



DEMOGRAPHIC RESEARCH

A peer-reviewed, open-access journal of population sciences

DEMOGRAPHIC RESEARCH

VOLUME 51, ARTICLE 35, PAGES 1095–1124

PUBLISHED 5 NOVEMBER 2024

<https://www.demographic-research.org/Volumes/Vol51/35>

DOI: 10.4054/DemRes.2024.51.35

Research Article

Interracial couples and intergenerational coresidence: Interracial couples who provide housing assistance to their aging parents

Kate H. Choi

Jenjira Yahirun

© 2024 Kate H. Choi & Jenjira Yahirun.

This open-access work is published under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 Germany (CC BY 3.0 DE), which permits use, reproduction, and distribution in any medium, provided the original author(s) and source are given credit.

See <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/de/legalcode>.

Contents

1	Introduction	1096
2	Background	1097
2.1	Adult children's union formation and intergenerational coresidence	1097
2.2	Theoretical expectations for differences in intergenerational coresidence between couples in interracial and endogamous unions	1098
2.3	Disparities in intergenerational coresidence by couple's joint ethnorace	1100
2.4	Gender and intergenerational coresidence of interracial couples	1101
2.5	Hypotheses	1102
3	Data and methods	1103
3.1	Data	1103
3.2	Samples	1104
3.3	Variables	1105
3.3.1	Dependent variables	1105
3.3.2	Explanatory variables	1105
3.3.3	Other factors	1105
3.4	Analytical strategy	1106
4	Results	1106
4.1	Sample characteristics	1106
4.2	Multivariate analysis	1109
4.2.1	Logistic regression models predicting the odds of living with aging parents	1109
4.2.2	Logistic regression models predicting the odds of living with the female partner's parents	1111
5	Discussion and conclusion	1113
6	Acknowledgments	1116
	References	1117
	Appendix	1122

Interracial couples and intergenerational coresidence: Interracial couples who provide housing assistance to their aging parents

Kate H. Choi¹

Jenjira Yahirun²

Abstract

BACKGROUND

Married and cohabiting partners frequently share the responsibility of caring for their aging parents. Adult children's union formation and partner selection decisions have important implications for their ability to care for their aging parents. However, extant research has yet to examine how adult children's partner selection decisions influence the levels of financial, emotional, and instrumental support adult children provide their aging parents.

OBJECTIVES

We explore how adult children's decision to cross ethnoracial boundaries in union formation affects their propensity to reside with the male or female partner's parents.

METHODS

Using data from the 2007–2022 American Community Survey, we estimate logistic regression to predict the odds of living with aging parents for couples with varying joint ethnorace. We then estimate logistic regression models to predict the odds of living with the female partner's parents over the male partner's parents for couples of varying joint ethnorace.

RESULTS

White/Black and White/Hispanic couples are more likely than endogamous White couples but less likely than endogamous minority couples to live with aging parents. White female/Black male couples are less likely than Black female/White male couples to live with the female partner's parents.

¹ Corresponding author. Department of Sociology and Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, Canada. Email: kate.choi@uwo.ca.

² Department of Sociology, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, OH, USA. Email: yahirun@bgsu.edu.

CONTRIBUTION

The in-between prevalence of intergenerational coresidence among interracial couples suggests that interracial unions are bridging ethnoracial distinctions by expanding family networks across ethnoracial groups.

1. Introduction

Adult children provide sizable financial, emotional, and instrumental support to their aging parents (Patterson 2023; Schulz and Eden 2016). As the population ages and the care-receiving needs of older adults increase, the support provided by adult children to their aging parents has increasingly become important for the well-being and health of aging adults (Patterson 2023; Schulz and Eden 2016).

Married and cohabiting partners usually share the responsibility of caring for their aging parents (Lee, Spitze, and Logan 2003; Seltzer 2019; Silverstein and Giarruso 2010). Thus adult children's union formation and partner selection influence how much care adult children provide their aging parents (Patterson 2023). Yet prior work has primarily examined how adult children's union status influences the level of financial, emotional, and instrumental support they provide their aging parents (Artis and Martinez 2016; Glaser et al. 2008; Patterson 2023). Past studies have seldom examined how adult children's partner selection and the resulting assortative mating patterns influence the level of support that adult children provide their aging parents. Notably absent are studies comparing the transfers adult children in interracial unions provide their parents to the transfers provided by those in endogamous unions. This gap exists, although the number of interracial marriages has increased dramatically over the past few decades and a growing share of older adults rely on children in interracial unions for support in their old age (Livingston and Brown 2017).

We use data from the 2007–2022 American Community Survey (ACS) to compare the prevalence of intergenerational coresidence according to the couple's joint ethnorace. To do so, we first compare the prevalence of intergenerational coresidence of couples with varying joint ethnorace, focusing on disparities between interracial and endogamous couples and among interracial couples. Second, we ascertain whether the association between the couple's joint ethnorace and the odds of living with aging parents varies by union type. Finally, we restrict our analyses to couples living with aging parents and ascertain how the couple's propensity to live with the female over the male partner's parents differs by the couple's joint ethnorace and union status. Of the various types of intergenerational support, we focus on intergenerational coresidence because it enables other types of support between family members and is considered a form of "structural solidarity" between family members (Bengtson and Roberts 1991; Pezzin, Pollack, and Schone 2015; Seltzer 2019).

This study makes several significant contributions to the literature on intermarriage and family exchange. First, unlike prior work focusing on differences by union status (Patterson 2023; Schulz and Eden 2016), we investigate the consequences of partner selection and the ensuing assortative mating patterns on family exchanges. In doing so, we address two questions driving studies of the implications of partner selection: Do interracial unions reduce ethnoracial distinction by expanding family ties across ethnoracial groups? Or do interracial unions weaken ties between the couple and their extended kin? (See, e.g., Bratter and Whitehead 2018; Tilman and Miller 2017; Zhang and Sassler 2019.) Second, prior studies on the impact of forming an interracial union on family relations have primarily focused on the relationship between young adults in interracial unions and parents (Ang 2023; Yahirun and Kroeger 2019; Zhang and Sassler 2019) or perceptions about the availability of parental support to young adult children (Bratter and Whitehead 2018).³ These studies have largely overlooked the experiences of middle-aged children in interracial unions with aging parents. Therefore, we do not know how interracial couples' willingness and ability to transfer resources and provide care to their aging parents compares with that of endogamous couples. This gap exists, although transfers from middle-aged children to aging parents have important implications for older adults' well-being and health (Schultz and Eden 2016; Seltzer 2019). Third, we assess how the race and gender of the partners in interracial couples interact to shape their propensity to live with the female over the male partner's parents. Such analyses help ascertain the relative importance of race and gender in shaping the couple's decision to provide more support to one side of the family over the other.

2. Background

2.1 Adult children's union formation and intergenerational coresidence

Adult children provide a sizable portion of the financial, emotional, and instrumental support that older adults receive (Morgan 1984; Patterson 2023; Seltzer 2019). Adult children's union formation and partner selection determine the resources at their disposal, competing responsibilities (e.g., child care), and the quality of the relationship between children and parents (Pezzin, Pollack, and Schone 2015; Seltzer 2019). Past studies have documented variations in the transfer behavior of adult children according to their union status. These studies have found that unmarried adult children are more likely than their married peers to live with their parents (Esteve and Reher 2021; Pilkauskas 2012).

³ Ang (2023), Tilman and Miller (2017), Yahirun and Kroeger (2019), and Zhang and Sassler (2019) use data from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health (Add Health). The reported age range of sampled respondents included in the four studies is 16 to 34. Bratter and Whitehead use the Year 1 data from the Future of Families and Child Wellbeing Study (FFCWS). The average age of respondents in this study is 25.

Cohabiting children are more likely than married children but less likely than single children to live with their aging parents (Pilkaukas 2012).

Previous studies seldom examined how adult children's partner-choice decisions and ensuing assortative mating patterns shape transfers between family members (exception Bratter and Whitehead 2018). Instead they examined how crossing ethnoracial boundaries in union formation affects family dynamics and relationships (Tilman and Miller 2017; Yahirun 2019). A noteworthy exception is a study by Bratter and Whitehead (2018). They find that mothers of multiracial infants perceive themselves to have less access to family support than mothers of single-race children. This study, however, focuses on younger adults with children and the perceived availability of support from their families. Whether or not the findings extend to middle-aged adults who provide actual support to their aging parents is unknown.

In the following two sections, we review theoretical and empirical work examining how forming a union with a partner of a distinct ethnorace can influence the propensity to coreside with aging parents.

2.2 Theoretical expectations for differences in intergenerational coresidence between couples in interracial and endogamous unions

Three theoretical frameworks – assimilation theory, status exchange theory, and homogamy perspective – offer insights into how the decision to cross ethnoracial boundaries in union formation affects couples' propensity to live with their aging parents. The first two theoretical frameworks focus on selection, and the third focuses on the challenges interracial couples may encounter after union formation.

