Move-In Patterns Among Latino Caregivers & Care Recipients

Anna Bokun March 03, 2025

Introduction

This document presents analysis of move-in patterns among Latino caregivers and care recipients from wave 7 (2010-2011) of the Hispanic Established Populations for the Epidemiologic Study of the Elderly (HEPESE) data. The analysis examines these patterns from both the care recipient's and caregiver's perspectives, with a focus on who moves in with whom and for what reasons.

1. Care Recipient Perspective

This section examines move-in patterns from the perspective of the care recipients.

1.1. Move-In Scenarios

Move-in Scenarios from the Care Recipient/Parent Perspective (N=659)

Scenario	Count	% of All Care Recipients/Parents
Someone moved in with parent	94	14.3%
Person moved in to provide care for parent	45	6.8%
Person moved in because they needed a place to stay	38	5.8%

1.2. Who Moved In

Who Moved In with Care Recipients (Among 94 Move-ins)

Relationship to Care Recipient	Count	Percentage
Adult Children (inc. in-laws)	70	74.5
Grandchildren	17	18.1

Other relatives	4	4.3
Non-relatives	2	2.1
Spouse	1	1.1

1.3. Move-In Reasons by Relationship

Reasons for Moving In by Relationship Type (Primary Mover Only)

Relationship to Care Recipient	Total Count	Moved for Care	% Moved for Care	Needed Place	% Needed Place
Adult Children (inc. in-laws)	70	40	57.1	24	34.3
Grandchildren	17	3	17.6	11	64.7
Other relatives	4	1	25.0	2	50.0
Non-relatives	2	1	50.0	1	50.0
Spouse	1	0	0.0	0	0.0

1.4. Adult Child Move-Ins

Characteristics of Adult Children Who Moved In With Parents

Characteristic	Count	Percentage
Total adult children who moved in	70	NA
Caregiver is head of household	21	30%
Care recipient/parent owns the home	34	48.6%
Moved in to provide care	40	57.1%
Moved in because needed place	24	34.3%
Reports financial strain	10	14.3%

1.5. Care Recipient Mobility

Care Recipient/Parent Mobility Patterns (N=659)

Scenario	Count	% of All Care Recipients
Care Recipient/Parent moved since last contact	75	11.4%
Care Recipient/Parent moved to be near children	24	3.6%

2. Caregiver Perspective

This section examines move-in patterns from the perspective of the caregivers, primarily focusing on household structure and headship.

2.1. Co-residence Patterns

Co-residence Patterns (N=659)

Living Arrangement Pattern	Count	% of All Caregiver-Care Recipient Dyads
Care recipient and caregiver co-reside	191	29%
Care recipient owns their home	376	57.1%
Care recipient owns home AND co-resides with caregiver	96	14.6%
Caregiver is head of household	287	43.6%
Caregiver is head of household AND co-resides with the care recipient	60	9.1%

2.2. Move-In Typology

Move-In Typology (N=659)

Move-In Type	Count	Percentage
Adult child likely moved in for caregiving reasons	27	4.1

Adult child likely moved in for housing	21	3.2
Adult child likely moved in for other reasons	9	1.4
General move-in (unspecified reason)	21	3.2
No movement	550	83.5
Parent likely moved in with adult child for care	31	4.7

2.3. Financial Strain by Living Arrangement

Financial Strain by Move-In Type

Move-In Type	N	# with Financial Strain	% with Financial Strain
Adult child likely moved in for caregiving reasons	27	6	22.2
Parent likely moved in with adult child for care	31	6	19.4
No movement	550	64	11.6
Adult child likely moved in for other reasons	9	1	11.1
Adult child likely moved in for housing	21	0	0.0
General move-in (unspecified reason)	21	0	0.0

3. Move-In Typologies

This section presents a more refined analysis of move-in patterns.

3.1. Move-In Types for Adult Child Caregivers

Move-In Types for Adult Child Caregivers Only

		% of	% with					Mean	Mean
		Adult	Financial	%	Mean	%	%	ADL	IADL
Move-In Type	Count	Children	Strain	Female	Age	Married	Medicaid	Hours	Hours

Adult child likely moved in for caregiving reasons	27	100	22.2	74.1	56.3	53.8	11.1	8.1	8.0
Parent likely moved in with adult child for care	31	100	19.4	64.5	54.0	90.0	12.9	7.1	6.8
No movement	550	100	11.6	70.0	54.7	53.5	10.9	5.0	4.7
Adult child likely moved in for other reasons	9	100	11.1	100.0	56.8	33.3	11.1	5.8	4.1
Adult child likely moved in for housing	21	100	0.0	66.7	53.5	35.0	5.0	3.4	4.3
General move-in (unspecified reason)	21	100	0.0	85.7	55.8	38.1	21.1	9.5	6.1

