer, Yahirun, and Bianchi 2013), whereas others (focusing on Europe) report no difference by parents' health status (Isengard and Szydlik 2012). Intergenerational geographic proximity may provide access to support and interaction when desired and needed. However, Isengard and Szydlik (2012) find that near residence (i.e. living in the same apartment block or house) is much more common in some countries in Europe (Germany and Austria) than in others (Belgium and the Netherlands). Although the focus of this paper is on co-residence, we explore the levels of parent–child geographic proximity among migrants and non-migrants in our study countries in order to assess whether lower levels of co-residence are substituted by higher levels of geographic proximity.

Data and method

We use data from the first wave of the GGS, carried out between 2002 and 2010 as part of the Generation and Gender Programme (GGP, www.ggp-i.org) in 19 countries. The GGS

is a set of comparative surveys on childbearing, partners, parents, work, and everyday life. This survey includes several questions concerning relations between generations, as well as information on the characteristics of the respondent's family of origin. It aims to improve our understanding of the relationship between parents and children and between partners throughout their life course.

We selected five European GGS survey countries that all have been major immigration countries in the past decades: Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, and the Netherlands. Although GGS includes several other countries, we cannot include Italy, as it does not provide information on the country of origin for those who are not born in the country of residence, nor Norway, which does not have full information about parents' origin. These questions were optional and not all countries decided to include them in their questionnaires. Eastern European countries included the GGS (Bulgaria, Russia, Georgia, Hungary, Romania, Estonia, Lithuania, Poland, and the Czech Republic) are not included in our analysis as countries of residence, but only as countries of origin because they were mainly countries of out-migration at the time of the survey. Australia is also excluded, as the focus of this paper is on Europe as a receiving context.

Sample selection

We consider respondents aged 27 and over and with at least one parent alive (in the original sample with these characteristics, $N = 22,602$). As the information about migration origin is key to our analysis, we only consider respondents who do not have missing observations on the country of birth (being born in or outside the country of residence). The sample is therefore reduced to 22,508 respondents. After excluding observations with missing information on any of the control variables (164 observations), our working sample covers a total of 22,344 respondents.

In order to make sure that we are not confusing the process of leaving home with the aim of our study, we considered the average and median ages of leaving the parental home as a threshold for age selection. Among the five European countries considered, the highest age at leaving the parental household was registered for Belgium, according to Eurostat data. In particular, young males in Belgium left the parental home, on average, at the age of 27.3 in 2002,¹ while for women and in all the other countries the average age at leaving the parental home was (substantially) lower. Since GGS data do not distinguish whether child-parent co-residence indicates prolonged or returned co-residence, we used the conservative threshold of age 27. It should be noted that using the highest median age at leaving the parental home would yield a very similar result: 26.1 (only one year less than the highest mean age) for men in Austria (Iacovou and Skew 2011). In order to assure that our age threshold of 27 was not a potential source of selection, we ran additional models to validate our findings and present analyses on the subsample within the first age tertile (i.e. 27–36).

Dependent variable

We study how co-residence between the respondent and their parents, defined as whether or not the respondent lives with at least one parent in the same household, is related to migrant status across the different countries of residence. In our binomial logistic

regression models, the dependent variable is a dummy variable which takes value 0 if the respondent does not live with a parent and value 1 if he/she lives with at least one parent. Although we could also consider whether the respondents who live with a partner reside with a parent-in-law, the GGS data do not give us information on whether the parents-in-law are alive and on their health status. However, the share of respondents living with at least one parent-in-law in our sample (as obtained by the household grid) is 0.63% (0.73% among those respondents living with a partner). Additional robustness checks carried out considering living with a parent or parent-in-law as the dependent variable and including only the relevant controls for its association with the explanatory variables confirmed the results reported here (analyses available upon request from the corresponding author). In our sample, 4.4% of the respondents live with at least one parent. This percentage is slightly higher in the sub-sample with migration background (5.3%) than in the majority population (4.3%).

We acknowledge that there may be differences by migration background in living arrangements other than parent–child co-residence. Our data show that while about 2.4% of the non-migrant working sample lives with other relatives or non-relatives (who are not partners, parents, parents-in-law, children, or grandchildren), the corresponding percentage among the migrants is 3.8%. Overall, this clearly indicates very small shares of the population; exploring the characteristics that affect these living arrangements goes beyond the purpose of this study and would require data where more detailed information is collected on a larger sub-sample.

Explanatory variables

The explanatory variable of interest is the migration background of the respondent. First, we distinguish between immigrants (1st generation) and non-migrants, where the latter are further distinguished between natives and 2nd or 2.5 generations. ‘Second generation’ refers to people who were born in the country of residence but have two foreign-born parents; ‘2.5 generation’ corresponds to those who were born in the country of residence with one native and one foreign-born parent. A categorical variable accounts for being a migrant versus non-migrant in its double specification (Model 1), based on respondent’s and parents’ countries of birth. It has value 0 if the respondent was born in the country of residence from native parents (i.e. ‘native’); 1 if the respondent was born in the country of residence from both or one migrant parent (2nd or 2.5 generation); 2 if the respondent was not born in the country of residence (migrant). The majority of our sample are native respondents (81.1%); 11.1% of the working sample was not born in the country of residence and 7.8% were 2nd or 2.5 generation. Models 2–4 are carried out separately for native, 2nd or 2.5 generations, and migrants, respectively to test whether the control variables have the same effects across these sub-samples.