Assimilation theory predicts that members of immigrant groups will attain socioeconomic and cultural assimilation over prolonged stay in the destination country and across immigrant generations (Alba and Nee 1997). Socioeconomic advancement offers members of immigrant and racial minority groups more structural opportunities to interact with members of other ethnoracial groups, increasing their prospects of forming an interracial union (Gordon 1964; Qian and Lichter 2011). Ethnoracial minorities and immigrants in interracial unions are typically more socioeconomically advantaged than their peers in endogamous unions but are more socioeconomically disadvantaged than Whites in endogamous unions (Choi and Goldberg 2020; Qian and Lichter 2021). As a result, interracial couples may have more resources at their disposal to subsidize their parents' independent living than endogamous minority couples, but they will have fewer resources at their disposal to do so than endogamous White couples.

Racial/ethnic differences in attitudes about intergenerational coresidence are well established (Caputo and Cagney 2023; Keene and Batson 2010). Due to a preference for culturally similar partners, individuals in interracial relationships may be more accepting of the attitudes toward filial obligations held by members of the partner's ethnoracial

group (Qian and Lichter 2021). Conceivably, Black individuals with White partners will be less likely than coethnics in ethnoracial endogamy to emphasize consanguineal ties (relationships between direct blood relatives), opting instead to emphasize conjugal ties (relationships between married partners) and independent living for the couple and aging parents (Raley and Stokes 2011). Similarly, Hispanic individuals in interracial unions will be less likely than coethnics in endogamous unions to emphasize familism and to perceive intergenerational coresidence as a normative living arrangement, displaying a stronger preference for independent living (Landale and Oropesa 2007). Conversely, White individuals in interracial unions will be less likely than their peers in endogamous unions to emphasize independent living and to assign greater value to the importance of aiding extended family members (Raley and Stokes 2011). The overall implication is that interracial couples will coreside less with their parents than endogamous minority couples but will coreside with their parents more than endogamous White couples.

Status exchange theory also offers insights into differences in intergenerational coresidence by couples' joint race/ethnicity. This theory, which has been the subject of much debate, argues that some individuals marry a partner who possesses status traits that they lack and compensate the partner by giving them a trait they have but the partner does not (Davis 1941; Gullickson 2006; Merton 1941; Schwartz, Zeng, and Xie 2016; Xie and Dong, 2021). Within the context of interracial unions, socioeconomically advanced members of racial minority and immigrant groups exchange their socioeconomic advantage to obtain the benefits that come with White status (Davis 1941; Gullickson 2006; Schwartz, Zeng, and Xie 2016; Xie and Dong 2021). Thus minority partners may be more likely to “marry down” socioeconomically when they intermarry a White partner than when they marry a co-ethnic. As it relates to our study, this theory predicts that racial minorities and immigrants in interracial unions will be more likely to have disadvantaged White in-laws with greater care-receiving needs, who depend more heavily on housing assistance from their children, than their peers in ethnoracial endogamy. The opposite will be true for White partners in interracial unions.

The *homogamy perspective* predicts that the prevalence of intergenerational coresidence among interracial couples will be lower than that of their same-race peers. According to this perspective, similarities in values and opinions result in fewer misunderstandings and lower union dissolution (Kalmijn 1998; Zhang and Van Hook 2009). In terms of our study, individuals will be less willing to care for and live with their partner's parents if they are not getting along with their partner or expect their union to dissolve in the near future. Although subject to considerable variation depending on the interracial pairing, interracial unions generally dissolve at higher rates than same-race unions (Choi, Goldberg, and Denice 2022; Zhang and Van Hook 2009). Thus men and women in interracial unions may be less willing to live with the partner's parents than their peers in endogamous unions. Additionally, some parents may oppose interracial unions on the grounds that interracial unions can threaten group identity, internal cohesion, and the strength of familial ties (Kalmijn 1998). As a result, interracial couples

may also have poorer relations with their parents than endogamous couples. Opposition toward the partnership may create tensions between parents and adult children (Ang 2023; Tilman and Miller 2017), reducing the willingness of parents and adult children to share a residence.

2.3 Disparities in intergenerational coresidence by couple's joint ethnorace

Past studies have not examined how adult children's partner selection behavior influences their propensity to reside with their parents. However, we can infer how interracial couples' propensity to coreside with their parents compares with that of their peers in ethnoracial endogamy from past research on interracial couples' socioeconomic circumstances, union status, geographic contexts, and relationship with parents.

Interracial couples with a White partner are generally more socioeconomically advantaged than endogamous minority couples, but they are more disadvantaged than endogamous White couples (Campbell 2009; Choi and Goldberg 2020; Gullickson 2006). Thus interracial couples may have more resources at their disposal to subsidize their parents' independent living than endogamous minority couples but fewer resources than endogamous White couples. Additionally, parents with socioeconomically advantaged children are generally wealthier and healthier than those with socioeconomically disadvantaged children (Friedman and Mare 2014; Sabater, Graham, and Marshall 2020). Thus the parents of interracial couples will be less likely than the parents of endogamous minority couples but more likely than the parents of endogamous White couples to have health or socioeconomic conditions limiting their ability to live independently. Consequently, the likelihood of living with parents among interracial couples will fall somewhere between that of their counterparts in endogamous unions.

Variations in union formation behavior may also contribute to disparities in the prevalence of intergenerational coresidence between interracial and endogamous couples. Relative to couples in endogamous unions, a higher percentage of interracial couples choose cohabitation over marriage as their first union (Choi and Goldberg 2020; Qian and Lichter 2021). Because cohabitation is deemed an incomplete institution, obligations to care for a cohabiting partner's parents are not as well established (Cherlin 2004; Seltzer 2019). Interracial couples may be less willing to live with the partner's parents than couples in endogamous unions, partly because they may feel less obligated to care for the cohabiting partner's parents. In addition, partially due to the absence of barriers to legal exit, cohabiting unions dissolve at higher rates than marriages (Seltzer 2000; Guzzo 2014). Men and women in interracial unions may have less incentive to invest in the care of the partner's parents because they expect their union to dissolve in the future. The higher cohabitation rates among interracial couples will contribute to a lower prevalence of intergenerational coresidence.

Relatedly, the greater instability of interracial cohabitations may be another factor that contributes to disparities in the prevalence of intergenerational coresidence by the couple's joint ethnoraice. Although there are virtually no discernable differences between the stability of interracial and endogamous marriages, interracial cohabitations dissolve at higher rates than endogamous cohabitations (Choi, Goldberg, and Denice 2022). These patterns likely emerge because individuals in interracial cohabitations may be less committed to each other or encounter more challenges than endogamous couples (Blackwell and Lichter 2004; Qian and Lichter 2021). If interracial couples in cohabiting unions are less committed to one another and/or perceive their union to be highly unstable, they will be less willing to invest in the care of in-laws, including offering them housing assistance in the form of intergenerational coresidence. This will result in a lower prevalence of intergenerational coresidence among interracial couples in cohabiting unions. Such patterns will not apply to couples in intermarriages.

Disparities in geographic concentration may also contribute to differences in the prevalence of intergenerational coresidence between interracial couples and their peers in ethnoraice endogamy. Interracial couples are more likely to live in racially diverse neighborhoods in metropolitan areas than endogamous White couples but are less likely to do so than endogamous minority couples (Choi and Soave 2024; Holloway et al. 2005; Livingston and Brown 2017; Zambelli 2023). The average income of neighborhoods where interracial couples reside follows this in-between pattern (Gabriel 2018). Relative to the parents of endogamous White couples, parents of interracial couples will have a greater need to rely on housing assistance offered by their children, but they will have less of a need than the parents of endogamous minority couples.

The variation in parent–child relationships offers another explanation for disparities in the prevalence of intergenerational coresidence between interracial and same-race couples. Although there is considerable variation by union type and interracial pairing, interracial couples often have weaker ties with their parents than their peers in same-race unions (Tilman and Miller 2017; Yahirun and Kroger 2019; Zhang and Sassler 2019). Due to their poorer relationship quality, interracial couples will be less likely than endogamous couples to invest in the care of aging parents, including living with them. It is worth noting, however, that these analyses have been largely conducted for young adults. Whether or not these patterns have implications for the living arrangements of middle-aged adults and their aging parents is unknown.

2.4 Gender and intergenerational coresidence of interracial couples

The role of gender in shaping the relative frequency with which interracial couples share residences with the female or male partner's parents is also unknown. Past studies argue that groups who adhere closely to gender egalitarian norms will invest more toward the care of the wife's parents (Kim et al. 2015; Lee, Spitze, and Logan 2003; Rossi and Rossi

1990). Married women frequently assume the role of kin-keeper and the primary responsibility of caring for ailing and aging kin on both sides of the family (Lee, Spitze, and Logan 2003). Because women provide most of the instrumental care, in societies that are more gender egalitarian, married couples provide more support to the wife's parents than to the husband's parents, even when the care-receiving needs of the wife's and husband's parents are similar (Silverstein and Giarruso 2010). Conversely, in more patriarchal societies, married couples tend to prioritize the care of the husband's parents over that of the wife's parents. In many societies, daughter-in-laws prove to be more instrumental in the care and well-being of aging parents than daughters and sons (Cong and Silverstein 2008; Kim et al. 2015).

These findings can be extended to partners from distinct ethnoracial backgrounds. Prior work has found that Black families have traditionally emphasized self-sufficiency for Black women, whereas Hispanic families have traditionally emphasized the role of women as mothers and caregivers (Dow 2019; Landale and Oropesa 2007). The extent to which distinct ethnoracial groups adhere to gender egalitarian norms may affect the amount of relative care that couples provide to the female or male partner's parents. It is conceivable that White/Black couples will be less likely than endogamous Black couples but more likely than endogamous White couples to prioritize the care of the female partner's parents even when the care needs of the female partner's parents are similar to those of the male partner's parents. The opposite will be true for White/Hispanic couples. These studies, however, focus on married couples, so the extent to which these patterns apply to cohabiting couples is unknown.

