TERESA M. COONEY [ID]   *University of Colorado Denver*

Grandparents' Support to Young Families: Variations by Adult Children's Union Status[†]

Objective: This study investigates whether grandparents' support to their children's families varies by the child's union status—single, cohabiting, or married.

Background: More young families today are headed by unmarried parents due to increases in nonmarital childbearing, cohabitation, and divorce, and these families have fewer resources than married-couple families. Grandparents can provide an important safety net to families in need. Although grandparents today possess a greater capacity to assist their children's families due to increased longevity, good health and financial well-being, little is known about whether their support varies based on their adult children's union status.

Method: Data are drawn from the 2015–2017 Add Health Parent Study (AHPS) (https://www.cpc.unc.edu/projects/addhealth/design/parents-phase-2), a follow-up study of 2013 parents who participated in the 1995 Add Health Study with their adolescents. Respondents' reports of instrumental and financial support to children, ages 18–40, and their children are analyzed. Mixed effects logistic regressions estimate the likelihood of support to 399 cohabiting, 518 single, and 1959 married children. Follow-up regressions estimate amounts of support to those receiving any assistance.

Results: Grandparents are more likely to provide instrumental and financial assistance to cohabiting and single children than married children. Cohabiting females receive more hours of instrumental help from grandparents than married females. Single and cohabiting children receive higher levels of financial assistance than married children.

Conclusion: Grandparental support appears responsive to the needs of their adult children. Nontraditional families no longer receive less extended-family support. Grandparents today appear to play an important support role for their children's families.

Department of Sociology, University of Colorado Denver, 1380 Lawrence Street, Suite 420, Denver, CO 80217 (teresa.cooney@ucdenver.edu).

Shifting patterns of intimate partnering and childbearing have dramatically altered the structure of U.S. families with young children over the last 50 years. As a result of increases in nonmarital births (Martin et al., 2018) and cohabitation (Smock & Manning, 2010), and high divorce rates (U.S. Census Bureau, 2020), a greater share of families with minor children are now headed by unmarried parents than in the late 20th century. Although just one in ten parents was unmarried in 1977, today the proportion is 25% (Pew Research Center, 2018). The complexity of young families has also increased due to recent changes in the union status of unmarried parents. Only 20% of unmarried parents lived with a cohabiting partner in 1997 whereas the same is true of 35%

of unmarried parents with minor children today (Pew Research Center, 2018). Underlining the importance of these family changes is the fact that married, cohabiting, and single parents differ considerably in demographic terms, and in the economic well-being of their families (Manning & Brown, 2006). These increasingly diverse family structures contribute to growing economic inequality among U.S. children (McLanahan, 2004).

Despite these significant changes to the profile of young families in recent decades, their implications for extended-family relationships are largely unknown (Silverstein & Giarrusso, 2010). Few recent studies of adults' relationships with their parents—the grandparents of their children—consider relationship outcomes across a detailed set of union statuses of the adult children, including married, cohabiting, and single status. Most research on this topic used data from the 1980s and 1990s when young families were noticeably different from today. The current study addresses this gap by using new data to examine the association between the union status of young adult parents and their relationships with their own parents, the grandparents of their children. This research asks: does grandparents' provision of instrumental and financial support to their young adult children and their families vary based on the adult child's union status?

This issue is timely because of the structural changes in young families introduced above, and for several other reasons. First, children born to unmarried parents or living in households not headed by married parents often lack the resources present in married-couple households that foster positive development and well-being (Manning & Brown, 2006). Grandparents can provide a critical safety net for vulnerable young families. Their childcare assistance may facilitate adult children's employment and enhance earnings (Harknett, 2006), and their financial support can benefit a young family's economic situation (Pilkauska & Alvarado Urbina, 2014). Determining whether grandparents' support differs for the families of single, cohabiting, and married children thus has implications for the well-being of parents and their young children.

How adult children's union status shapes grandparents' experiences is also relevant given extended longevity. Older adults today face a longer period as grandparents and do so with increasingly good health (Margolis &

Wright, 2017) and economic advantages compared to young adults (MetLife, 2011). These advances expand grandparents' capacity to engage with their children and grandchildren, and to provide support that could enhance their family well-being. Determining if grandparents' experiences vis-à-vis their children's families vary by adult children's union status thus contributes to our understanding of contemporary grandparenthood.

Finally, this study informs public debate on the status of American families. Some social commentators warn that increases in nonmarital childbearing and cohabitation are among recent family changes that threaten to destabilize contemporary families and jeopardize their key social functions, such as raising children and meeting the needs of their members (Popenoe, 1993). Others counter that this family decline argument is focused too narrowly on nuclear families, neglecting the support roles of multigenerational extended families, and their resilience to social and demographic changes (Bengtson, 2001). Given limited current data on the impact of family changes on extended-family ties and functions, this study offers valuable insight into this debate.

BACKGROUND

To lay the foundation for this study, I begin with a brief overview of differences between single, cohabiting, and married adults to highlight how their need for support may vary. I then present a conceptual framework for considering relationships between young adults and their parents, and articulate its application to this study. Finally, I review literature identifying predictors of support from parents to adult children.

Socio-Demographic Differences across Union Statuses

Single, cohabiting, and married adults differ in several ways that may affect grandparents' support to their families. Educational attainment is one distinction. Most (80%) single parents of minor children have not completed college and 45% of them have a high school education or less. Conversely, a majority of married parents have some experience with college, and 43% have earned a degree. Cohabiting parents' educational attainment resembles that of single parents as 54% have a high school degree or less,

and 15% hold a bachelor's degree (Pew Research Center, 2018). Single, cohabiting, and married parents also differ in age. Current Population Survey (CPS) data reveal a median age of 40 for married parents of minors, 38 for single parents, and 34 for those who are cohabiting (Pew Research Center, 2018).