We then carried out regression models considering different migrant generations in combination with regions of origin (Models 5 and 6). The origin regions are classified according to the often used classification of countries made by the United Nations Statistics Division.² Although we acknowledge that more detailed groupings would add knowledge on within-group heterogeneity, we are limited to the available information from the survey. For example, in the GGS Egypt is classified as Egypt in Austria, Maghreb in France and Northern Africa in Belgium. As a result, going beyond this

more general grouping was impossible with the data at hand. The region of origin thus covers the following categories in our Model 5: non-migrant and no migrant parents; migrant from European countries; migrant from the Middle East or Northern Africa; migrant from Asia; migrant from the Americas; migrant from Africa; migrant of other origin; 2.5 generation; second generation. In Model 6, we use the same variable specification but additionally distinguished 2nd generation respondents by parents' region of origin: non-migrant and no migrant parents; second-generation migrant with parents from the Middle East or Northern Africa; second generation with parents from Asia; second generation with parents from European countries; migrant from the Middle East or Northern Africa; migrant from Asia; migrant from European countries; second generation from other origin or 2.5 generation; migrant of other origin. [Table 1](#) provides an overview of the descriptive statistics related to the explanatory variables of origin and generation.

Socio-demographic characteristics

Other variables included in the regression models are socio-demographic characteristics of the respondent (i.e. the adult child), as suggested by the described literature on intergenerational co-residence:

- *age*: we consider age as categorical, calculated in tertiles (0 if age = 27–36, i.e. the first tertile; 1 if age = 37–45, the second tertile; 2 if age = 46+, the third tertile);
- *gender* (0 if male, 1 if female);
- *education* (0 if low, 1 if high, i.e. upper secondary or more);
- *living arrangement* (0 if living with a non-migrant spouse or partner; 1 if living with spouse or partner of migrant origin; 2 otherwise);
- *having children* (1 if the respondent has own children; 0 otherwise);
- *number of siblings* (0; 1; 2; 3 or more);

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of explanatory variables: migration generation and region of origin of adult children living with at least one parent (% values).

Migrant (<i>N</i> = 2489)	11.1	
Migrant from other European countries		55.8
Migrant from Middle East–North Africa		25.6
Migrant from Asia		3.6
Migrant from America		5.4
Migrant from Africa		4.9
Migrant of other origin		4.8
Total		100
Native (<i>N</i> = 18,116)	81.1	
2.5 generation (<i>N</i> = 1140)	5.1	
2nd generation (<i>N</i> = 599)	2.7	
Middle East–North African origin		25.4
Asian origin		10.7
European origin		56.3
Other origin		7.7
Total		100
Total (<i>N</i> = 22,344)	100	

- we additionally control for whether the respondent or the partner are *limited* in their ability to carry out normal everyday activities because of a physical or mental health problem or a disability as well as for whether at least one parent has such limitation. Two dummy variables account, respectively, for the respondent/partner's and the parent's limitation;
- *country dummy variables* are included in all models in order to account for the country of residence effect (as in Bordone and de Valk 2016).

Model specification

Given the nature of the dependent variable, we carry out binomial logistic analysis. In the first set of regressions (Table 3), we study similarities and differences in co-residence between natives, 2nd or 2.5 generations, and immigrants, and the differential association that socio-demographic variables have with the likelihood of parent–child co-residence among these origin groups. Model 1 is a multivariate analysis including all the controls and the first explanatory variable (i.e. distinguishing native, 2nd or 2.5 generation, and migrant) on the pooled sample (i.e. migrants and non-migrants). The same model specification has been replicated separately on the three sub-populations defined by migration background (native, 2nd or 2.5, and migrant, respectively; Models 2–4, Table 3). Additional analyses performed for each of the five countries under study (results not shown, available upon request from the corresponding author) show that odds ratios, when significant, have the same direction and similar magnitude across countries.

In a second step, we include the explanatory variables as described above, which account for both migration generation and regions of origin (Models 5–6 in Table 4). This allows us to investigate more deeply the role of the region of origin in the likelihood of parent–child co-residence. This analysis is replicated on the sub-sample belonging to the first age tertile (i.e. age 27–36; Model 7) in order to capture peculiar associations within the youngest age group considered, which may have different socio-demographic characteristics from the older sub-samples.

Results

First, we present descriptive statistics on the level of co-residence of migrant and non-migrant adults across Europe (Table 2). Co-residence among the native population is most common in Austria where 9.2% of adults live with at least one parent, followed by Belgium and Germany (6.2% and 4.5%, respectively). Co-residence among the native population is least likely in the Netherlands (slightly more than 1%) and France takes an intermediate position between these extremes (2.7%). For those respondents of migrant origin, we see a more or less similar pattern in which co-residence is most common in Germany, Belgium, and Austria and much less likely in the Netherlands and France. At the same time, while migrants by large follow the patterns for the majority group across the countries considered, for Germany we find that migrants are significantly much more likely to reside with parents than non-migrants (z -test, $p < .001$), while migrants in Austria are less likely to co-reside than the native population ($p < .01$). In the other countries, there is no significant difference.

Table 2. Co-residence with parents among migrant and non-migrant adults across Europe: % of adult children living with at least one parent, by respondents' country and migration background.

Country	Migration background	(N)	Living with parent
Germany	Native	(4159)	4.45
	2nd or 2.5 generation	(339)	5.31
	Migrant	(645)	9.15
France	Native	(4345)	2.65
	2nd or 2.5 generation	(618)	3.72
	Migrant	(531)	2.45
The Netherlands	Native	(4128)	1.28
	2nd or 2.5 generation	(162)	1.85
	Migrant	(285)	2.46
Austria	Native	(2705)	9.24
	2nd or 2.5 generation	(265)	4.15
	Migrant	(572)	5.94
Belgium	Native	(2779)	6.15
	2nd or 2.5 generation	(355)	8.17
	Migrant	(456)	4.17
All countries ^a	Native	(18,116)	4.27
	2nd or 2.5 generation	(1739)	4.83
	Migrant	(2489)	5.30

^aThe difference in the percentage of respondents living with parents among natives and migrants is statistically significant (z-test, $p < .01$).