2.5 Hypotheses

Given extant work, we hypothesize the following:

Hypothesis A: Interracial couples' odds of living with the female or male partner's parents are lower than those of endogamous minority couples but higher than that of endogamous White couples (assimilation theory).

Hypothesis B: Minority partners in interracial unions have higher odds of living with the partner's parents than minority partners in endogamous unions. The opposite is true for White partners in interracial unions (status exchange).

Hypothesis C: Interracial couples will be less likely to live with their aging parents than endogamous couples (homogamy perspective).

Hypothesis D: Reflecting group differences in adherence to gender egalitarian values, White/Hispanic couples' odds of living with the female partner's parents

are lower than those of endogamous White couples but higher than the corresponding odds for endogamous Hispanic couples. The opposite will be true for White/Black couples.

Hypothesis E: Interracial couples in cohabiting unions (but not marriages) are less likely than their peers in endogamous unions to live with aging parents.

3. Data and methods

3.1 Data

We pool data from the 1% sample of the Integrated Public Use Microdata (IPUMS) files of the 2007–2022 ACS. This dataset, which replaced the long-form census, includes a household roster with information about the social, economic, and demographic traits of members of roughly 3 million US households every year (Ruggles et al. 2023). For couple-level analysis, we use data from 2008 onward, as ACS began to collect basic information about marriage, such as the number of times married, in 2008 (Ruggles et al. 2023). We use data from the 2007–2021 ACS to characterize a couple’s geographic contexts. Owing to low response rates in 2020, IPUMS used experimental designs for the 2020 ACS. As a robustness check, we ran our models excluding the 2020 ACS and obtained robust estimates. These findings are available in Tables A-1 and A-2 in the appendix.

There are many reasons why we used the 2007–2022 ACS. A major advantage of the pooled ACS is its large size, which allows us to disaggregate couples according to the race and gender of each spouse and union type. It identifies the householder and reports the relationship between the household head and each household member. This information can be used to identify the married and unmarried partners of the householders. Along with information about the ethnorace and gender of each partner, this information can be used to classify couples into varying categories of joint ethnorace and union status. It also allows us to identify whether a couple is coresiding with the householder’s or partner’s parents. Finally, it permits the narrowing of the direction of support. Householders (those whose name appears on the lease, mortgage, or deed) usually provide “housing support” to family members who move in with them (Harvey, Duniform, and Pilkauskas 2021), so we can ensure that the direction of the housing support is from the couple to the aging parents.

3.2 Samples

We conduct our analyses on a sample of couples consisting of either (a) the householder and their spouse or (b) the householder and their unmarried partner. Our sample is limited to unions involving a partner who is the householder for two reasons. First, the householder is the person whose name appears on the deed, mortgage, or rental agreement. They are the “hosts,” who usually offer housing support (Harvey, Dunifon, and Pilkauskas 2021). This sampling restriction ensures that we examine cases where an aging parent moves in with the couple. Second, the ACS identifies the cohabiting partner of the household head, but it does not identify the cohabiting partner of another household member. We further restrict our sample to couples with partners ages 40 to 59.⁴ This group has been identified as part of the “sandwiched” generation responsible for the care of their aging parents and their children (Parker and Patten 2013). We also limit our sample to same-race White, same-race Black, same-race Hispanic, White/Black, and White/Hispanic couples so that our sample includes at least 500 couples in each category of joint race/ethnicity and union type. Because a goal of our paper is to ascertain the role of gender in shaping couples’ living arrangements, we also exclude the small number of cases where couples live with both the male and female partner’s parents.⁵ We also limit our sample to couples with non-missing data on key covariates. Once these restrictions are applied, we have a sample of 3,074,549 married and cohabiting couples. The first part of our study relies on this sample. The second part uses the subsample of 86,404 married and cohabiting couples who reside with aging parents. Table A-3 of the appendix shows how each restriction affects each analytical sample.

As supplementary analyses, we ran analogous models using alternate sampling restrictions. Our results are robust. First, differences in intergenerational coresidence by the couple’s joint ethnorace may partly emerge due to disparities in the opportunities to live with aging parents. The prevalence of intergenerational coresidence may be lower for foreign-born individuals because the immigration process can preclude parents from migrating to the United States. We ran our analyses for the subsample of couples comprised solely of two US-born spouses (Tables A-4 and A-5). Second, we also applied different age restrictions to our sample. These results are available upon request.

⁴ ACS is a household dataset, so we do not have information about the ages of nonresident parents. However, the average age of the resident parents is 71.

⁵ As supplementary models, we conducted our analyses using a sample that included these couples. In one version of these models, we treated these couples as those living with the female partner’s parents. In another version, we treated them as those living with the male partner’s parents. Our results do not change, as these couples are only 0.03% of all couples. These data are available upon request.

3.3 Variables

3.3.1 Dependent variables

Couple's living arrangement is a dichotomous variable distinguishing between couples living with any aging parent and those living without any aging parent.

Whether couples live with the female partner's parents differentiates between couples living with the female partner's parents and couples living with the male partner's parents.

3.3.2 Explanatory variables

Couple's joint ethnorace is our main independent variable. To construct this variable, we first classify partners into mutually exclusive ethnoracial categories: non-Hispanic White (hereafter White), non-Hispanic Black (hereafter Black), and Hispanic. We then cross-classify the female and male partner's ethnorace and obtain the following categories: endogamous White (WW), endogamous Black (BB), endogamous Hispanic (HH), White female/Black male (WFBM), Black female/White male (BFWM), White female/Hispanic male (WFHM), Hispanic female/White male (HFWM).

Union status distinguishes between married and cohabiting couples.

3.3.3 Other factors

Our models also control for several determinants of intermarriage and living arrangements. We capture the partners' sociodemographic traits, including *couple's nativity status* (both US-born, US-born female/foreign-born male, foreign-born female/US-born male, both foreign-born), *female partner's age* (40–44, 45–49, 50–54, 55–59), *male partner's age* (40–44, 45–49, 50–54, 55–59), *age differentials between partners* (female partner is older, male partner is older by at most two years, male partner is older by three to five years, male partner is older by six or more years), *female partner's education* (less than high school, high school degree or diploma, some college, college graduate), *male partner's education* (less than high school, high school graduate, some college, college graduate), *educational differentials between partners* (male partner has more schooling, male and female partners have the same levels of education, female partner has more schooling), *couple's employment status* (both unemployed, male sole earner, female sole earner, dual earner), and *couple's homeownership status* (yes, no).

Our measures of local geographic contexts include the percentage of foreign-born residents, the Herfindahl index for ethnic diversity, the mean value of housing units, average family income, and the percentage of rental units. The Herfindahl index is

computed using the following formula: $H_k = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^5 p_i^2$, where p_i is the share of residents belonging to the i^{th} ethnoracial group in the k^{th} locale. As with many studies of intermarriage, we classify couple's local geographic contexts as *consistent metropolitan statistical areas* for metropolitan areas and *consistent public-use microdata areas* for non-metropolitan areas (Choi and Tienda 2017; Harris and Ono 2005; Lewis and Oppenheimer 2000). We lag these measures by a year to establish proper temporary ordering. We also control for region (Midwest, South, West, Northeast), metropolitan area (metropolitan vs. non-metropolitan area), and survey year.

3.4 Analytical strategy

Our study consists of two parts. In the first part, we estimate logistic regression models predicting couples' odds of living with aging parents by a couple's joint ethnorace, net of all controls.⁶ We are particularly interested in examining disparities between interracial and endogamous couples (e.g., White/Black vs. endogamous White and Black) and among interracial couples (e.g., White female/Black male vs. Black female/White male). Once these patterns are established, we examine how the association between couple's joint ethnorace and living arrangements differs by union status.

In the second part, we restrict our analyses to couples living with aging parents and estimate logistic regression models to predict the odds of living with the female partner's parents over the male partner's parents, net of all controls. We are particularly interested in ascertaining the role of the ethnoracial minority partner's gender in shaping the odds of living with the female over the male partner's parents. We also examine whether the association between the couple's joint ethnorace and their odds of living with the female partner's parents differs by union status. We weigh all analyses using the wife's personal weights adjusted by the number of ACS years included in our study (16).

4. Results

4.1 Sample characteristics

Table 1 compares the sociodemographic characteristics, marital sorting behavior, and geographic context of couples with varying joint ethnorace. Among those in endogamous unions, the percentage of White couples who cohabit is lower than that of Black and Hispanic couples. White women in ethnoracial endogamy are older than their Black and

⁶ In the main text, we present the results from the full model, including all controls. In earlier versions of this paper, we estimated the zero-order association between the couple's joint ethnorace and living arrangements. Our models explain some differentials, but most of the differentials remain.