Age and education distinctions between single, cohabiting, and married parents portend variations in economic well-being for their families as well. Data from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study showed that the earnings and household income of married mothers were over twice that of cohabiting mothers, who reported slightly higher wages than single mothers and whose household incomes were 50% greater than those of mothers living without partners (Kalil & Ryan, 2010). CPS data also reveal sharp contrasts in poverty rates: 8% of married parents live in poverty compared to 16% of cohabiting parents and 27% of single parents (Pew Resource Center, 2018). The significant economic need of unmarried parents is thus evident.

Family stability also varies based on parents' union status. Cohabiting couples break up at a rate 2.5 times higher than that of recently married couples (Manning et al., 2014). Estimates are that children born to cohabitors are nearly twice as likely to experience parental separation by age 5 as those born to married couples (Musick & Michelmore, 2018). These differences and the socioeconomic distinctions between married, single, and cohabiting parents are key factors that may influence grandparents' differential support to their families.

Intergenerational Solidarity

Three relationship meta-dimensions identified by Silverstein and Bengtson (1997), based on the intergenerational solidarity perspective, are used herein to consider grandparents' support to adult children's families. One meta-dimension of parent–child relationships, *affinity*, is based on emotional closeness and attitudinal consensus between the generations. *Opportunity*, a second meta-dimension, refers to geographic proximity and parent–child association, and is associated with affinity. These components of parent–child bonds are connected with, but distinct from, a third meta-dimension, *functional solidarity*, which pertains to support exchanges between the generations. This study focuses on grandparents'

support to adult children because during young adulthood exchanges primarily flow down generational lines (Zarit & Eggebeen, 2002).

Theorizing the Role of Adult Children's Union Status in Grandparents' Support

Adult children's union status may influence grandparents' support to their families for several reasons. First, affinity and opportunity generally promote support to adult children (Silverstein & Bengtson, 1997), and both may be affected by a child's union status. Regarding affinity, grandparents who disapprove of their adult child's lifestyle may feel less emotional closeness and value consensus with that child, resulting in less willingness to help their family (Eggebeen, 2005). Although there is growing acceptance of cohabitation in general among recent cohorts of older adults today (Brown & Wright, 2016), their attitudes about cohabiting families that include children are still largely negative. Older adults are 50% more likely than young adults to agree that cohabiting-couple families are "a bad thing for society" (Pew Survey Center, 2018), and they are less accepting of nonmarital childbearing than young adults (Taylor et al., 2007). The association between emotional closeness, the other component of affinity, and children's union status is less clear. Among adults aged 18 and older, Sarkisian and Gerstel (2008) found that never-married and married daughters reported higher-quality relationships with parents than divorced daughters. Unmarried sons reported closer relationships with parents than married ones, but divorced sons did not differ from either group. These findings do not extend perfectly to the current study because the marital history (i.e., never married, divorced, widowed) of single and cohabiting children was not reported in the data analyzed herein. Yet, because affinity predicts support to adult children (Eggebeen, 2005) and likely differs by union status, it is critical to consider in grandparents' support to adult children in various union statuses.

Opportunity also affects intergenerational assistance. Studies (Eggebeen, 2005; Suitor et al., 2006) have found that limited contact appears to restrict parents' chances of giving support to their adult children, at least instrumental help requiring in-person contact. Data from Europe and the United States have revealed a link between cohabitation and reduced contact

with parents (Hogerbrugge & Dykstra, 2009; Yahirun & Hamplova, 2014), thus less instrumental support from grandparents to cohabitors than married adults may be expected. Because single adults have greater contact with parents than married adults (Sarkisian & Gerstel, 2008; Yahirun & Hamplova, 2014), they may have a support advantage.

Studies based on the solidarity perspective also document the explanatory value of reciprocity theory (Geurts et al., 2012; Silverstein et al., 2002). This theory views giving to others as motivated by self-interest, thereby support is offered with the expectation that the recipient will return support in the future (Silverstein et al., 2002). In light of the greater instability of cohabiting than marital unions, grandparents may be less willing to give help to cohabiting than married children because investments in the former may have less potential for long-term reciprocity (Eggebeen, 2005; Hogerbrugge & Dykstra, 2009). Additionally, they may anticipate greater chances of future reciprocity from single than married children because the latter have competing partner and in-law obligations, and tend to be less engaged with aging parents (Sarkisian & Gerstel, 2008).

Based on theorizing thus far, grandparents' support to married children's families is expected to be more limited than that to their single children's families, but greater than that to the families of cohabiting children. Yet, contingency theory (Eggebeen & Davey, 1998) suggests a different pattern of support in relation to children's union status. This theory posits that support is given based primarily on need, and studies using with-in family designs have documented that adult children with greater need do receive more parental help than their siblings (Fingerman et al., 2009; Suitor et al., 2006). Therefore, given the resource disadvantage of families headed by unmarried adults, contingency theory suggests that grandparents will provide more support to single and cohabiting children than to married children.

Predictors of Support to Adult Children and Their Families

This section reviews factors that predict support to adult children, in addition to union status. The review addresses instrumental and financial support separately because they require different types of parental resources (time vs money)

and opportunity factors (instrumental support depends more on contact). Furthermore, because instrumental support usually entails face-to-face interaction, it may be more strongly associated with affinity than is financial assistance. It also is likely to offer more opportunities for interaction with grandchildren.

Instrumental Support. A recent TD Ameritrade (2016) survey of over 1,000 parents, ages 19–37, revealed that 54% were recipients of instrumental help from grandparents. Childcare is a common form of such assistance, as one in four preschoolers and one in five primary-school children receive grandparent care on a regular basis (Laughlin, 2013). Grandparents devote substantial time to childcare, with 20% reporting over 100 hours a year (Luo et al., 2013).