In the next step, we ran a set of binomial logistic regressions (Tables 3 and 4). Based on pooled models (i.e. models considering adult child-parents of migrant origin and those of non-migrant origin together), we find that the fact of being a migrant or a second-generation member does not show any statistically significant difference in living arrangements, once one controls for the above-mentioned socio-demographic characteristics (Model 1 in Table 3). The multivariate analyses corroborate the descriptive findings indicating clear differences in levels of co-residence across Europe. The likelihood of adult children living with at least one parent is higher in Austria, Germany and Belgium and lower in the Netherlands, as compared to France (reference category). This holds true in the native population as well as among the 2nd generation and the migrant sub-samples.

Moreover, the analyses by migrant status show that the association between socio-demographic characteristics and the likelihood to live with parents, where statistically significant, does not differ between migrants and non-migrants (Models 2–4 in Table 3). We find support that both resources and demographic characteristics are relevant for adult child–parent co-residence, but in a similar way for migrants and non-migrants. Even though some coefficients do not achieve statistical significance, the trend is in the same direction. Note that the odds in Model 3 tend not to be statistically significant, most likely due to the small sample size of 2nd or 2.5 generation respondents.

In line with the literature discussed above, there is a curvilinear association between age of the child and the likelihood of living with the parents. The likelihood decreases among 37–45-year-olds and rises again later. We also confirm previous findings that women and higher educated people are less likely to reside with parents than men and lower educated individuals. This is equally the case for migrants and non-migrants. Adult children who do not live with a partner are more likely to live with a parent, whereas those with own children are less likely to live with a parent, as expected. This points to the importance of the adult child's life course stages and events for the likelihood of co-residence with a (older)

Table 3. Odds ratios for a set of logistic regressions on living with at least one parent, by migration background (reference categories in parentheses).

	Model 1 All		Model 2 Native		Model 3 2nd or 2.5		Model 4 Migrant	
	Odds ratio	Std. error	Odds ratio	Std. error	Odds ratio	Std. error	Odds ratio	Std. error
Country (France)								
Germany	1.879***	0.210	1.622***	0.210	1.578	0.570	4.646***	1.582
Austria	3.577***	0.409	4.150***	0.538	1.424	0.583	3.169**	1.171
The Netherlands	0.382***	0.060	0.368***	0.064	0.314~	0.204	0.701	0.343
Belgium	2.635***	0.301	2.776***	0.363	3.143***	1.016	1.927~	0.727
Gender (Male): Female	0.556***	0.040	0.562***	0.046	0.455**	0.118	0.526***	0.102
Education (Low): High	0.651***	0.061	0.641***	0.072	0.489*	0.145	0.860	0.189
Age (27–36)								
37–45	0.736***	0.064	0.779*	0.077	0.509*	0.165	0.760	0.171
46+	1.258*	0.123	1.407**	0.157	0.604	0.226	1.223	0.326
Living arrangement (No partner)								
Migrant partner	1.986***	0.313	1.303	0.372	3.244*	1.859	1.663	0.538
Not living with partner	6.297***	0.575	6.099***	0.602	15.232***	6.543	4.451***	1.442
Children (No own): At least one	0.332***	0.028	0.309***	0.030	0.450**	0.137	0.385***	0.086
No. siblings (0)								
1	1.336**	0.149	1.225	0.152	1.512	0.705	2.180*	0.702
2	1.100	0.106	1.091	0.116	1.562	0.566	0.698	0.222
3 or more	1.034	0.095	0.975	0.103	1.515	0.495	0.933	0.229
Parents with physical limitations (None): Yes	0.280***	0.037	0.299***	0.044	0.204***	0.093	0.225***	0.099
Respondent or partner with physical limitations (None): Yes	1.146	0.144	1.093	0.153	1.117	0.550	1.773	0.643
Migrant status (Native)								
Migrant	1.107	0.128						
2nd or 2.5 generation	0.982	0.125						
(N)	(22,344)		(18,116)		(1739)		(2489)	
AIC	0.283		0.270		0.298		0.365	
BIC	–217,282.235		–172,602.555		–12,364.474		–18,455.949	
L^2	1819.053		1545.251		189.476		158.005	
Degrees of freedom	18		16		16		16	

AIC: Akaike information criterion; BIC: Bayesian information criterion; L^2 : likelihood ratio statistic.Significance levels: ~ $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

parent. Again, this holds for both migrants and non-migrants. Finally, single child respondents are more likely to co-reside. While having a parent with physical limitations is associated with reduced likelihood to live with them, no effects are found for the physical limitations of the respondent.

Migrant respondents have been on average 19 years in the country of residence (mean = 19.2; s.d. = 13.6). We have run Model 4 including this variable: duration of stay is positively associated with the likelihood of co-residence. However, we decided not to include this variable in the final models because we would no longer have been able to compare directly Model 4 with Models 1–3; also, it would have required excluding the Netherlands, as this information is not available in the Dutch GGS data.

In other models, we have also included an indicator of the approximate range of monthly income of the household (less than €1000; €1000–1999; €2000–2999; €3000 or more). The results show that, among both migrants and non-migrants, the higher the income, the more likely co-residence. However, information about household income was also not collected for the Netherlands and was missing for about 22% of the respondents in the other countries. Additionally, we have performed Models 1–4 for each of the

Table 4. Odds ratios for a set of logistic regressions on living with at least one parent, accounting for respondents' and parents' region of origin (reference categories in parentheses).

