

# Transitions in Coresidence with Adult Children among Older Adults in Beijing

Zachary Zimmer<sup>1</sup>, Xianghua Fang<sup>2</sup>,  
Toshiko Kaneda<sup>1</sup>, Zhe Tang<sup>2</sup>, Julia Kwong<sup>3</sup>

Population Council<sup>1</sup>, Xuanwu Hospital<sup>2</sup>, University of Manitoba<sup>3</sup>

**This research is supported by a grant from the National Institute on Aging, Grant  
Number R01 AG20063-01.**

# Background

- Adult children are a primary source of support for older adults**
- Coresidence underpins the support system**
- Fewer children and socioeconomic change can reduce levels of coresidence and hence levels of support**

# Three perspectives

## Demographic:

Availability of children

## Modernization:

Values on privacy and living independently

## Altruistic:

Needs of family members

# Conceptual Model

## Demographic:

# of Children, Has a Son

## Modernization:

Education, Occupation

## Altruistic:

Health (functional disability,  
chronic conditions),  
Income, Living with a spouse

**Coresidence  
Status**

Controls

# Conceptual Model

## Demographic:

# of Children, Has a Son

## Modernization:

Education, Occupation

## Altruistic:

*Changes in* Health (functional disability, chronic conditions),  
Income, Living with a spouse

Controls

Coresidence  
Status T1

Coresidence  
Status T2

# **Beijing Multidimensional Longitudinal Study on Aging**

- Capital University of Medical Science**
- Representative sample aged 55+ in 3 districts**
- Three waves: 1992, 1994, 1997**
- N= 3,257**
- 64% coresiding with a child in 1992**

# Determinants of Coresidence (1)

(N=7,670)

<u>Demographic</u>	$\beta$	<u>Altruistic</u>	$\beta$
# of children:		Has disability	+.28**
1	---	Has chronic condition	ns
2	+.32^	Receives income	-.26**
3	+.33*	Lives with spouse	-1.03**
4	ns		
5	ns	<u>Modernization</u>	
6+	ns	Education	ns
Has a son(s)	ns	While-collar occupation	-.29**

\* p < .01   \* p < .05   ^ p < .10

# Determinants of Coresidence (2)

(N=7,670)

<u>Year of Observation</u>	<u><math>\beta</math></u>	<u>Controls</u>	<u><math>\beta</math></u>
Wave 1 (1992)	---	Age:	---
Wave 2 (1994)	ns	55-59	---
Wave 3 (1997)	ns	60-64	-.51**
		65-69	-.82**
		70-74	-1.02**
		75+	-1.00**
		Female	-.23*
		Rural Residence	-.59**

\*p < .01    \* p < .05    ^ p < .10



# Coreidence Status at Wave 3 by Wave 2 & 3 Status (N=1,951)

Wave 1 Status	Wave 2 Status	Wave 3 Coresiding	N
Coreside	Coreside	83.1	1020
Not	Not	13.6	584
Coreside	Not	39.6	192
Not	Coreside	53.3	155

# Predicted Probability of Moving in with a Child between Waves 2 & 3 (N=1,951)

<b>Wave 1</b> <b>Characteristics</b>	<b>Wave 2</b> <b>Characteristics</b>	<b>Move in bet</b> <b>Waves 2 and 3</b>
<b>No disability</b>	<b>No disability</b>	<b>0.149</b>
	<b>Has disability</b>	<b>0.279</b>
<b>Receives income</b>	<b>Receives income</b>	<b>0.135</b>
	<b>Receives no income</b>	<b>0.203</b>
<b>Lives with spouse</b>	<b>Lives with spouse</b>	<b>0.137</b>
	<b>Does not live with spouse</b>	<b>0.236</b>

# Summary and Conclusion

- The family support system for older adults remains relatively intact for those who have greater needs
- Our results are supportive of the altruistic perspective
- For example, becoming functionally disabled increases the chance of coresidence
- Demographic and modernization perspective receive partial support