Hispanic peers, whereas Hispanic men in these unions are younger than their non-Hispanic peers. Partners in endogamous White unions are more similar in age than those in endogamous Black and Hispanic unions. Endogamous White unions are least likely and endogamous Hispanic unions are most likely to involve a foreign-born partner. In endogamous unions, White partners attained the most education, whereas Hispanic female partners attained the least. Black partners in endogamous unions are less likely than their White and Hispanic peers to have the same levels of education. Relative to their White and Black peers, higher shares of Hispanic men in endogamous unions are sole earners. In contrast, higher shares of Black women are sole earners. Hispanic couples in endogamous unions have more coresident children than White and Black couples in these unions. Moreover, White couples in ethnoracial endogamy are least likely, and Hispanic couples in endogamous unions are most likely, to live in racially diverse neighborhoods in cities with high shares of foreign-born residents, high average family income, and high housing costs.

Interracial couples are more socioeconomically advantaged than endogamous minority couples but are less advantaged than endogamous White couples. For example, 34% of White women with Black partners are college graduates, compared to 40% of their White and 30% of their Black peers. Similarly, 12% of White female/Black male couples reside in female sole earner households, compared to 8% of endogamous White and 13% of endogamous Black couples. Interracial couples' geographic contexts also follow the in-between pattern. For instance, interracial couples live in locales that are more racially diverse than those of endogamous White couples but are less racially diverse than those of endogamous minority couples. They live in locales with higher shares of foreign-born residents than the locales of endogamous White couples but with lower shares of foreign-born residents than the locales of endogamous minority couples. They are also more likely than endogamous White couples but less likely than endogamous minority couples to reside in metropolitan areas.

There are noteworthy exceptions to this general pattern. Interracial couples are more likely to cohabit than couples in endogamous unions. Twenty-nine percent of White female/Black male couples are cohabiting, compared to 9% of endogamous White and 14% of endogamous Black couples. Similarly, a higher percentage of interracial couples are in mixed-nativity unions. For example, 9% of Hispanic female/White male couples are in mixed-nativity unions compared to 2% of endogamous White and 6% of endogamous Hispanic couples. Interracial couples are also less likely than endogamous couples to be in educationally homogamous unions. For instance, 39% of Hispanic female/White male couples are in an educational homogamy, in contrast to 44% of endogamous White and 53% of endogamous Hispanic couples. White/Black couples are also less likely to have coresident children than endogamous White and Black couples.

Table 1: Sample characteristics

	Endogamous			Interracial			
	White 2,393,222	Black 188,195	Hispanic 313,166	WFBM 21,466	BFBM 9,368	WFHM 66,895	HFWM 82,237
% cohabit	8.6	14.4	12.6	28.8	24.3	14.9	12.2
Couple's nativity (col %)							
Both US-born	93.0	81.7	26.3	86.8	78.8	80.1	68.0
Foreign-born male/US-born female	1.2	1.5	4.1	5.3	2.9	13.2	1.8
Foreign-born female/US-born male	0.9	1.1	2.2	2.5	4.5	1.5	6.8
Both foreign born	4.9	15.7	67.4	5.4	13.8	5.3	23.4
Female age (col %)							
40–44	24.1	26.9	33.0	32.3	29.4	30.2	29.9
45–49	28.3	29.4	31.0	30.4	29.7	29.7	30.4
50–54	28.4	27.1	23.6	23.7	25.2	25.2	25.0
55–59	19.2	16.6	12.4	13.7	15.7	14.9	14.7
Male age (col %)							
40–44	16.5	17.7	22.7	22.3	21.0	22.0	20.5
45–49	26.0	26.8	30.0	29.9	27.6	29.2	28.1
50–54	29.6	29.6	27.1	28.1	27.8	27.6	28.8
55–59	27.9	26.0	20.1	19.8	23.7	21.3	22.6
Spousal age gap (col %)							
Female partner is older	24.5	26.1	26.7	31.0	33.3	29.0	28.8
M > F: 0–2 years	42.6	36.8	35.9	29.9	28.9	36.2	35.4
M > F: 3–5 years	20.8	21.0	21.8	20.0	17.8	20.2	19.3
M > F: 6+ years	12.1	16.1	15.6	19.0	20.1	14.6	16.5
Female education (col %)							
Less than high school	3.3	6.1	34.2	5.3	4.2	3.8	4.9
HS graduate	31.7	34.3	34.5	34.3	26.8	29.7	28.7
Some college	24.9	29.6	16.7	26.9	27.7	26.1	27.7
College graduate	40.1	30.0	14.7	33.5	41.2	40.5	38.8
Male education (col %)							
Less than high school	4.6	7.6	36.3	6.2	4.7	8.4	3.2
HS graduate	34.7	42.8	35.4	38.9	30.5	32.5	28.9
Some college	22.2	26.1	15.3	27.4	24.1	25.6	25.2
College graduate	38.5	23.5	13.1	27.5	40.7	33.5	42.7
Edu assortative mating (col %)							
Hyper: M > F	25.9	21.9	21.7	25.5	28.9	24.0	33.3
Homo: M = F	44.1	42.6	52.5	39.7	38.3	40.0	38.9
Hypo: M < F	30.0	35.5	25.7	34.8	32.8	35.9	27.8
Couple's employment (col %)							
Both unemployed	4.2	6.7	4.9	6.8	6.3	4.1	3.9
Female sole	7.9	13.1	7.1	12.2	10.2	8.6	7.9
Male sole	22.1	16.8	33.6	16.7	20.7	21.1	24.0
Dual earner	65.9	63.4	54.3	64.3	62.9	66.2	64.3

Table 1: (Continued)

	Endogamous			Interracial			
	White	Black	Hispanic	WFBM	BFWM	WFHM	HFWM
	2,393,222	188,195	313,166	21,466	9,368	66,895	82,237
No. of coresident children							
None	39.8	37.4	20.3	43.3	47.5	35.7	35.5
One	25.1	27.4	24.4	25.0	22.9	25.3	26.0
Two	23.9	22.3	30.4	21.2	20.2	26.0	26.7
Three or more	11.2	12.9	24.9	10.5	9.5	13.0	11.8
% homeownership	88.0	67.0	63.1	65.1	71.2	79.6	81.5
Ethnoracial index	37.7	49.1	49.5	42.4	45.0	46.0	46.5
% foreign-born	11.5	14.3	22.6	13.4	15.8	17.5	18.4
Average family income	88,080	93,155	96,159	93,739	97,416	95,956	96,265
% own	66.6	64.5	61.1	65.1	64.3	63.3	62.8
Value of homes	227,132	239,090	307,845	251,580	277,075	289,543	296,764
Region							
Northeast	20.5	15.0	12.5	16.4	18.9	14.8	14.3
Midwest	27.6	15.0	7.7	23.3	19.6	14.6	12.3
South	34.3	62.9	39.0	40.5	40.0	33.6	34.4
West	17.6	7.1	40.8	19.8	21.5	37.0	39.0
% metropolitan	74.6	87.6	93.0	86.4	90.1	88.1	89.0

Source: 2008–2022 ACS for couple data; 2007–2021 ACS for geographic data.

Sample: 3,074,549 couples who married within five years of date of interview.

Notes: Percentages are weighted. Numbers are not weighted.

4.2 Multivariate analysis

4.2.1 Logistic regression models predicting the odds of living with aging parents

In Table 2 we present the results from logistic regression models estimating the odds of living with an aging parent. Being in an educational homogamy, cohabiting, and residing in areas with a higher average family income are associated with lower odds of living with aging parents. Conversely, owning a home, living in an ethnoracially diverse neighborhood with high concentrations of foreign-born residents, residing in a metropolitan area, and living in the Northeast are associated with higher odds of living with aging parents. The relationship between the male partner's education and the odds of living with any parents follows an inverted U pattern. For men without a college education, more schooling is associated with higher odds of living with aging parents. For college-educated men, more schooling is associated with a lower odds of living with aging parents. The same is also true for female partner's education.

Table 2: Logistic regression models predicting odds of living with partner's parents by couple's joint ethnora