	Model 5 All		Model 6 All		Model 7 1st age tertile	
	Odds ratio	Std. error	Odds ratio	Std. error	Odds ratio	Std. error
Country (France)						
Germany	1.888***	0.212	1.901***	0.215	1.268	0.244
Austria	3.675***	0.424	3.677***	0.427	4.837***	0.820
The Netherlands	0.390***	0.062	0.392***	0.062	0.420***	0.102
Belgium	2.670***	0.306	2.666***	0.306	4.239***	0.781
Gender (Male): Female	0.555***	0.040	0.555***	0.040	0.470***	0.053
Education (Low): High	0.658***	0.062	0.659***	0.063	0.660*	0.111
Age (27–36)						
37–45	0.745***	0.064	0.745***	0.064		
46+	1.287*	0.126	1.288**	0.126		
Living arrangement (No partner)						
Migrant partner	1.891***	0.299	1.896***	0.300	2.142**	0.596
Not living with partner	6.281***	0.574	6.264***	0.572	14.467***	2.525
Children (no own): At least one	0.330***	0.028	0.330***	0.028	0.386***	0.058
No. siblings (0)						
1	1.340**	0.150	1.338**	0.150	1.245	0.215
2	1.093	0.106	1.093	0.106	1.056	0.152
3 or more	1.017	0.095	1.012	0.095	1.137	0.165
Parents with physical limitations (None): Yes	0.277***	0.037	0.278***	0.037	0.195***	0.054
Respondent or partner with physical limitations (None): Yes	1.155	0.145	1.154	0.145	1.093	0.261
Origin (Native and native parents)						
Europe migrant	1.213	0.166				
Middle East–North Africa migrant	1.086	0.235				
Asia migrant	0.355	0.264				
America migrant	1.118	0.600				
Africa migrant	0.861	0.387				
Other origin migrant	1.398	0.556				
2.5 generation	0.606**	0.110				
Second generation	1.854***	0.323				
Origin (Native and native parents)						
Middle East–North Africa 2nd gen.			2.051*	0.641	2.969**	1.085
Asia 2nd generation			2.114~	0.948	2.736*	1.314
Europe 2nd generation			1.542~	0.384	1.548	0.576
Middle East–North Africa migrant			1.088	0.235	0.968	0.348
Asia migrant			0.356	0.265	0.214	0.231
Europe migrant			1.212	0.166	1.313	0.279
Other origin 2nd or 2.5 generation			0.674*	0.116	0.646~	0.158
Other origin migrant			1.112	0.293	1.404	0.511
(N)	(22,344)		(22,344)		(7626)	
AIC	0.282		0.283		0.328	
BIC	–217,247.8		–217,242.1		–65,512.7	
L ²	1844.704		1839.036		1125.7	
Degrees of freedom	24		24		22	

AIC: Akaike information criterion; BIC: Bayesian information criterion; L²: likelihood ratio statistic.
Significance levels: ~*p* < .10, **p* < .05, ***p* < .01, ****p* < .001.

five countries under study separately yielding similar findings to those presented in Table 3 for the pooled sample (results available upon request).

Models 5 and 6 (Table 4) consider the pooled sample (as in Model 1) and focus on respondents' and their parents' migration characteristics. Model 5 results show that second-generation migrants are significantly more likely to live with at least one parent than their third generation (native) counterparts; while 2.5 generation migrants are significantly less likely to live with at least one parent. Confirming the results from Model 1 in

Table 3, no significant differences are found in the likelihood to live with parents between migrants and native respondents, even when distinguishing between different regions of origin. Model 6 adds information about the region of origin of the parents of respondents who were born in the country from non-native parents (i.e. 2nd generation). The findings that second-generation migrants are significantly more likely to live with at least one parent than their non-migrant counterparts seems to be driven by the higher likelihood of living with parents among Middle Eastern, Northern African, or Asian origin. Even though the odds are not statistically significant, both models suggest that, migrants of Asian origin are less likely to live with parents than non-migrants, while those of European origin show a higher likelihood of co-residence.

Finally, Model 7 in **Table 4** is specified as Model 6 and includes only respondents within the first age tertile (i.e. 27–36). Overall, these results confirm those relating to the whole working sample.

Robustness check

The focus of this paper is on the likelihood of adult child–parent co-residence by migrant origin. However, living close-by may be a substitute for co-residence in providing support across generations. We therefore carry out a robustness check on the sub-sample with information about geographical proximity to the parents (a variable that was not operationalised in the Netherlands). Respondents who do not live with parents live on average 1.8 hours (s.d. = 5.1) away from the geographically closest parent (for more details on parent–child geographical proximity, see **Table 5**). In this respect, there are some differences by country and migration background. **Figure 1** shows that, on average, in all the countries non-migrants not living with parents live closer to them than migrants do. This holds for both natives and respondents born in the country from migrant parents. Moreover, geographical proximity between adult children and parents is lowest in Austria and Belgium among non-migrants, but among migrants in Germany and France. In **Figure 2**, we notice that among the migrants, the share of respondents living no more than half an hour from their parents is on average as low as 20–35%, with only less than 5% of Asian migrants living within half an hour from their parents. This has clear implications on the associations we found between socio-demographic variables and the probability of adult child–parent co-residence. We therefore ran the same analyses as in Models 1–6 of **Tables 3** and **4**, defining our dependent variable as a dummy indicating whether the respondent lives with a parent or within half an hour from them (=1; =0 otherwise) (the results are reported in Table A1 in the appendix).

Table 5. Descriptive statistics concerning the proximity between adult child and geographically closest parent, among respondents not living with a parent, by migration background (% values).

	All	Native	2nd or 2.5	Migrant
Within 1/2 hour	65.3	70.5	68.2	29.2
½–2 hours	16.4	17.4	15.4	10.5
2–5 hours	8.5	7.5	7.7	15.6
>5 hours	9.8	4.6	8.7	44.7
Total	100	100	100	100
(N)	(15,721)	(12,449)	(1389)	(1883)

Note: Information not available for the Netherlands.