Evidence of how grandparents' childcare support varies based on adult children's union status is mixed. National time-diary data showed that nonresident grandparents spent more time in activities with grandchildren (including childcare) when grandchildren lived in single-parent than two-parent families (Dunifon et al., 2018). Based on a sample of children in Italy, Meggiolaro (2018) found that those living in married-couple families had 50% greater odds of receiving grandparental care than those in cohabiting-couple families in 2003. Yet, analyses with 2009 data revealed no union-status difference in the likelihood of grandparental care, although children living in cohabiting-couple families in 2009 received more hours of grandparental care than those in married-couple families, perhaps reflecting greater need.

Research on parental support to adult children usually combines data on help with childcare with that assessing other types of practical assistance (e.g., transportation, household help). Need factors appear influential in instrumental support as such assistance is generally greater for younger adult children (Fingerman et al., 2009; Sarkisian & Gerstel, 2008; Suitor et al., 2006) and those with health or financial problems (Fingerman et al., 2009; Suitor et al., 2006). Because grandmothers tend to engage more in instrumental support, especially childcare (Luo et al., 2013), than grandfathers (Suitor et al., 2006), the higher rates of instrumental help to daughters than sons found in some research (Sarkisian & Gerstel, 2008; Suitor et al., 2006) may reflect mother–daughter

affinity or mothers' stronger expectations for future care (reciprocity) from daughters than sons (Suitor et al., 2006).

Studies reveal fairly distinct patterns of instrumental support from parents to adult children, based on children's union status. But, most of this research is based on data from the National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH)—wave 1 fielded in the mid-1980s and wave 2 in the early 1990s. Using NSFH2, Sarkisian and Gerstel (2008) found that single and divorced adults were more likely to receive instrumental help from their parents than married adults. The presence of grandchildren increased the chances of such assistance. Although these researchers did not consider adult children's cohabitation status, Eggebeen (2005) did in analysis of NSFH1 data. He found significant differences in parents' provisions of instrumental support, which favored help to married and single young adult children over cohabiting children. These differences were significant after controlling for parent factors that may impact their capacity to help, as well as children's need, opportunity, and parent–child affinity.

Marks and McLanahan (1993) conducted a similar analysis of NSFH1 data but restricted their sample to parents of minor children, and included interactions of children's sex and family structure in predicting grandparents' support. They revealed that overall, single mothers and fathers were more likely to receive grandparental assistance than their married counterparts. Cohabiting parents, in contrast, were disadvantaged relative to married parents in terms of grandparental support, but patterns varied by sex. Specifically, grandparents were less likely to give instrumental support to cohabiting daughters whose partner was not the grandchildren's father than to married daughters. For sons, cohabitation in general was linked to reduced grandparental support relative to that for married sons. Their findings highlight the importance of testing interactions between sex and union status in relation to grandparental support.

Evidence from two vignette studies also suggests important race/ethnicity differences in grandparents' attitudes about unmarried parents and their willingness to support them. Work by Mollborn (2009), focused on adults' reactions to scenarios about nonmarital pregnancy, found that non-Hispanic Whites were more bothered by such situations than African Americans, though their reactions did not differ significantly from those of Latino adults. A study of adults' views about the appropriateness of assistance to a variety of family members also revealed less approval of parental help to cohabiting than married children with such attitudes especially strong among non-Hispanic Whites (Seltzer et al., 2012).

In sum, research findings on grandparents' childcare and instrumental support to adult children generally suggest that grandparents are more supportive of single than married children's families. This possibly reflects differences in need for adult children in these union statuses. Evidence is less clear and more dated as it pertains to support for cohabiting parents. Although the greater needs of cohabitors suggest they too may warrant more support than married children, reduced opportunity and affinity may limit their receipt of grandparental support relative to married children, especially for sons. Moreover, when race/ethnicity is considered, non-Hispanic White grandparents may be expected to provide less support than African American grandparents if children are cohabiting or single, relative to being married.

Financial Support. Fewer young families today receive financial than instrumental assistance from grandparents, though nearly half reported some monetary help in TD Ameritrade's (2016) recent survey. European (Albertini & Radl, 2012) and U.S. studies (McGarry, 2016) indicate that financial transfers to adult children are largely "associated with negative shocks to income" (McGarry, 2016, p. 12). That is, parents typically give financial assistance to adult children to help them weather the economic hardship of events like job loss, marital disruption, or the birth of children, which reduce household income or increase family need. Rarely do parents' financial transfers contribute to longer-term wealth accumulation for their children. This is especially true for unmarried children who likely use such assistance to cover living expenses and their families' immediate needs (Hao, 1996).

Financial support from parents is linked to several factors indicative of adult children's needs. Young adults with health problems were more likely to receive financial help from parents (Suitor et al., 2006), as were those with more children of their own (McGarry, 2016).

Research has consistently shown a negative correlation between adults' age and receipt of financial help from parents (Albertini & Radl, 2012; Berry, 2008; Eggebeen, 2005; McGarry, 2016;Sarkisian & Gerstel, 2008; Suitor et al., 2006), as younger adults are assumed to be less established and have greater need. Although children with higher incomes generally have lower chances of receiving monetary support (Berry, 2008; McGarry, 2016), several studies (Albertini & Radl, 2012; Eggebeen, 2005; McGarry, 2016; Sarkisian & Gerstel, 2008) report that those with more education have a higher likelihood of financial help from parents. This finding may reflect enrollment (Albertini & Radl, 2012; McGarry, 2016; Swartz et al., 2011), which increases an adult child's expenses, or parents' investment in successful children who may be more able to reciprocate in the future (Fingerman et al., 2009).