	All			Married			Cohabiting		
	OR	95th CI		OR	95th CI		OR	95th CI	
Couple's ethnora (WW)									
Endogamous Black	1.33	1.28	1.37	1.32	1.27	1.37	1.38	1.22	1.55
Endogamous Hispanic	1.53	1.48	1.58	1.52	1.47	1.58	1.65	1.47	1.85
White female/Black male	1.06	0.95	1.18	1.07	0.95	1.21	0.98	0.76	1.26
Black female/White male	1.21	1.03	1.41	1.22	1.02	1.44	1.23	0.83	1.83
White female/Hispanic male	1.26	1.20	1.33	1.27	1.20	1.34	1.19	1.00	1.42
Hispanic female/White male	1.42	1.36	1.49	1.45	1.39	1.52	1.15	0.98	1.36
Cohabit (Married)	0.72	0.70	0.74	-	-	-	-	-	-
Couple's nativity (both US-born)									
Foreign-born male/US-born female	1.30	1.23	1.38	1.33	1.25	1.40	1.09	0.91	1.30
Foreign-born female/US-born male	1.35	1.27	1.44	1.35	1.26	1.45	1.25	1.04	1.52
Both foreign-born	1.63	1.59	1.68	1.66	1.61	1.71	1.28	1.14	1.43
Partner age gap (F > M)									
M > F: 0–2 years	0.93	0.91	0.95	0.93	0.90	0.95	1.01	0.91	1.11
M > F: 3–5 years	1.01	0.97	1.04	1.01	0.98	1.05	0.98	0.86	1.11
M > F: 6+ years	1.02	0.97	1.07	1.03	0.98	1.08	0.96	0.82	1.13
Male partner's education (less than HS)									
HS graduate	1.14	1.10	1.19	1.16	1.12	1.22	0.97	0.86	1.10
Some college	1.08	1.02	1.14	1.10	1.04	1.16	0.88	0.73	1.06
College graduate	0.86	0.81	0.92	0.88	0.82	0.94	0.66	0.52	0.85
Female partner's education (less than HS)									
HS graduate	1.31	1.25	1.36	1.31	1.25	1.37	1.28	1.11	1.48
Some college	1.27	1.20	1.34	1.27	1.20	1.34	1.31	1.07	1.61
College graduate	1.04	0.98	1.11	1.04	0.97	1.11	1.12	0.87	1.44
Educational gap (F > M)									
Homogamy (M = F)	0.87	0.85	0.90	0.88	0.85	0.90	0.83	0.74	0.94
Hypogamy (M < F)	0.94	0.90	0.99	0.95	0.91	1.00	0.81	0.66	0.99
Male householder (female)									
	0.84	0.83	0.86	0.86	0.84	0.88	0.63	0.58	0.67
Couple's employment (neither)									
Female sole	1.06	1.01	1.12	1.07	1.02	1.14	0.98	0.85	1.13
Male sole	0.90	0.86	0.94	0.91	0.87	0.96	0.92	0.80	1.06
Dual earner	0.97	0.93	1.02	1.00	0.95	1.04	0.82	0.73	0.93
Homeownership (rent)									
	1.73	1.68	1.77	1.67	1.62	1.72	2.18	2.01	2.36
Region (Northeast)									
Midwest	0.64	0.62	0.66	0.63	0.61	0.65	0.73	0.65	0.83
South	0.81	0.79	0.83	0.81	0.78	0.83	0.84	0.75	0.94
West	0.74	0.72	0.76	0.74	0.71	0.76	0.75	0.66	0.84
Metro (non-metro)									
	1.16	1.13	1.20	1.17	1.14	1.21	1.03	0.92	1.15
Ethnoracial diversity*	1.13	1.11	1.15	1.13	1.11	1.15	1.15	1.08	1.23
% foreign-born*	1.12	1.11	1.14	1.11	1.10	1.13	1.22	1.15	1.29
Average family income*	0.86	0.84	0.88	0.87	0.85	0.89	0.80	0.74	0.87
% homeowner*	1.07	1.05	1.08	1.07	1.05	1.08	1.07	1.01	1.13
Average home value*	1.15	1.13	1.18	1.15	1.12	1.18	1.18	1.09	1.27
Intercept	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.02

Source: 2008–2022 ACS for couple data; 2007–2021 for geographic data.

Sample: 3,074,549 couples who were in a union at the date of interview.

Notes: Percentages are weighted. Numbers are not weighted. Reference groups are in parentheses. Models also include female and male partner's age, number of coresident children, and survey year.

* Standardized coefficients.

Black and Hispanic couples in endogamous unions are more likely than White couples in endogamous unions to live with their aging parents. Net of controls, the odds that Black couples in endogamous unions live with their aging parents are 1.3 times those of White couples in endogamous unions. The corresponding multiple is 1.5 for endogamous Hispanic couples. Interracial couples are typically more likely than endogamous White couples but less likely than endogamous minority couples to live with aging parents. For instance, White female/Black male couples' adjusted odds of living with aging parents are similar to those of endogamous White couples but lower than those of endogamous Black couples. Black female/White male couples' adjusted odds of living with aging parents are 1.2 times those of endogamous White couples. The corresponding multiple is 1.3 times for endogamous Black couples. Interracial couples with a female minority partner are more likely than interracial couples with a male minority partner to live with aging parents. To illustrate, the odds that Hispanic female/White male couples live with their aging parents are 1.4 times the corresponding odds for endogamous White couples. This compares with 1.3 times for White female/Hispanic male couples who live with aging parents.

We now turn our attention to ascertain whether the association between a couple's joint ethnorate and the odds of living with aging parents differs by union type. The results for married and cohabiting couples mirror closely the results obtained using the pooled sample. The only noteworthy difference is observed among White/Hispanic couples. Among cohabiting couples, the odds that White female/Hispanic male couples live with their aging parents are similar to the corresponding odds for Hispanic female/White male couples.

4.2.2 Logistic regression models predicting the odds of living with the female partner's parents

In this section, we restrict our analyses to couples living with aging parents. Using this subsample, we estimate logistic regression models predicting the odds of living with the female over the male partner's parents. Our results, presented in Table 3, show that cohabiting and the presence of a male householder are associated with lower odds of living with the female partner's parents instead of the male partner's parents. In contrast, being in a mixed-nativity union with a foreign-born female partner, having higher levels of education for male and female partners, being in an educationally hypogamous union, and living in metropolitan areas are associated with higher odds of living with the female partner's parents.

Table 3: Logistic regression models predicting couple's odds of living with the female partner's parents for those living with any aging parent

	All			Married			Cohabiting		
	OR	95th CI		OR	95th CI		OR	95th CI	
Couple's ethnoraace (WW)									
Endogamous Black	1.31	1.22	1.41	1.29	1.20	1.39	1.55	1.13	2.12
Endogamous Hispanic	1.21	1.13	1.29	1.21	1.13	1.29	1.31	0.94	1.84
White female/Black male	0.99	0.78	1.26	0.95	0.74	1.23	0.83	0.35	1.97
Black female/White male	1.20	0.87	1.65	1.45	1.00	2.12	0.43	0.19	0.96
White female/Hispanic male	0.82	0.74	0.92	0.84	0.75	0.94	0.81	0.53	1.23
Hispanic female/White male	1.46	1.32	1.61	1.46	1.32	1.62	1.54	1.03	2.30
Cohabit (married)	0.89	0.83	0.95	-	-	-	-	-	-
Couple's nativity (both US-born)									
Foreign-born male/US-born female	0.88	0.78	1.00	0.90	0.80	1.03	0.68	0.40	1.17
Foreign-born female/US-born male	1.20	1.02	1.41	1.23	1.04	1.46	0.59	0.35	0.99
Both foreign born	1.02	0.96	1.07	0.99	0.94	1.05	1.38	1.00	1.90
Partner age gap (F > M)									
M > F: 0–2 years	1.06	1.01	1.12	1.06	1.00	1.12	1.22	0.92	1.62
M > F: 3–5 years	1.05	0.98	1.12	1.05	0.98	1.13	1.26	0.87	1.81
M > F: 6+ years	1.00	0.91	1.10	1.03	0.93	1.14	0.98	0.61	1.56
Male partner's education (less than HS)									
HS graduate	1.05	0.98	1.14	1.06	0.98	1.15	0.94	0.67	1.32
Some college	1.11	1.00	1.23	1.12	1.01	1.25	1.12	0.67	1.87
College graduate	1.21	1.06	1.37	1.21	1.06	1.38	1.11	0.60	2.05
Female partner's education (less than HS)									
HS graduate	1.08	1.00	1.18	1.10	1.01	1.20	0.83	0.57	1.21
Some college	1.11	1.00	1.23	1.12	1.00	1.25	0.76	0.45	1.29
College graduate	1.13	1.00	1.29	1.14	1.00	1.30	0.80	0.43	1.50
Educational gap (F > M)									
Homogamy (M = F)	1.03	0.97	1.10	1.03	0.96	1.10	1.14	0.81	1.58
Hypogamy (M < F)	1.12	1.01	1.23	1.11	1.00	1.23	1.16	0.67	2.00
Couple's employment (neither)									
Female sole	0.93	0.84	1.03	0.90	0.80	1.01	0.93	0.63	1.37
Male sole	1.11	1.01	1.22	1.12	1.01	1.24	0.93	0.63	1.37
Dual earner	1.04	0.95	1.14	1.03	0.93	1.13	1.16	0.81	1.66
Homeownership (rent)	0.97	0.92	1.03	0.99	0.93	1.05	0.93	0.74	1.16
Male householder	0.34	0.33	0.36	0.41	0.39	0.43	0.02	0.02	0.03
Region (Northeast)									
Midwest	0.95	0.89	1.01	0.93	0.87	1.00	1.41	0.98	2.01
South	1.00	0.94	1.06	0.97	0.91	1.03	1.88	1.35	2.64
West	0.91	0.85	0.97	0.91	0.84	0.97	0.89	0.61	1.30
Metro (non-metro)	1.10	1.04	1.17	1.10	1.04	1.17	1.01	0.73	1.39
Ethnoracial diversity*	1.00	0.96	1.03	1.01	0.98	1.05	0.72	0.59	0.87
% foreign-born*	0.99	0.96	1.03	0.99	0.96	1.03	1.02	0.87	1.19
Average family income*	1.02	0.97	1.07	1.02	0.97	1.07	1.22	0.94	1.57
% homeowner*	1.00	0.97	1.03	1.00	0.97	1.03	0.75	0.63	0.89
Average home values*	1.00	0.95	1.05	1.00	0.95	1.05	0.98	0.76	1.26
Intercept	2.24	1.92	2.62	1.98	1.68	2.33	7.36	3.63	14.93

Source: 2008–2022 ACS for couple data; 2007–2021 for geographic data.

Sample: 86,414 couples who were in a union at the date of interview.