Figure 1. Distribution of geographical proximity to the closest parent among respondents who do not live with parents, by country and migration background defined in three categories (native; 2nd or 2.5 generations; migrant).

Note: Information not available for the Netherlands.

As shown descriptively in the graphs, migrants are less likely to live near their parents than non-migrants. In these analyses age has now a negative association with the probability of living with or near the parents: we saw before that 46+ year-olds are more likely to live with a parent than their younger counterparts, however, this new evidence shows that if they do not live *with* a parent, they are likely to live further away. This suggests that the older parents may live independently or in care facilities further away. Moreover, while we found that physical limitations of the parents decrease the likelihood of parent-child co-residence, they positively affect close proximity among all groups defined by their migration background. This may suggest that more intense care is more likely to be provided by living close to the parent rather than together. It is also to be noted that the odds for having own children are above 1 in the new models, suggesting that being a parent may increase the likelihood of proximity to one's parents, while at the same time it decreases co-residence.

Conclusion and discussion

In this paper, we first addressed the question of whether there are differences in levels and determinants (resources and cultural values) of adult child-older parent co-residence

Figure 2. Distribution of geographical proximity to the closest parent among respondents who do not live with parents (%), by migration background distinguishing migration background and migrant origin (native – i.e. non-migrant and non-migrant parents; 2.5 generation; 2nd generation; and six categories of migrant origin, i.e. Europe, Middle East–North Africa, Asia, America, Africa, other).

Note: Information not available for the Netherlands.

between migrants and non-migrants across Europe. Second, we explored to what extent migrant-specific factors (like region of origin and migrant generation) are associated with intergenerational co-residence in this stage of life. Using data from the GGS in five European countries, we focused on the adult child's stage of life after the expected leaving of the parental home.

We find no clear differences in adult child–parent co-residence between migrants and non-migrants. We do, however, find a clear regional gradient in terms of co-residence across Europe, which is reflected among both migrants and non-migrants. This finding suggests that differences in housing and care options and potentially different norms regarding intergenerational support across Europe lead to diverse levels of co-residence. These factors seem to be of similar importance for migrants and non-migrants in the five studied countries. This implies that to understand care arrangements among migrant populations we should pay ample attention to the institutional setting that the latter are navigating and not only focus on cultural factors that might be related to their background, but not necessarily act as key determinants of their living arrangement choices in later life. The interplay between institutional context and cultural factors was also suggested by the work of Kagitçibasi (2005) on intergenerational relations among migrant families, but it still remains underused in empirical studies. Furthermore, in

light of the ongoing discussions on the more individual responsibility of care and withdrawing of governments from providing this type of welfare, the availability of sufficient and adequate housing options become highly important. Again, this holds for migrants and non-migrants alike. At the same time, however, migrants might be more prone to discrimination and exclusion from access to certain welfare arrangements, making them a more vulnerable group – especially when they have fewer resources, as it was clear from our analyses showing that resources do matter for co-residence.

Additionally, our findings point to the importance of a set of similar socio-demographic factors and resources that influence co-residence among migrants and non-migrants, as was expected (H1 and H2). Our results in this regard reflect previous evidence found among the majority groups across Europe. It is clear that needs, resources (of adult child and parent), and life course stage are all important aspects in intergenerational co-residence choices of adult children with their parents. Therefore, while immigrants do not co-reside more often than natives (contrary to our hypothesis H3a), we do see that second-generation adults co-reside more often and 2.5 generation adults less often than natives (only partly confirming our hypothesis H3b). This might be related to the fact that parents of first-generation immigrants in our sample may live outside the country, as the additional analyses on geographic distance between adult child and parent suggest. This study cannot establish whether this is related to preferences to co-reside or barriers in establishing separate households due to, for example, financial limitations or discrimination in the housing market. Future work on intergenerational co-residence should more explicitly take into account the roles of wishes and needs among migrants of different generations and origins.

Interestingly, we find that having a parent with physical limitations is associated with lower likelihood to co-reside. This seems to suggest that intense care for a parent in need is not (or no longer) provided via co-residence. This is in line with our findings on higher proximity: parents suffering from poor health may receive more intense care via other institutional support measures, while children will live close by to supplement the care. Due to the cross-sectional nature of our data, we cannot assess changes in living arrangements over the life course and how care across generations is divided between siblings and institutional care providers. Earlier studies have shown that adult children might be moving in and out of the parental house and also older parents may reside with one child for a period of time and then move to live with another child. Existing literature has suggested, for example, that younger parents more often live with sons while older parents with more health problems are more likely to live with their daughters, suggesting different care roles and agreements between brothers and sisters when it comes to caring for parents in different stages of life. For immigrant families, such studies are lacking but essential to understand the relationship between parents and adult children as well as broader family dynamics. In addition, our study does not shed light on the role of relationship quality and its potentially diverse importance among individuals of migrant and non-migrant origin. We also cannot assess the potentially reverse causality between co-residence and relationship quality as well as that between co-residence and other health outcomes. Including a fuller account of the interplay between family composition and relations would be essential to further understand intergenerational care through co-residence. This could be even more relevant for migrant families, that are more likely to have a parent living further away, as our exploratory analyses show. In this regard, geographic

proximity only partially substitutes co-residence and seems to be more relevant for non-migrants than it is for the current generation of migrants.

Another drawback of our work is that the analysis is based on self-reported co-residence from the adult child's perspective. This implies that we assume that all respondents have the same understanding of sharing a household and what their living arrangement is. We furthermore assume that, when asked about living with the parents, they all refer and include their own parents only. However, it could very well be that some respondents reported co-residence with a parent-in-law. Although additional analyses, considering the information derived from the household grid on living with a parent or parent-in-law as a dependent variable, confirmed the results reported here (analyses available upon request from the corresponding author), we may underestimate the role of parents-in-law in our analyses. The importance of in-laws in the lives of adult children, including co-residence, is an understudied topic by and in itself. More attention is needed on these relationships that may play a key role in the development of intergenerational (care) relations over the life course. This may even be more true in the case of migrants whose own parents may not be in the country of residence while in-laws are, or the other way around. How and the extent to which this affects intergenerational bonds are yet to be understood (see e.g. Karpinska and Dykstra 2019 on transnational ties in the case of Polish migrants in the Netherlands and their parents living in Poland).