Evidence that affinity and opportunity promote adults' receipt of financial assistance from parents is less extensive and consistent than in the case of instrumental assistance. Some research revealed that relationship quality positively predicted parents' monetary support for young adults (Eggebeen, 2005), while other research found no link between shared values and parents' financial support to children (Suitor et al., 2006). Yet another investigation found young adults' monetary help from parents was positively associated with relationship quality with their mothers, but negatively associated with relationship quality with fathers (Swartz et al., 2011). Opportunity factors also operate inconsistently in past research as some studies found no association between proximity and adults' financial help from parents (Sarkisian & Gerstel, 2008; Suitor et al., 2006) and others demonstrated a positive connection between contact with parents and receipt of financial support from them (Eggebeen, 2005). Age differences in samples of adult children may explain this inconsistency, as opportunity and affinity appear to be more significant predictors of parents' financial help to younger adults, who are the focus of this study.

The role of children's union status in their receipt of financial support from parents has primarily been examined with NSFH data. Though Sarkisian and Gerstel's (2008) analysis of NSFH2 data did not account for adults' cohabitation status, they found that compared to their married counterparts of the same sex, single males and females, and divorced females had greater chances of financial support, but divorced males had lower odds of receiving monetary help. In contrast, Eggebeen (2005) reported no differences in receipt of monetary support from parents for cohabiting, single and married young adults in NSFH1 data. Hao's (1996) analysis of financial transfers from parents also used NSFH1 data, but was restricted to transfers to children who were parents themselves. Hao found that grandparents were less likely to direct monetary transfers to the families of cohabiting than married children of both sexes. For unmarried adults, both their sex and marital history mattered. Families of never-married females were less likely to be recipients of grandparental support than those of married females, and ever-married single females had greater chances of grandparental support than cohabiting females. Single males were more likely to receive financial support from grandparents than were cohabiting males. Analysis of more recent data from an urban sample revealed that both married and cohabiting young adults were less likely than single adults to be beneficiaries of parents' financial support (Swartz et al., 2011). But, recent data from Europe indicated that divorced and single adults have an edge over married adults in terms of monetary transfers from parents (Albertini & Radl, 2012).

To summarize, the overall picture of financial transfers from parents to adult children highlights the influence of children's need—indicated by younger age, unmarried status, having fewer resources and more demands (e.g., children, unemployment). Some research reveals the positive influence of affinity and opportunity factors, with relationship quality and higher contact predicting parents' financial support, at least to younger adults. Older studies offer mixed results regarding attitudinal factors—an aspect of affinity; some studies found no differences between single, cohabiting and married adults, and others showed never-married females and cohabiting adults of both sexes to be disadvantaged, in terms of receiving financial help from parents.

To restate, the current study asks the question: Does grandparents' instrumental and financial support to their young adult children and their families vary based on whether the adult child is married, cohabiting or single? Additionally,

the study examines union-status variations in grandparents' instrumental and financial support by race/ethnicity and children's sex.

Methods

Data

This study draws on data from the Add Health Parent Study (AHPS), conducted from 2015 to 2017. The dataset includes 2013 parents, primarily mothers, ages 47–80. All had participated in 1995 in Wave 1 of the national Add Health Study along with at least one of their adolescent children who was part of that study. AHPS respondents were screened to verify their relationship to the Add Health participant (biological, adoptive, or stepparent) and to determine if they met other eligibility requirements for the AHPS (i.e., not incarcerated; having at least one surviving child who was an Add Health respondent) (Eischen et al., 2018). AHPS was completed by 65% of targeted respondents. Because the original Add Health sample was representative of U.S. adolescents, this weighted AHPS sample constitutes a probability sample of parents of a nationally representative sample of adolescents ages 12–18 in 1995.

AHPS involved in-home interviews (11% did telephone interviews) that gathered social, behavioral and health data on the respondents' lives (Eischen et al., 2018). The current study primarily uses data from the respondent's Child Roster, which gathered information on each of the respondent's children, and assessed their relationship quality and contact with each. Each adult child the respondent named (over age 18 and a biological, adopted, stepchild, or child of partner) contributed a record to the analyses (*n* = 6,206). Because this study focuses on support to adult children with families, 1,939 records for adult children who were not themselves parents (or parental status was unknown) were excluded. Another 277 records were excluded because the adult child lived with the respondent, making support transfers difficult to assess. Records for 1,007 adult children over age 40 were excluded because assistance to children drops sharply after age 40 (Cooney & Uhlenberg, 1990). This resulted in an initial analytic sample of 2,959 young parents, aged 40 and under, who are adult children of 1,611 AHPS participants (grandparents). Only 83 records (0.03%) had missing values on at least one of

the study variables and were thus removed via list-wise deletion, leaving a final analytic sample of 2,876. Of these adult children, 518 were currently single (child's marital history was not reported), 399 were cohabiting ("living with a romantic partner"), and 1,959 were married, based on AHPS respondent reports.

Dependent Variables. Four dependent variables address grandparents' support to adult children's families. Two are dichotomous, indicating whether the grandparent provided *any* instrumental or *any* financial help to each child in the past 12 months. Instrumental support includes "help with activities such as child care, errands, transportation, chores, or hands-on care". Financial support includes "any money, personal loans, or gifts of $100 or more." Interviewers noted that "Money to grandchildren should count as money to the child who is the parent of these children." The other two outcome variables, hours of instrumental support and dollars of financial support, indicate the level of assistance grandparents reported to a given child, if any support of that type was noted. Children not receiving support were omitted from the analyses predicting amount of support.