Notes: Percentages are weighted. Numbers are not weighted. Reference groups are in parentheses. Models also include female and male partner's age, number of coresident children, and survey year.

* Standardized coefficients.

Among those in endogamous unions, Black couples have the highest and White couples have the lowest adjusted odds of living with the female rather than the male partner's parents. The adjusted odds that endogamous Black couples live with the female partner's parents are 1.3 times those for endogamous White couples. The corresponding multiple for endogamous Hispanic couples is 1.2 times. White/Black couples' odds of living with the female partner's parents fall in between those of endogamous White and Black couples. White female/Black male couples' odds of living with the female partner's parents differ little from those of endogamous White couples. Black female/White male couples are less likely than endogamous Black couples but more likely than endogamous White couples to live with the female partner's parents. The adjusted odds that Black female/White male couples reside with the female partner's parents are 1.2 times those of endogamous White couples. The results for White/Hispanic couples deviate from this in-between pattern. White female/Hispanic male couples are less likely than endogamous White and Hispanic couples to live with the female partner's parents. Conversely, Hispanic female/White male couples are more likely than endogamous White and Hispanic couples to live with the female partner's parents. The adjusted odds that Hispanic female/White male couples live with the wife's parents are 1.5 times those of endogamous White couples. The corresponding multiple is 0.9 times for White female/Hispanic male couples.

Our study also shows that interracial couples with female minority partners are more likely than interracial couples with male minority partners to live with the female partner's parents. Black female/White male couples are more likely than White female/Black male couples to live with the female partner's parents, as are Hispanic female/White male couples relative to White female/Hispanic male couples.

Next we ascertain how the association between the couple's joint ethnorace and the adjusted odds of living with the female partner's parent differs by union status. The results for married couples mirror closely those obtained using the entire sample, but the results for cohabiting couples differ from those obtained using the entire sample. Deviating from the in-between pattern, Black female/White male couples in cohabiting unions are less likely than their peers in endogamous cohabitations to live with the female partner's parents. Black female/White male couples in cohabiting unions are also less likely than White female/Black male couples to live with the female partner's parents: 0.4 versus 0.8 times relative to endogamous White couples.

5. Discussion and conclusion

Married couples frequently care for their parents together (Patterson 2023). Thus partner selection and ensuing assortative mating patterns have important implications for the ability and willingness to care for aging parents. Yet extant research has focused on marital status differences in the level of emotional, instrumental, and financial support

that adult children provide their aging parents (Glaser et al. 2008; Patterson 2023). To our knowledge, it has not examined how partner choice decisions and ensuing assortative mating influence adult children's caregiving behavior. To fill this gap in the literature, we examine how adult children's decision to cross ethnoracial boundaries in union formation influences their propensity to live with their aging parents. Of the various dimensions of sorting, we focus on interracial unions given the dramatic rise in interracial unions over the past few decades and their presumed ability to reduce ethnoracial distinctions by expanding family networks across ethnoracial groups (Livingston and Brown 2017; Qian and Lichter 2007). Our study yields several noteworthy findings.

Interracial couples are typically more likely than endogamous White couples but less likely than their minority peers in endogamous unions to live with their aging parents. This intermediary pattern is consistent with the predictions of the *assimilation theory* (*Hypothesis A*) and past findings on differences in family behavior between interracial and endogamous couples (Campbell 2009; Choi and Goldberg 2020). This in-between pattern likely reflects the fact that interracial couples have more resources at their disposal to subsidize their parents' independent living than do endogamous minority couples but have fewer resources at their disposal than do endogamous White couples (Glick and Van Hook 2002; Keene and Batson 2010). Similarly, there is a strong positive correlation between adult children's socioeconomic status and parent's health and socioeconomic well-being (Friedman and Mare 2014). The parents of interracial couples may have fewer health and socioeconomic needs that would require them to move in with their adult children compared to the parents of endogamous minority couples. In contrast, they may have more health and socioeconomic needs that would require them to move in with their adult children compared to the parents of endogamous White couples. It is also feasible that partners in interracial unions may be more open to the views about intergenerational support of the partner's ethnoracial group (Zhang and Sassler 2019). Due to these factors combined, interracial couples will be less likely than endogamous minority couples to live with their aging parents. Our findings detract from the predictions of the *homogamy perspective* (*Hypotheses B and E*) and are inconsistent with findings by Bratter and Whitehead (2018) claiming that cohabiting or marrying a partner from another ethnoracial group systematically weakens ties with extended kin and reduces access to family support. Our results may differ from those in Bratter and Whitehead (2018) because we are looking at the support that middle-aged children provide their aging parents instead of the perceived support young adults receive from parents.

Our analysis also underscores the importance of the gender of the minority spouse in shaping the living arrangements of interracial couples. Interracial couples with female minority partners are more likely than interracial couples with male minority partners to live with aging parents. For instance, Hispanic female/White male couples are more likely than White female/Hispanic male couples to live with aging parents. This pattern may emerge because women often assume the role of kin-keeper (Lee, Spitze, and Logan 2003). Because caring for aging parents is within married and cohabiting women's

domain, they may have a greater say on the couple's decision to provide housing assistance to aging parents (Silverstein and Giarruso 2010). Minority women are more likely than their White counterparts to subscribe to norms emphasizing filial obligations as well as the importance of consanguineal or extended family ties (Keene and Batson 2010; Raley and Stokes 2011). They are more likely than White women to be willing to care for and offer housing assistance to their aging parents or in-laws.

Deviating from the predictions in *Hypothesis D*, our study shows that interracial couples involving female minority partners are generally more likely than interracial couples involving male minority partners to live with the female partner's parents instead of the male partner's parents. For example, Black female/White male couples are more likely than White female/Black male couples to live with the female partner's parents instead of the male partner's parents. This pattern likely emerges because minority women are more likely than White women to grow up in cultures that emphasize filial duty (Raley and Stokes 2011). In the United States, couples tend to prioritize care of the female partner's parents more than care of the male partner's parents (Silverstein and Giarruso 2010). The greater sense of filial duty that ethnoracial minority women feel toward the care of their own parents is more likely to materialize in the form of actual support – in this case intergenerational coresidence. Methodologically, these differences highlight the need for studies of a couple's propensity for intergenerational coresidence to recognize that couples do not exchange resources equally with the parents of both partners and to distinguish between transfers provided to the female or male partner's parents (Kim et al. 2015).

Finally, our study shows that the living arrangements of Black female/White male couples in cohabiting unions are exceptions to overall patterns. In stark contrast to patterns observed for married couples, cohabiting Black female/White male couples are less likely than peers in White female/Black male cohabitations to live with the female over the male partner's parents. This exceptional pattern is consistent with the predictions of *status exchange theory* (*Hypothesis C*), which raises the possibility that Black female/White male couples are in unions involving advantaged ethnoracial minority women and White men with unmeasured disadvantages (Davis 1941; Xie and Dong 2021). A potential source of disadvantage for White men in these unions may be their unusually high caregiver burden. At the same time, we recognize the possibility that Black female/White male couples in cohabiting unions may also be a select group who subscribe to traditional gender norms, including patriarchal norms that favor residence with the male partner's parents (Kim et al. 2015). Indeed, supplementary analyses reveal that relative to other interracial pairings, the share of cohabiting Black female/White male couples in educationally hypergamous unions (where the male partner's education exceeds the female partner's education) is unusually high. Future work should make greater efforts to capture the multitude of dimensions that may alter a partner's attractiveness in the marriage market.

Like all studies, our study has a few limitations. First, data limitations preclude us from considering several relevant mechanisms, such as attitudes about intergenerational coresidence and intermarriage, the quality of the relationship between parents and children, and the health and economic needs of aging parents. We attribute some of the unexplained disparities by the couple's joint ethnorace to these factors. Future work with appropriate data should include these considerations. Second, we rely on cross-sectional data, which may understate the prevalence of living with extended kin (Cross 2018). It is unknown whether such an underestimate would be more prominent among interracial couples than among same-race couples. Nonetheless, despite these limitations, ACS is the only dataset with sufficient numbers of cohabiting interracial couples to allow us to distinguish couples who are residing with the wife's or husband's parents.

The in-between prevalence of intergenerational coresidence suggests that the rise in interracial unions may be reducing ethnoracial inequality in the prevalence of intergenerational coresidence, suggesting that interracial unions may be decreasing ethnoracial distinctions by expanding family networks across ethnoracial groups (Qian and Lichter 2007). Nevertheless, the gender of the minority spouse plays a pivotal role in shaping the propensity to cohabit with aging parents, highlighting the importance of considering partners' race and gender in determining interracial couples' living arrangements.

6. Acknowledgments

A previous version of this paper was presented at the 2023 annual meeting of the American Sociological Association. This work was possible due to generous support from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (grant number 435-2021-0701) and a Western University Faculty Scholar Award. Yahirun acknowledges support from the Center for Family and Demographic Research, Bowling Green State University.