Although our findings generally suggest that similar mechanisms operate for migrant and non-migrant families in terms of intergenerational co-residence, more in-depth studies are needed to understand how care is negotiated in migrant families. Given that individual needs and life course phases are important, it is crucial to get a more detailed picture of how family relations and support are shaped and re-shaped across the life course among migrant and non-migrant families.

Notes

1. http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=yth_demo_030&lang=en, accessed on 27 April 2016.
2. <http://unstats.un.org/unsd/methods/m49/m49regin.htm>, accessed on 27 April 2016.

Acknowledgements

We gratefully acknowledge the feedback by two anonymous reviewers and the guest editors on the earlier version of our work. We also thank the participants at the international workshop on 'Intergenerational Transfers and Immigrant Population' held at the University of Bologna, Italy in September 2015, where a preliminary version of this paper was presented for their suggestions.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Funding

The work of the first author is part of and financed by the European Research Council, Starting Grant Project [number 26.38.29] 'Families of Migrant Origin: A Life Course Perspective' (FaMiLife).

References

- Albertini, M., G. Gasperoni, and D. Mantovani. 2019. "Whom to Help and Why? Family Norms on Financial Support for Adult Children among Immigrants." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 45 (10): 1769–1789. doi:10.1080/1369183X.2018.1485206.
- Albertini, M., D. Mantovani, and G. Gasperoni. 2019. "Intergenerational Relations among Immigrants in Europe: The Role of Ethnic Differences, Migration and Acculturation." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 45 (10): 1693–1706. doi:10.1080/1369183X.2018.1485202.
- Angel, R. J., and M. Tienda. 1982. "Determinants of Extended Household Structure: Cultural Pattern or Economic Need." *American Journal of Sociology* 87: 1360–1383.
- Attias-Donfut, C., J. Ogg, and F.-C. Wolff. 2005. "European Patterns of Intergenerational Financial and Time Transfers." *European Journal of Ageing* 2: 161–173.
- Attias-Donfut, C., and F.-C. Wolff. 2008. "Patterns of Intergenerational Transfers among Immigrants in France: A Comparative Perspective." In *Families, Ageing and Social Policy: Generational Solidarity in European Welfare States*, edited by C. Saraceno, 259–284. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Baykara-Krumme, H. 2008. "Reliable Bonds? A Comparative Perspective of Intergenerational Support Patterns among Migrant Families in Germany." In *Families, Ageing and Social Policy: Generational Solidarity in European Welfare States*, edited by C. Saraceno, 285–311. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Baykara-Krumme, H., and T. Fokkema. 2019. "The Impact of Migration on Intergenerational Solidarity Types." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 45 (10): 1707–1727. doi:10.1080/1369183X.2018.1485203.
- Bengtson, V. L., R. Giarrusso, M. Silverstein, and H. Wang. 2000. "Families and Intergenerational Relationships in Aging Societies." *International Journal of Aging* 2: 3–10.
- Billari, F. C., D. Philipov, and P. Baizán. 2001. "Leaving Home in Europe: The Experience of Cohorts Born Around 1960." *International Journal of Population Geography* 7: 339–356.
- Boos-Nünning, U., and Y. Karakaşoğlu. 2005. *Viele Welten leben. Zur Lebenssituation von Mädchen und jungen Frauen mit Migrationshintergrund*. Münster: Waxmann.
- Bordone, V. 2009. "Contact and Proximity of Older People to Their Adult Children: A Comparison Between Italy and Sweden." *Population, Space and Place* 15: 359–380.
- Bordone, V., and H. A. G. de Valk. 2016. "Intergenerational Support among Migrant Families in Europe." *European Journal of Ageing* 13 (3): 259–270.
- Bueno, X., and H. A. G. de Valk. 2016. "Arreglos familiares de la población latinoamericana en España: ¿cambios en tiempos de crisis?" *Notas de Población* 43 (102): 123–148.
- Burr, J., and J. E. Mutchler. 1993. "Nativity, Acculturation, and Economic Status: Explanations of Asian American Living Arrangements in Later Life." *Journal of Gerontology: Social Sciences* 48: 55–63.
- Burr, J., and J. E. Mutchler. 2003. "English Language Skills, Ethnic Concentration, and Household Composition: Older Mexican Immigrants." *Journal of Gerontology* 58: 83–92.
- de Valk, H. A. G., and D. Schans. 2008. "'They Ought to Do This for Their Parents': Perceptions of Filial Obligations among Immigrant and Dutch Older People." *Ageing & Society* 28: 49–66.
- Dykstra, P. A., M. P. B. van den Broek, C. Muresan, M. Haragus, P.-T. Haragus, A. Abramowska-Kmon, and I. E. Kotowska. 2013. *State-of-the-Art Report Intergenerational Linkages in Families*. Families and Societies Working Paper Series No. 1.
- Fernández-Reino, M., and A. González-Ferrer. 2019. "Intergenerational Relationships among Latino Immigrant Families in Spain: Conflict and Emotional Intimacy." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 45 (10): 1746–1768. doi:10.1080/1369183X.2018.1485205.
- Giuliano, P. 2006. *Living Arrangements in Western Europe: Does Cultural Origin Matter?* IZA Discussion Paper No. 2042.
- Glick, J. E., and J. Van Hook. 2002. "Parent's Coresidence with Adult Children: Can Immigration Explain Racial and Ethnic Variation?" *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 64: 240–253.
- Gordon, M. M. 1964. *Assimilation in American Life*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Greenwell, L., and V. L. Bengtson. 1997. "Geographic Distance and Contact Between Middle-Aged Children and Their Parents: The Effects of Social Class over 20 Years." *Journal of Gerontology, Social Sciences* 52B: S13–S26.
- Grundy, E. 2000. "Co-residence of Mid-Life Children with Their Elderly Parents in England and Wales: Changes Between 1981 and 1991." *Population Studies* 54 (2): 193–206.