Independent Variables. Predictor variables address adult child characteristics and grandparent characteristics and circumstances. The key predictor variables, "married," "single," and "cohabiting" union status are dichotomized (1–0) with a value of 1 indicating that variable represents the current union status of the adult child. Children's needs are based on three continuous indicators: age, education (years of school completed), and number of children. AHPS respondents did not report adult children's incomes so education is used to index socioeconomic status. Parent–child affinity and opportunity measures include four variables. The question "How close do you feel to [child]?" captures grandparent–adult child closeness. Responses ranged from 1 = "*not at all close*" to 5 = "*very close*" but were recoded to 1 = close (responses of 4 or 5) and 0 = not close (responses 1–3) due to positive skew. Adult child's sex (1 = female, 0 = male) is considered an affinity factor because of greater closeness and support between parents and adult daughters than sons (Cooney & Uhlenberg, 1990; Fingerman et al., 2009).

The adult child's relationship to the AHPS respondent also is assessed as relationships are generally closer and more supportive between parents and biological or adopted children (=1) compared to step-children or those of a partner (=0) (Meggiolaro, 2018). Opportunity is indexed with a variable denoting days per year the respondent and adult child had any contact—"either in person, on the phone, in letters, email, video chatting, online messaging or texting."

All models included controls for grandparent characteristics. These variables had the same values across all adult children in a given family. Grandparents' capacity to provide support is likely influenced by several factors. Increasing age (in years) may limit instrumental help (Luo et al., 2013) but promote financial transfers (Cooney & Uhlenberg, 1990). Education, net worth, and income index grandparents' socioeconomic status and ability to financially help their children (Cooney & Uhlenberg, 1990). Education is coded as years of completed school, net worth pertains to the reported value of respondents' assets minus debt (coded in $10,000s), and income refers to all earned income (wages, salaries, self-employment, etc.) in the previous 12 months (coded in $1000s). Hours worked in the last year were assessed because they may restrict grandparents' opportunities to provide assistance. Self-reported good health (the scale of 1 = "*excellent*" to 5 = "*poor*" is reverse coded) likely facilitates grandparents' support, especially instrumental help (Cooney & Uhlenberg, 1990; Luo et al., 2013). Grandparents with more sets of grandchildren generally give less support to each adult child's family (Uhlenberg & Hammill, 1998). Grandchild sets represents a count of adult children with children of their own. Even though the grandparent sample is predominantly female, sex (1 = female, 0 = male) is controlled as grandmothers usually provide more instrumental help to children than grandfathers (Cooney & Uhlenberg, 1990; Luo et al., 2013). Whether the grandparent lives with a partner (married or unmarried) is dummy coded 1 = partnered, 0 = single. Parents without partners generally give less support to adult children (Cooney & Uhlenberg, 1990). Finally, grandparents' race is considered because of race/ethnicity distinctions documented in the literature. Race/ethnicity is indexed with four dummy variables, each coded to 1 = yes, 0 = no to capture exclusive categories of: non-Hispanic

White, non-Hispanic Black, Hispanic, and Other race/ethnicity.

Analytic Plan

The analyses begin with bivariate comparisons of single, cohabiting and married children across all study variables. This analysis identifies group differences that may affect variations in grandparents' support. Analyses of variance (with the three-group union-status variable as the predictor) are conducted with each continuous variable as the outcome, and Bonferroni post-hoc tests of means are used to identify significant union-status differences on these variables. Chi-square tests are used to determine significant associations between union status and each categorical variable.

Next, multivariate analyses are run using weighted data. AHPS respondent weights are a function of the respondent's adolescent child being selected for Wave 1 of Add Health and the parent being selected for the AHPS. Because each respondent may have multiple adult children in the analyses, mixed effects models are estimated to account for nonindependence across observations. (These grandparents had between 1 and 7 adult children in the analyses, with a mean of 1.8 per grandparent.) The fixed effects in each model refer to the grandparent characteristics. Model estimation begins with two sets of mixed effects logistic regressions run in Stata 16. Each set estimates the odds of respondents providing any support to the adult child—with financial and instrumental support modeled separately. Modeling proceeds in three steps: (a) predictors for union status are entered (dummy variables for cohabiting and for single—omitted category is the married group), along with controls for grandparent characteristics; (b) the adult child's needs, affinity, and opportunity variables are added next to determine if these predictors account for union status differences in support; (c) sex × union status and sex × race/ethnicity interactions are each added separately to the full model in the last step to test the significance of interactions suggested by the literature. Next, mixed effects linear models are conducted to estimate levels of support for adult children who receive support of each type. Due to the positively skewed distributions of hours and dollars provided by grandparents, values for each of these dependent variables are logged. (To assist in interpretation of these

Table 1. *Descriptive Statistics (Mean [*SD*] or Percentage) on Analytic Variables, by Young Adult's Union Status (Unweighted Data)[a]*