References

- Alba, R. and Nee, V. (1997). Rethinking assimilation theory for a new era of immigration. *International Migration Review* 31(4): 826–874. doi:10.1177/019791839703100403.
- Ang, I.L. (2023). Interracial relationships and parent-child bonds. *Journal of Undergraduate Research in Anthropology* 7: 83. https://uca.edu/sociology/files/2023/10/jura2023_name_typo_fixed-October-27-2023.pdf#page=84.
- Artis, J.E. and Martinez, M.A. (2016). Cohabitation, marriage and relationships with ‘parents-in-law’. *Families, Relationships and Societies* 5(1): 3–22. doi:10.1332/204674314X14164923149780.
- Bengtson, V. L. and Roberts, R. (1991). Intergenerational solidarity in aging families: An example of formal theory construction. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 53(4): 856–870. doi:10.2307/352993.
- Blackwell, D.L. and Lichter, D.T. (2004). Homogamy among dating, cohabiting, and married couples. *The Sociological Quarterly* 45(4): 719–737. doi:10.1111/j.1533-8525.2004.tb02311.x.
- Bratter, J.L. and Whitehead, E.M. (2018). Ties that bind? Comparing kin support availability for mothers of mixed-race and monoracial infants. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 80(4): 951–962. doi:10.1111/jomf.12485.
- Campbell, M.E. (2009). Multiracial groups and educational inequality: A rainbow or a divide? *Social Problems* 56: 425–446. doi:10.1525/sp.2009.56.3.425.
- Caputo, J. and Cagney, K.A. (2023). Under different roofs? Coresidence with adult children and parents’ mental health across race and ethnicity over two decades. *Demography* 60(2): 461–492. doi:10.1215/00703370-10571923.
- Cherlin, A.J. (2004). The deinstitutionalization of American marriage. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 66(4): 848–861. doi:10.1111/j.0022-2445.2004.00058.x.
- Choi, K.H. and Goldberg, R.E. (2020). The social significance of interracial cohabitation: Inferences based on fertility behavior. *Demography* 57(5): 1727–1751. doi:10.1007/s13524-020-00904-5.
- Choi, K.H., Goldberg, R.E., and Denice, P.A. (2022). Stability and outcome of interracial cohabitation before and after transitions to marriage. *Demographic Research* 46(33): 957–1006. doi:10.4054/DemRes.2022.46.33.
- Choi, K.H. and Soave, A. (2024). Housing attainment of interracial couples. *Population Research and Policy Review* 43: 56. doi:10.1007/s11113-024-09900-8.

- Choi, K.H. and Tienda, M. (2017). Marriage-market constraints and mate-selection behavior: Racial, ethnic, and gender differences in intermarriage. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 79(2): 301–317. doi:10.1111/jomf.12346.
- Cong, Z. and Silverstein, M. (2008). Intergenerational support and depression among elders in rural China: Do daughters-in-law matter? *Journal of Marriage and Family* 70: 599–612. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2008.00508.x.
- Cross, C.J. (2018). Extended family households among children in the United States: Differences by race/ethnicity and socioeconomic status. *Population Studies* 72(2): 235–251. doi:10.1080/00324728.2018.1468476.
- Davis, K. (1941). Intermarriage in caste societies. *American Anthropologist* 43(3): 376–395.
- Dow, D.M. (2019). *Mothering while black: Boundaries and burdens of middle-class parenthood*. Oakland, Ca: University of California Press.
- Esteve, A. and Reher, D.S. (2021). Rising global levels of intergenerational coresidence among young adults. *Population and Development Review* 47(3): 691–717. doi:10.1111/padr.12427.
- Friedman, E.M. and Mare, R.D. (2014). The schooling of offspring and the survival of parents. *Demography* 51(4): 1271–1293. doi:10.1007/s13524-014-0303-z.
- Gabriel, R. (2018). Gender and the residential mobility and neighborhood attainment of black-white couples. *Demography* 55(2): 459–484. doi:10.1007/s13524-018-0648-9.
- Glaser, K., Stuchbury, R., Tomassini, C., and Askham, J. (2008). The long-term consequences of partnership dissolution for support in later life in the United Kingdom. *Ageing and Society*: 28(3): 329–351. doi:10.1017/S0144686X07006642.
- Glick, J.E. and Van Hook, J. (2002). Parents' coresidence with adult children: Can immigration explain racial and ethnic variation? *Journal of Marriage and Family* 64(1): 240–253. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2002.00240.x.
- Gordon, M.M. (1964). *Assimilation in American life: The role of race, religion, and national origins*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Gullickson, A. (2006). Education and black-white interracial marriage. *Demography* 43(4): 673–689. doi:10.1353/dem.2006.0033.
- Guzzo, K.B. (2014). Trends in cohabitation outcomes: Compositional changes and engagement among never-married young adults. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 76(4): 826–842. doi:10.1111/jomf.12123.

- Harris, D.R. and Ono, H. (2005). How many interracial marriages would there be if all groups were of equal size in all places? A new look at national estimates of interracial marriage. *Social Science Research* 34(1): 236–251. doi:10.1016/j.ssresearch.2004.01.002.
- Harvey, H., Dunifon, R., and Pilkauskas, N. (2021). Under whose roof? Understanding the living arrangements of children in doubled-up households. *Demography* 58(3): 821–846. doi:10.1215/00703370-9101102.
- Holloway, S.R., Ellis, M., Wright, R., and Hudson, M. (2005). Partnering ‘out’ and fitting in: Residential segregation and the neighbourhood contexts of mixed-race households. *Population, Space and Place* 11(4): 299–324. doi:10.1002/psp.378.
- Kalmijn, M. (1998). Inter-marriage and homogamy: Causes, patterns, trends. *Annual Review of Sociology* 24(1): 395–421. doi:10.1146/annurev.soc.24.1.395.
- Keene, J.R. and Batson, C.D. (2010). Under one roof: A review of research on intergenerational coresidence and multigenerational households in the United States. *Sociology Compass* 4(8): 642–657. doi:10.1111/j.1751-9020.2010.00306.x.
- Kim, K., Zarit, S.H., Fingerman, K.L., and Han, G. (2015). Intergenerational exchanges of middle-aged adults with their parents and parents-in-law in Korea. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 77(3): 791–805. doi:10.1111/jomf.12185.
- Landale, N. S. and Oropesa, R. S. (2007). Hispanic families: Stability and change. *Annual Review of Sociology* 33: 381–405. doi:10.1146/annurev.soc.33.040406.131655.
- Lee, E., Spitze, G., and Logan, J.R. (2003). Social support to parents-in-law: The interplay of gender and kin hierarchies. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 65(2): 396–403. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2003.00396.x.
- Lewis, S.K. and Oppenheimer, V.K. (2000). Educational assortative mating across marriage markets: Non-hispanic whites in the United States. *Demography* 37(1): 29–40. doi:10.2307/2648094.
- Livingston, G. and Brown, A. (2017). Inter-marriage in the U.S. 50 years after Loving v. Virginia. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center. <https://www.pewresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/20/2017/05/Inter-marriage-May-2017-Full-Report.pdf>.
- Merton, R.K. (1941). Inter-marriage and the social structure: Fact and theory. *Psychiatry* 4(3): 361–374. doi:10.1080/00332747.1941.11022354.
- Morgan, J.N. (1984). The role of time in the measurement of transfers and well-being. In: Moon, M. (ed.). *Economic transfers in the United States*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press: 199–238.

- Parker, K. and Patten, E. (2013). The sandwich generation: Rising financial burdens for middle-aged Americans. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center. <https://www.pewresearch.org/social-trends/2013/01/30/the-sandwich-generation/>.
- Patterson, S.E. (2023). Cohabiting adult children's transfers to parents in the United States. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 85(1): 321–336. doi:10.1111/jomf.12879.
- Pezzin, L.E., Pollak, R.A., and Schone, B.S. (2015). Bargaining power, parental caregiving, and intergenerational coresidence. *Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences* 70(6): 969–980. doi:10.1093/geronb/gbu079.
- Pilkuskas, N.V. (2012). Three-generation family households: Differences by family structure at birth. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 74(5): 931–943. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2012.01008.x.
- Qian, Z. and Lichter, D.T. (2007). Social boundaries and marital assimilation: Interpreting trends in racial and ethnic intermarriage. *American Sociological Review* 72(1): 68–94. doi:10.1177/000312240707200104.
- Qian, Z. and Lichter, D.T. (2011). Changing patterns of interracial marriage in a multiracial society. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 73(5): 1065–1084. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2011.00866.x.
- Qian, Z. and Lichter, D.T. (2021). Racial pairings and fertility: Do interracial couples have fewer children? *Journal of Marriage and Family* 83(4): 961–984. doi:10.1111/jomf.12758.
- Raley, R.K. and Stokes, C.E. (2011). Kin connection: Kin involvement while growing up and marriage in adulthood. *Social Science Research* 40(2): 433–443. doi:10.1016/j.ssresearch.2010.09.005.
- Rossi, A.S. and Rossi, P.H. (1990). *Of human bonding: Parent–child relations across the life course*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Ruggles, S., Flood, S., Goeken, R., Schouweiler, M., and Sobek, M. (2023). IPUMS USA: Version 12.0 [dataset]. Minneapolis, MN: IPUMS. doi:10.18128/D010.V12.0.
- Sabater, A., Graham, E., and Marshall, A. (2020). Does having highly educated adult children reduce mortality risks for parents with low educational attainment in Europe? *Ageing and Society* 40(12): 2635–2670. doi:10.1017/S0144686X19000795.