- Grundy, E. 2006. "Ageing and Vulnerable Elderly People: European Perspectives." *Ageing & Society* 26: 105–134.
- Gurak, D. T., and M. M. Kritz. 2010. "Elderly Asian and Hispanic Foreign- and Native-Born Living Arrangements: Accounting for Differences." *Research on Aging* 32 (5): 567–594.
- Hank, K. 2007. "Proximity and Contacts Between Older Parents and Their Children: A European Comparison." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 69: 157–173.
- Iacovou, M., and A. J. Skew. 2011. "Household Composition Across the New Europe: Where Do the New Member States Fit in?" *Demographic Research* 25: 465–490.
- Isengard, B., and M. Szydlik. 2012. "Living Apart (or) Together? Coresidence of Elderly Parents and Their Adult Children in Europe." *Research on Aging* 34: 449–474.
- Johar, M., S. Maruyama, and S. Nakamura. 2015. "Reciprocity in the Formation of Intergenerational Coresidence." *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* 36: 192–209.
- Kagitçibasi, Ç. 2005. "Autonomy and Relatedness in Cultural Context: Implications for Self and Family." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 36 (4): 403–422.
- Kagitçibasi, Ç., B. Ataca, and A. Diri. 2005. "Intergenerational Relationships in the Family: Ethnic, Socioeconomic, and Country Variations in Germany, Israel, Palestine, and Turkey." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 41: 652–670.
- Karpinska, K., and P. A. Dykstra. 2019. "Intergenerational Ties Across Borders: A Typology of the Relationships Between Polish Migrants in the Netherlands and Their Ageing Parents." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 45 (10): 1728–1745. doi:10.1080/1369183X.2018.1485204.
- Keene, J. R., and C. D. Batson. 2010. "Under One Roof: A Review of Research on Intergenerational Coresidence and Multigenerational Households in the United States." *Sociology Compass* 4 (8): 642–657.
- Kleinepieter, T., and H. A. G. de Valk. 2014. *Leaving Home among Migrant-Descent and Dutch Young Adults: Parent-Child and Peer Relations*. NIDI Working Paper No. 2014/5. NIDI: The Hague.
- Lanzieri, G. 2011. *Fewer, Older and Multicultural? Projections of the EU Populations by Foreign/National Background*. Eurostat Methodologies and Working Papers. Eurostat: Luxembourg.
- Lennartz, C., R. Arundel, and R. Ronald. 2016. "Younger Adults and Homeownership in Europe Through the Global Financial Crisis." *Population Space and Place* 22 (8): 823–835.
- Michielin, F., and C. H. Mulder. 2007. "Geographical Distances Between Adult Children and Their Parents in the Netherlands." *Demographic Research* 17: 655–678.
- Nauck, B. 2000. "Eltern-Kind-Beziehungen in Migrantenfamilien – ein Vergleich zwischen griechischen, italienischen, türkischen und vietnamesischen Familien in Deutschland." In *Familien ausländischer Herkunft in Deutschland: empirische Beiträge zur Familienentwicklung und Akkulturation*. Materialien zum 6. Familienbericht, edited by Sachverständigenkommission 6. Familienbericht, Band I, 347–392. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.
- Portes, A., and R. G. Rumbaut. 2006. *Immigrant America: A Portrait*. 3rd ed. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Reher, D. S. 1998. "Family Ties in Western Europe: Persistent Contrasts." *Population and Development Review* 24 (2): 203–234.
- Rosenmayr, L., and E. Köckeis. 1965. *Umwelt und Familie alter Menschen*. Neuwied am Rhein: Hermann Luchterhand.
- Rossi, A. S., and P. H. Rossi. 1990. *Of Human Bonding: Parent-Child Relations over the Life Course*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Ruggles, S., and M. Heggeness. 2008. "Intergenerational Coresidence in Developing Countries." *Population and Development Review* 34 (2): 253–281.
- Rumbaut, R. G. 2015. "Assimilation of Immigrants." In *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, edited by J. D. Wright, 2nd ed., 2 vols, 81–87. Elsevier: Oxford.

- Schans, D. 2008. "Solidariteit tussen generaties: Beeldvorming allochtonen/autochtonen genuanceerd." *Demos* 24 (5): 6–7.
- Seltzer, J. A., and E. M. Friedman. 2014. "Widowed Mothers' Coresidence with Adult Children." *Journals of Gerontology: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences* B69 (1): 63–74.
- Seltzer, J. A., J. J. Yahirun, and S. M. Bianchi. 2013. "Co-residence and Geographic Proximity of Mothers and Adult Children in Stepfamilies." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 75: 1164–1180.
- Shelton, N., and E. Grundy. 2000. "Proximity of Adult Children to Their Parents in Great Britain." *International Journal of Population Geography* 6: 181–195.
- Smits, A., R. I. Van Gaalen, and C. H. Mulder. 2010. "Parent-Child Coresidence: Who Moves in with Whom and for Whose Needs?" *Journal of Marriage and Family* 72: 1022–1033.
- Steinbach, A. 2013. "Family Structure and Parent-Child Contact: A Comparison of Native and Migrant Families." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 75: 1114–1129.
- Taylor, P., J. Passel, R. Fry, R. Morin, W. Wang, G. Velasco, and D. Dockterman. 2010. *The Return of the Multi-generational Family Household*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center.
- Tomassini, C., S. Kalogirou, E. Grundy, T. Fokkema, P. Martikainen, M. Broese Van Groenou, and A. Karisto. 2004. "Contacts Between Elderly Parents and Their Children in Four European Countries: Current Patterns and Future Prospects." *European Journal of Ageing* 1: 54–63.
- Van Mol, C., and H. A. G. de Valk. 2016. "Migration and Immigrants in Europe: A Historical and Demographic Perspective." In *Integration Processes and Policies in Europe: Contexts, Levels and Actors*, edited by B. Garcés-Masareñas and R. Penninx, 31–55. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Zorlu, A., and C. H. Mulder. 2011. "Ethnic Differences in Leaving Home: Timing and Pathways." *Demography* 48 (1): 49–72.