Analytic variable	Married $n = 1,959$	Cohabiting $n = 399$	Single $n = 518$
Adult child's age (19–40)	35.59 (3.19)a	34.13 (4.16)b	34.91 (3.96)c
Number of children (1–11)	2.26 (1.11)a	2.10 (1.22)b	2.15 (1.25)a,b
Adult child's years of education	14.60 (2.21)a	12.97 (1.70)b	13.25 (2.02)b
Adult child's sex (% female)	53.70a	50.63a	59.65b
Close relationship to grandparent (%)	84.28a	77.69b	78.76b
Days of contact/year with grandparent	166.32 (161.56)a	185.02(162.87)a,b	194.44 (164.78)b
Biological/adopted child (%)	90.96a	86.72b	91.12a,b
Grandparent's age (47–80)	61.72 (5.39)a	59.30 (5.50)b	60.38 (5.48)c
Grandparent's sex (% Female)	95.87a	98.25a	96.33a
Grandparent non-Hispanic White (%)	81.11a	66.67b	52.70c
Grandparent non-Hispanic Black (%)	7.45a	18.05b	32.82c
Grandparent Hispanic (%)	9.24a	12.28a	11.00a
Grandparent other race/ethnicity (%)	2.19a	3.00a	3.47a
Grandparent's years of education	13.99 (2.16)a	13.25 (1.81)b	13.35 (1.90)b
Grandparent's health (1–5)	3.19 (1.05)a	2.85 (1.05)b	2.89 (1.08)b
Number of sets of grandchildren	2.26 (1.18)a	2.46 (1.23)b	2.47 (1.33)b
Grandparent lives with partner (%)	73.10a	61.15b	53.28c
Grandparent's hours worked last year	898.49 (985.97)a	1,046.24 (1,016.68)b	776.70 (942.79)c
Grandparent's net worth (in $10,000s)	31.88 (34.34)a	17.51 (26.54)b	18.01 (26.65)b
Grandparent's income (in $1,000s)	24.43 (37.90)a	21.68 (29.06)a,b	16.47 (26.70)b
Received instrumental assistance (%)	73.70a	72.68a	74.13a
Received financial assistance (%)	49.46a	50.88a	48.84a
Hours of instrumental assistance[b]	464.81a (965.39)	804.10b (1,624.58)	724.85b (1,552.56)
Dollars of financial assistance[c]	1,825.59a (4,032.31)	1,651.09a (2,861.56)	2,464.63a (4,514.76)

[a]Means or percentages marked with the same letter (a, b, c) are not significantly different at $p \leq .05$ based on analysis of variance with Bonferroni correction and chi-square tests of independence. [b]Means for those receiving any instrumental support. [c]Means for those receiving any financial support.

coefficients, Table S1 is presented to show the percent change in the amount of support [hours or dollars] associated with a unit change in each independent variable in these regression models. This is based on the equation: % change $= [e^{b-1}) \times 100$.) Modeling of estimates of union status effects on amount of hours and amount of dollars received from grandparents uses the same three-step procedure described for the series of logistic regressions. Tables 2 and 3 include only the interaction models if interactions are significant, otherwise results of those models are included in Tables S1–S3.

RESULTS

Bivariate Comparisons

Table 1 presents comparisons of the union-status groups on all study variables. Generally, these contrasts showed married parents to have less need than cohabiting and single parents, based on greater education and being older. But, they do have more children than cohabiting parents. Affinity and opportunity factors revealed a different pattern. Although married adults were more likely to have a close relationship with the grandparent than single and cohabiting adults, they had less contact with the grandparent than single adults. Single parents were more likely to be female than both married and cohabiting parents, which may favor them as recipients of support. Cohabiting parents were less likely to be biological/adopted children of the grandparent, which may limit their receipt of support. The need to include controls for grandparent characteristics in the multivariate analyses was confirmed by several significant differences across union-status groups for the grandparent variables. Consistently, married children would appear to have a support advantage relative to cohabiting and single children based on grandparent characteristics. The grandparents to

Table 2. *Mixed Effects Regressions Predicting Instrumental Support from Grandparents*

	Any support received[a]		Amount of support received[b]		
	Model I	Model II	Model I	Model II	Model III
	OR (*SE*)	OR (*SE*)	Coeff. (*SE*)	Coeff. (*SE*)	Coeff. (*SE*)
Adult child variables					
Cohabiting (1–0)[c]	1.54* (0.33)	1.83** (0.46)	0.22 (0.14)	0.23 (0.14)	−0.13 (0.17)
Single (1–0)[c]	1.80** (0.37)	2.18*** (0.51)	0.03 (0.12)	0.04 (0.12)	−0.19 (0.20)
Age		0.90*** (0.02)		−0.04*** (0.01)	−0.04*** (0.01)
Number of children		1.29** (0.11)		0.12** (0.04)	0.11** (0.04)
Education		1.11* (0.05)		−0.01 (0.02)	−0.01 (0.02)
Female (1–0)		1.26 (0.22)		0.07 (0.09)	−0.09 (0.09)
Bio/Adopted (1–0)		6.63*** (2.23)		0.44* (0.20)	0.45* (0.20)
Relationship close (1–0)		2.70*** (0.72)		−0.05 (0.15)	−0.05 (0.15)
Days of contact per year		1.00*** (0.00)		0.00*** (0.00)	0.00*** (0.00)
Grandparent variables					
Female (1–0)	0.88 (0.43)	0.74 (0.41)	0.40* (0.20)	0.35 (0.19)	0.37* (0.19)
Age	0.99 (0.02)	1.00 (0.02)	−0.01 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)	−0.01 (0.01)
NH Black (1–0)[d]	0.81 (0.22)	0.45** (0.15)	0.09 (0.19)	−0.09 (0.19)	−0.08 (0.19)
Hispanic (1–0)[d]	0.34*** (0.11)	0.17*** (0.06)	0.09 (0.16)	−0.09 (0.16)	−0.08 (0.16)
Other race/ethnicity[d]	2.02 (1.24)	1.36 (0.94)	0.11 (0.28)	0.04 (0.32)	0.02 (0.33)
Lives with a partner (1–0)	0.78 (0.16)	0.97 (0.22)	−0.02 (0.11)	0.00 (0.11)	0.02 (0.11)
Health	1.28** (0.12)	1.24* (0.13)	−0.09 (0.05)	−0.09 (0.05)	−0.08 (0.05)
Education	1.08 (0.05)	1.13* (0.07)	0.04 (0.03)	0.06** (0.02)	0.06** (0.02)
Net worth ($10,000s)	1.02*** (0.00)	1.02*** (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00* (0.00)	0.00* (0.00)
Income ($1000s)	1.01 (0.00)	1.01 (0.00)	−0.00 (0.00)	−0.00 (0.00)	−0.00 (0.00)
Hours worked last year	1.00 (0.00)	1.00 (0.00)	−0.00 (0.00)	−0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)
Grandchild sets	0.67*** (0.06)	0.76** (0.08)	−0.20*** (0.05)	−0.17*** (0.05)	−0.17*** (0.05)
Cohab × Female[e]					0.64** (0.23)
Single × Female[e]					0.38 (0.25)
Constant (*SE*)	3.09 (4.49)	0.13 (0.24)	5.60*** (0.80)	4.59*** (0.83)	4.64*** (0.82)
N cases (*N* families)	2,875 (1,610)	2,875 (1,610)	1,983 (1,281)	1,983 (1,281)	1,983 (1,281)