- Schulz, R. and Eden, J. (eds.) (2016). *Families caring for an aging America*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press. doi:10.17226/23606.
- Schwartz, C.R., Zeng, Z., and Xie, Y. (2016). Marrying up by marrying down: Status exchange between social origin and education in the United States. *Sociological Science* 3: 1003–1027. doi:10.15195/v3.a44.
- Seltzer, J.A. (2000). Families formed outside of marriage. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 62(4): 1247–1268. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2000.01247.x.
- Seltzer, J.A. (2019). Family change and changing family demography. *Demography* 56(2): 405–426. doi:10.1007/s13524-019-00766-6.
- Silverstein, M. and Giarrusso, R. (2010). Aging and family life: A decade review. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 72(5): 1039–1058. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00749.x.
- Tillman, K.H. and Miller, B. (2017). The role of family relationships in the psychological wellbeing of interracial dating adolescents. *Social Science Research* 65: 240–252. doi:10.1016/j.ssresearch.2016.11.001.
- Xie, Y. and Dong, H. (2021). A new methodological framework for studying status exchange in marriage. *American Journal of Sociology* 126(5): 1179–1219. doi:10.1086/713927.
- Yahirun, J.J. (2019). Intermarriage and mother-child relationships. *Social Science Research* 78 (2019): 203–214. doi:10.1016/j.ssresearch.2018.12.005.
- Yahirun, J.J. and Kroeger, R.A. (2019). Parent-child relationships and interracial first union formation in the United States. *Advances in Life Course Research* 42: 100307. doi:10.1016/j.alcr.2019.100307.
- Zambelli, E. (2023). Interracial couples and the phenomenology of race, place, and space in contemporary England. *Identities* 30(5): 725–743. doi:10.1080/1070289X.2021.1993007.
- Zhang, X. and Sassler, S. (2019). The age of independence, revisited: Parents and interracial union formation across the life course. *Sociological Forum* 34(2): 361–385. doi:10.1111/sofc.12501.
- Zhang, Y. and Van Hook, J. (2009). Marital dissolution among interracial couples. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 71(1): 95–107. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2008.00582.x.

Appendix

Table A-1: Abridged logistic regression models predicting odds of living with any parent, without 2020 ACS

	All			Married			Cohabiting		
	OR	95th CI		OR	95th CI		OR	95th CI	
Main text									
Couple's ethnorace (WW)									
Endogamous Black	1.33	1.28	1.37	1.32	1.27	1.37	1.38	1.22	1.55
Endogamous Hispanic	1.53	1.48	1.58	1.52	1.47	1.58	1.65	1.47	1.85
White female/Black male	1.06	0.95	1.18	1.07	0.95	1.21	0.98	0.76	1.26
Black female/White male	1.21	1.03	1.41	1.21	1.02	1.44	1.23	0.83	1.83
White female/Hispanic male	1.26	1.20	1.33	1.27	1.20	1.34	1.19	1.00	1.42
Hispanic female/White male	1.42	1.36	1.49	1.45	1.39	1.52	1.15	0.97	1.36
Without 2020									
Couple's ethnorace (WW)									
Endogamous Black	1.30	1.26	1.35	1.30	1.25	1.35	1.32	1.16	1.49
Endogamous Hispanic	1.52	1.46	1.57	1.51	1.46	1.56	1.66	1.47	1.87
White female/Black male	1.04	0.94	1.16	1.06	0.94	1.20	0.95	0.74	1.21
Black female/White male	1.16	0.99	1.36	1.15	0.97	1.37	1.23	0.81	1.87
White female/Hispanic male	1.25	1.19	1.33	1.27	1.20	1.34	1.14	0.95	1.36
Hispanic female/White male	1.40	1.34	1.47	1.44	1.37	1.51	1.10	0.93	1.30

Source: 2007–2022 ACS for the main text; 2007–2019, 2021–2022 ACS for supplementary analyses.

Notes: Analyses are weighted using wife's annualized personal weights.

Table A-2: Abridged logistic regression models predicting odds of living with female over male partner's parents, without 2020 ACS

	All			Married			Cohabiting		
	OR	95th CI		OR	95th CI		OR	95th CI	
Main Text									
Couple's ethnora (WW)									
Endogamous Black	1.31	1.22	1.41	1.29	1.20	1.39	1.55	1.13	2.12
Endogamous Hispanic	1.21	1.13	1.29	1.21	1.13	1.29	1.31	0.94	1.84
White female/Black male	0.99	0.78	1.26	0.95	0.74	1.23	0.83	0.35	1.97
Black female/White male	1.20	0.87	1.65	1.45	1.00	2.12	0.43	0.19	0.96
White female/Hispanic male	0.82	0.74	0.92	0.84	0.75	0.94	0.81	0.53	1.23
Hispanic female/White male	1.46	1.32	1.61	1.46	1.32	1.62	1.54	1.03	2.30
Without 2020									
Couple's ethnora (WW)									
Endogamous Black	1.33	1.24	1.44	1.31	1.21	1.42	1.68	1.22	2.31
Endogamous Hispanic	1.21	1.14	1.30	1.21	1.13	1.29	1.33	0.94	1.89
White female/Black male	1.06	0.83	1.34	0.98	0.75	1.28	1.45	0.87	2.42
Black female/White male	1.28	0.92	1.79	1.58	1.07	2.34	0.41	0.17	1.01
White female/Hispanic male	0.82	0.73	0.92	0.82	0.73	0.93	0.83	0.54	1.29
Hispanic female/White male	1.49	1.34	1.65	1.48	1.33	1.64	1.65	1.10	2.47

Source: 2007–2022 ACS for the main text; 2007–2019, 2021–2022 ACS for supplementary analyses.

Notes: Analyses are weighted using wife's annualized personal weights.

Table A-3: Sample restrictions

	N	%
Married and cohabiting couples	4,290,686	100.00
Exclusions		
Not 40–59	834,098	19.44
Not NH White, NH Black, Hispanic	380,669	8.87
Partners live with both parents	1,370	0.03
Analytical sample	3,074,549	71.66

Source: 2007–2022 ACS.

Table A-4: Abridged logistic regression models predicting odds of living with any parent; both partners are US-born

	All			Married			Cohabiting		
	OR	95th CI		OR	95th CI		OR	95th CI	
Main Text									
Couple's ethnorace (WW)									
Endogamous Black	1.33	1.28	1.37	1.32	1.27	1.37	1.38	1.22	1.55
Endogamous Hispanic	1.53	1.48	1.58	1.52	1.47	1.58	1.65	1.47	1.85
White female/Black male	1.06	0.95	1.18	1.07	0.95	1.21	0.98	0.76	1.26
Black female/White male	1.21	1.03	1.41	1.21	1.02	1.44	1.23	0.83	1.83
White female/Hispanic male	1.26	1.20	1.33	1.27	1.20	1.34	1.19	1.00	1.42
Hispanic female/White male	1.42	1.36	1.49	1.45	1.39	1.52	1.15	0.97	1.36
Both US-born									
Couple's ethnorace (WW)									
Endogamous Black	1.12	1.07	1.16	1.10	1.05	1.15	1.23	1.07	1.41
Endogamous Hispanic	1.71	1.64	1.79	1.72	1.64	1.80	1.62	1.41	1.87
White female/Black male	1.08	0.97	1.22	1.11	0.98	1.26	0.97	0.74	1.27
Black female/White male	1.29	1.07	1.55	1.30	1.05	1.60	1.32	0.87	2.00
White female/Hispanic male	1.31	1.23	1.39	1.32	1.24	1.41	1.18	0.97	1.44
Hispanic female/White male	1.40	1.32	1.48	1.44	1.36	1.53	1.05	0.85	1.29

Source: 2007–2022 ACS.

Notes: Analyses are weighted using wife's annualized personal weights.

Table A-5: Abridged logistic regression models predicting odds of living with female over male partner's parents; both partners are US-born

	All			Married			Cohabiting		
	OR	95th CI		OR	95th CI		OR	95th CI	
Main Text									
Couple's ethnorace (WW)									
Endogamous Black	1.31	1.22	1.41	1.29	1.20	1.39	1.55	1.13	2.12
Endogamous Hispanic	1.21	1.13	1.29	1.21	1.13	1.29	1.31	0.94	1.84
White female/Black male	0.99	0.78	1.26	0.95	0.74	1.23	0.83	0.35	1.97
Black female/White male	1.20	0.87	1.65	1.45	1.00	2.12	0.43	0.19	0.96
White female/Hispanic male	0.82	0.74	0.92	0.84	0.75	0.94	0.81	0.53	1.23
Hispanic female/White male	1.46	1.32	1.61	1.46	1.32	1.62	1.54	1.03	2.30
Both US-born									
Couple's ethnorace (WW)									
Endogamous Black	1.64	1.55	1.74	1.63	1.53	1.74	1.73	1.39	2.14
Endogamous Hispanic	1.54	1.47	1.61	1.54	1.46	1.61	1.72	1.44	2.06
White female/Black male	0.97	0.80	1.18	0.92	0.74	1.13	0.98	0.55	1.74
Black female/White male	1.13	0.88	1.44	1.26	0.97	1.63	0.50	0.27	0.92
White female/Hispanic male	0.90	0.82	1.00	0.92	0.82	1.02	0.91	0.66	1.24
Hispanic female/White male	1.58	1.46	1.70	1.57	1.45	1.69	1.86	1.37	2.52

Source: 2007–2022 ACS.

Notes: Analyses are weighted using wife's annualized personal weights.