Appendix

Table A1. Odds ratios for a set of logistic regressions on living with/within 30 minutes from at least one parent (reference categories in parentheses).

	Model 1 All		Model 2 Native		Model 3 2nd or 2.5		Model 4 Migrant		Model 5 All		Model 6 All	
	Odds ratio	Std. error	Odds ratio	Std. error	Odds ratio	Std. error	Odds ratio	Std. error	Odds ratio	Std. error	Odds ratio	Std. error
Country (France)												
Germany	1.003	0.042	0.967	0.045	0.754*	0.107	1.415*	0.194	1.001	0.042	1.009	0.043
Austria	2.582***	0.135	3.361***	0.211	2.154***	0.370	0.945	0.142	2.630***	0.139	2.636***	0.139
The Netherlands	0.010***	0.001	0.009***	0.001	0.014***	0.008	0.058***	0.023	0.010***	0.001	0.010***	0.001
Belgium	2.538***	0.126	2.906***	0.168	3.460***	0.574	0.976	0.140	2.605***	0.130	2.600***	0.130
Gender (Male): Female	0.838***	0.028	0.844***	0.032	0.800*	0.090	0.844~	0.080	0.842***	0.028	0.842***	0.028
Education (Low): High	0.805***	0.038	0.795***	0.045	0.876	0.133	0.832~	0.088	0.817***	0.038	0.816***	0.038
Age (27–36)												
37–45	0.890**	0.036	0.931	0.044	1.000	0.132	0.685***	0.076	0.895**	0.037	0.895**	0.037
46+	0.797***	0.035	0.808***	0.041	0.818	0.125	0.880	0.114	0.799***	0.036	0.799***	0.036
Living arrangement (No partner)												
Migrant partner	0.777***	0.049	0.625***	0.058	1.072	0.192	0.947	0.111	0.745***	0.047	0.747***	0.048
Not living with partner	1.014	0.041	0.988	0.045	1.025	0.138	1.301~	0.176	1.015	0.041	1.012	0.041
Children (No own): At least one	1.177***	0.051	1.154**	0.057	1.391*	0.197	1.102	0.143	1.181***	0.051	1.180***	0.051
No. siblings (0)												
1	1.062	0.062	1.071	0.068	0.791	0.165	1.258	0.244	1.065	0.062	1.065	0.062
2	0.993	0.044	0.989	0.050	0.961	0.144	0.939	0.137	0.991	0.044	0.992	0.045
3 or more	0.922~	0.039	0.901*	0.044	1.080	0.153	0.780*	0.095	0.914*	0.039	0.912*	0.039
Parents with physical limitations (None): Yes	1.152***	0.048	1.176***	0.055	1.206	0.162	1.005	0.128	1.152***	0.048	1.151***	0.048
Respondent or partner with physical limitations (None): Yes	1.064	0.065	1.051	0.072	1.058	0.222	1.100	0.195	1.061	0.065	1.063	0.065
Migrant status (Native)												
Migrant	0.196***	0.012										
2nd or 2.5	0.881*	0.051										
Origin (Native and native parents)												
Europe migrant									0.212***	0.015		
Middle East–North Africa migrant									0.254***	0.026		
Asia migrant									0.019***	0.009		
America migrant									0.109***	0.041		
Africa migrant									0.125***	0.028		

(Continued)

Table A1. Continued.

	Model 1 All		Model 2 Native		Model 3 2nd or 2.5		Model 4 Migrant		Model 5 All		Model 6 All	
	Odds ratio	Std. error	Odds ratio	Std. error	Odds ratio	Std. error	Odds ratio	Std. error	Odds ratio	Std. error	Odds ratio	Std. error
Other origin migrant									0.192***	0.044		
2.5 generation									0.784***	0.055		
Second generation									1.104	0.106		
Origin (Native and native parents)												
Middle East–North Africa 2nd gen.											1.412~	0.264
Asia 2nd generation											0.845	0.243
Europe 2nd generation											1.037	0.129
Middle East–North Africa migrant											0.254***	0.026
Asia migrant											0.019***	0.009
Europe migrant											0.212***	0.015
Other origin 2nd or 2.5 generation											0.793***	0.054
Other origin migrant											0.145***	0.022
(N)	(22,344)		(18,116)		(1739)		(2489)		(22,344)		(22,344)	
AIC	0.922		0.949		1.135		1.112		0.989		0.989	
BIC	−201,442.2		−16,0287.2		−10,907.833		−16,595.2		−201,456.0		−201,455.6	
L^2	8846.7		7896.2		410.3		188.1		8920.5		8920.2	
Degrees of freedom	18		16		16		16		24		24	

Note: For the Netherlands, the dependent variable has value 1 only if living with at least one parent, as information on geographical proximity between parents and children is not available.

AIC: Akaike information criterion; BIC: Bayesian information criterion; L^2 : likelihood ratio statistic.

Significance levels: ~ $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.