3.2. Detailed Living Arrangements of Adult Child Caregivers

Detailed Living Arrangements of Adult Child Caregivers

Living Arrangement	Count	% of Adult Children		% Female	Mean Age	% Married	% Medicaid	Mean ADL Hours	Mean IADL Hours
Adult child moved in for care (parent owns home)	14	100	35.7	85.7	54.9	35.7	21.4	5.9	6.9
Parent moved	13	100	30.8	92.3	47.5	84.6	23.1	5.2	4.7

in but caregiver is not HOH									
Adult child moved in for other reasons (parent owns home)	4	100	25.0	100.0	54.0	25.0	25.0	2.0	3.5
Co-residence (no recent movement)	148	100	16.2	63.5	55.1	30.1	16.8	5.9	5.7
Adult child moved in for care (parent doesn't own home)	9	100	11.1	77.8	59.1	87.5	0.0	14.2	9.2
Parent moved in with caregiver (caregiver is HOH)	18	100	11.1	44.4	58.7	94.1	5.6	8.7	8.3
Not co- residing	425	100	9.4	72.2	54.6	60.7	9.0	4.7	4.4
Adult child moved in for housing (parent doesn't own home)	6	100	0.0	83.3	53.8	33.3	0.0	2.5	6.1
Adult child moved in for housing (parent owns home)	13	100	0.0	69.2	52.2	41.7	7.7	2.6	3.0
Adult child moved in for other reasons	2	100	0.0	100.0	62.5	50.0	0.0	15.0	3.0

(parent doesn't own home)

movement

Other co-	7	100	0.0	85.7	60.9	28.6	16.7	13.5	10.2
residence with									

3.4. Dementia Status by Move-In Type

Dementia Status by Move-In Type

Move-In Type	N	# with Dementia	# without Dementia	Valid Cases	% with Dementia
Parent likely moved in with adult child for care	31	20	11	31	64.5
Adult child likely moved in for caregiving reasons	27	12	15	27	44.4
Adult child likely moved in for other reasons	9	4	5	9	44.4
General move-in (unspecified reason)	21	9	12	21	42.9
No movement	550	221	329	550	40.2
Adult child likely moved in for housing	21	7	14	21	33.3

3.5. Adult child moved in vs. parent moved in

Comparison: Parent Moved In vs. Adult Child Moved In

Living Arrangement	N	Mean Age	% Female	% Married	% Medicaid	% with Financial Strain	Mean ADL Hours	Mean IADL Hours	% CR with Dementia
Adult child likely moved in for caregiving reasons	27	56.3	74.1	53.8	11.1	22.2	8.1	8.0	44.4

Parent likely moved in with adult child for care 31 54.0

64.5

90.0

12.9

19.4

7.1

6.8

64.5

Key Findings and Conclusions

Based on the analysis presented in this document, several key patterns emerge regarding move-in scenarios among Latino caregivers and care recipients:

- 1.) Bidirectional Mobility Patterns: The data reveals that caregiving arrangements involve movement in both directions—adult children moving in with parents (accounting for 74.5% of move-ins [70/94], by relationship to care recipient) and parents moving in with adult children (31/659 = 4.7% of cases). The motivations behind these moves differ significantly and impact financial strain outcomes.
- 2.) Divergent Financial Strain by Move-In Type: Financial strain varies considerably by living arrangement:
 - Adult children who moved in specifically for caregiving purposes experience the highest rates of financial strain (22.2%)
 - Adult children whose parents who moved in for care show similar high rates (19.4%)
- 3.) Home Ownership Dynamics: Home ownership appears to be a crucial factor in financial strain:
 - Adult children who moved in for care when the parent owns the home experience particularly high financial strain (35.7%)
- 4.) Dementia as a Driver of Living Arrangements: Care recipients with dementia are significantly more likely to have moved in with their adult children (64.5% vs. 44.4% when the child moved in), suggesting that cognitive impairment may precipitate more dramatic household restructuring.
- 5.) Caregiving Intensity Variations: Adult children who moved in specifically for caregiving report providing substantially more hours of assistance (8.1 ADL hours and 8.0 IADL hours) compared to those who moved in for their housing needs (2.6-3.4 hours), indicating that move-in motivation correlates strongly with caregiving intensity.
- 6.) Marriage Status as a Buffer: Parents who moved in with adult children show dramatically higher marriage rates (90%) than adult children who moved in for caregiving (53.8%), suggesting that spousal support may influence living arrangement decisions.