[a]OR = odds ratios from logistic regression models. *SE* = standard errors. [b]Coeff. = coefficients from ordinary least square regressions predicting hours (logged) of support received. [c]Compared to married children. [d]Compared to non-Hispanic White grandparents. [e]Compared to married females.

∗∗∗$p \leq .001$. ∗∗$p \leq .01$. ∗$p \leq .05$.

families of married adults had more education and net worth, were in better health, and more likely to live with a partner than grandparents to families of cohabitors and single adults. They also had fewer sets of grandchildren to whom to offer support. Finally, married children were more likely to have non-Hispanic White parents, a group that generally favors support to married children over cohabiting or single children.

There is mixed evidence of union-status differences in grandparental support in Table 1. There were no marked differences in the likelihood of instrumental or financial help based on children's union status; about 75% of each group received instrumental help and approximately half received financial support in the last year.

Yet, of those receiving instrumental support, married parents received only about 60% as many hours of help from grandparents as single and cohabiting parents. Levels of financial support revealed no significant group differences.

Multivariate Analyses

The left side of Table 2 presents the multivariate models predicting the odds of parents receiving any instrumental support from grandparents. Model I revealed that when only controls for grandparent characteristics were included, cohabiting parents had 54% higher odds and single parents had 80% higher odds of receiving instrumental support than married parents. Once

Table 3. *Mixed Effects Regressions Predicting Financial Support from Grandparents*

	Any support received[a]		Amount of support received[b]	
	Model I OR (*SE*)	Model II OR (*SE*)	Model I Coeff. (*SE*)	Model II Coeff. (*SE*)
Adult child variables				
Cohabiting (1–0)[c]	3.82*** (1.16)	4.04*** (1.31)	0.20* (0.10)	0.21* (0.10)
Single (1–0)[c]	2.56*** (0.71)	2.86*** (0.85)	0.43*** (0.08)	0.45*** (0.09)
Age		0.90*** (0.03)		−0.02** (0.01)
Number of children		1.24* (0.12)		0.07** (0.02)
Education (years)		0.91 (0.06)		−0.00 (0.02)
Female (1–0)		1.21 (0.25)		−0.09 (0.07)
Bio/Adopted (1–0)		3.23** (1.38)		0.18 (0.18)
Relationship close (1–0)		2.76** (0.96)		0.03 (0.12)
Days of contact/year		1.00*** (0.00)		0.00*** (0.00)
Grandparent variables				
Female (1–0)	1.29 (1.04)	1.43 (1.18)	0.11 (0.24)	0.14 (0.25)
Age	1.04 (0.03)	1.07* (0.03)	−0.00 (0.01)	0.00 (0.00)
NH Black (1–0)[d]	0.86 (0.32)	0.56 (0.22)	−0.33* (0.15)	−0.39** (0.15)
Hispanic (1–0)[d]	0.13*** (0.06)	0.09*** (0.04)	−0.53*** (0.17)	−0.58*** (0.17)
Other race/ethnicity[d]	6.08 (5.72)	5.14 (4.88)	0.28 (0.19)	0.24 (0.19)
Lives with a partner (1–0)	1.86* (0.54)	2.31** (0.71)	0.02 (0.10)	0.02 (0.10)
Health	1.17 (0.16)	1.15 (0.16)	−0.01 (0.05)	−0.02 (0.05)
Education (years)	1.63*** (0.15)	1.80*** (0.18)	0.07** (0.02)	0.07** (0.02)
Net worth ($10,000s)	1.02*** (0.00)	1.02*** (0.01)	0.01*** (0.00)	0.01*** (0.00)
Income ($1000s)	1.01 (0.00)	1.01 (0.01)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00* (0.00)
Hours worked last year	1.00** (0.00)	1.00*** (0.00)	−0.00 (0.00)	−0.00 (0.00)
Grandchild sets	0.40*** (0.07)	0.40*** (0.07)	−0.09* (0.05)	−0.09* (0.05)
Constant	0.00*** (0.00)	0.00*** (0.00)	5.74*** (0.76)	5.52*** (0.81)
N cases (*N* families)	2,877 (1,611)	2,876 (1,611)	1,337 (887)	1,337 (881)

[a]OR = odds ratios from logistic regression models. *SE* = standard errors. [b]Coeff. = coefficients from ordinary least square regressions predicting dollars (logged) of support received. [c]Compared to married children. [d]Compared to non-Hispanic White grandparents.

*p ≤ .05. **p ≤ .01. ***p ≤ .001.

adult children's need, affinity and opportunity factors were included in Model II, the support advantage of cohabiting and single parents increased. The odds ratios in Model II revealed that need (young age and more children) was linked to higher odds of grandparents' instrumental support, although so too was higher education of the adult child. Affinity and opportunity matter as well, with biological/adopted children having a higher odds of receiving any help, as did those who have a close relationship and high contact with the grandparent. Interactions of union status and sex, and union status and race/ethnicity were tested next, but were not significant (see Table S1). In sum, these analyses showed that cohabiting and single parents were about twice as likely as

married parents to be recipients of grandparents' instrumental help.

Models presented in the right-hand columns of Table 2 estimated how much instrumental support (in logged hours) grandparents provided to adult children's families in the past 12 months (for those given any instrumental support). Results in Model I indicated no significant union-status differences in hours of help received from grandparents. Addition of need, affinity and opportunity factors in Model II revealed that younger parents and those with more children received significantly more hours of grandparental help, in accord with the need explanation. Affinity factors had a mixed influence, with biological/adopted children receiving more hours of help, although those adult children with whom the grandparent reported

greater closeness were not advantaged in hours of support received. Contact was significantly associated with more hours of support. Although union status revealed no significant main effects in Models I and II, the tested interaction between union status and sex was significant, as shown in Model III. Compared to married female children, cohabiting females received 89% more hours of support per year from grandparents (see Table S3). Union status × race/ethnicity interactions were not significant (see Table S1).

Table 3 presents the multivariate results for grandparents' provision of financial support. The logistic regressions results on the left side of Table 3 pertain to receipt of any financial help from grandparents. Model 1 shows that cohabiting parents had nearly four times the odds and single parents had about 2.5 times the odds of married parents of receiving financial help, controlling for grandparent characteristics. These union-status effects remain significant in Model II after adding predictors for the adult child's needs, and affinity and opportunity factors. Younger parents and those with more children had greater odds of receiving financial help from grandparents, as did those who were biological/adopted children, and those with greater closeness to and contact with the grandparents. Neither the interaction of sex and union status or race/ethnicity and union status were significant in predicting the receipt of any financial support from grandparents (see Table S2).

Models presented on the right side of Table 3 show coefficients for the mixed effects regressions that estimated the amount (in logged dollars) of financial support grandparents provided to those who received monetary help. Model I revealed that controlling for differences in grandparent characteristics, both cohabiting and single parents received significantly more financial support than married parents. The results in Model II showed that although need factors were associated with levels of monetary support given to adult children (both younger age and more children resulted in higher levels of support), affinity was not important. Moreover, both group of unmarried parents still received significantly more money from grandparents than married parents, with singles receiving 56% more money and cohabitors 24% more (see Table S3). Grandparents did not give more money to biological/adopted children, or to those with whom they reported greater closeness. Yet, there was

a positive connection between contact and levels of monetary support. Similar to the results for receipt of any financial support, no significant interactions were revealed between union status and adult child's sex or race/ethnicity in predicting levels of grandparents' financial help (see Table S2).

Discussion and Conclusions

This study fills a critical gap in our understanding of extended-family support to young families today by presenting updated evidence of grandparents' support to adult children in various union statuses. Compared to survey results from the 1980s and 1990s showing more favorable patterns of extended-family support to married than cohabiting children and their families, this study found both cohabiting and single parents were more often beneficiaries of instrumental and financial support from grandparents than married parents. Moreover, cohabiting females received significantly more hours of instrumental help from grandparents, and both cohabiting and single parents received greater amounts of financial support than married parents. Broadly speaking, extended-family support today appears to be targeted to young families with the greatest need.

These differences in support across union statuses were observed in analyses that included parent–child affinity, opportunity (contact), adult children's needs, and grandparent characteristics. Similar to Eggebeen's (2005) results with 1980s data, the AHPS grandparents did report more emotional closeness to married than cohabiting and single children. But, despite feeling less affinity to cohabiting and single children, grandparents were still more likely to give them financial and instrumental help than married children. Contemporary grandparents appear particularly sensitive to the pressing needs of their cohabiting and single children's families—needs that impact their grandchildren's lives. Hence, they may put aside any disapproval they have of nonmarital parenting (which other studies show) and disregard their emotional distance with the adult child to support their grandchildren's well-being. Indeed, others speculate that personal attitudes and norms may be more predictive of hypothetical behavior than real-life actions (Mollborn, 2009), a point eloquently made by a participant in Mollborn's vignette study on

unmarried pregnancy who said, "Actually being in that situation [having an unmarried, pregnant family member] is much different than being on the sidelines" (p. 132).

Just as inclusion of affinity indicators did not account for the union-status differences revealed in the multivariate models, neither did the child need indicators available in these data. The results consistently revealed that younger adult children and those with more children of their own had higher odds or receiving grandparental help, and more of it, than others, which is consistent with the literature (Fingerman et al., 2009; Suitor et al., 2006) and contingency theory (Eggebeen & Davey, 1998). Yet, even with these variables included in the models, cohabitors and single children benefitted more from grandparental support than married children. Perhaps the need indicators available in the AHPS data did not fully capture variation in adult children's needs. For example, the AHPS did not collect data on adult children's employment or income, which differ for married, cohabiting, and single adults (Kalil & Ryan, 2010). As a result, it is likely that the variables indexing cohabiting and single statuses absorbed some of this variation. Grandparents' reports of how many children each adult child had may also have failed to accurately tap family need, as grandparents' counts may have varied in whether they omitted or included children of their adult child's partner (married or unmarried), or children of the adult child who did not reside with them. Future work on extended-family support to young families would benefit by improving on these data limitations.

Although the need variables in this study did not account for union-status differences in received support, that grandparents were more supportive of the families of unmarried than married children is consistent with contingency theory, given documented differences in resources across union status (Kalil & Ryan, 2010). To illustrate, the one in four chance of poverty for single parents is particularly striking (Pew Research Center, 2018) and warrants the significantly higher level of grandparent financial support for single parents (approximately 50% more than married parents) found in this study. Yet, beyond helping unmarried children meet their immediate living expenses, grandparents may have other motives for providing financial support—especially to cohabiting children. For example, because perceived financial barriers is

the most common reason cohabiting parents give for postponing marriage (Smock et al., 2005), grandparents may view their financial help as a way to both enhance the economic status of their cohabiting children and possibly promote their marriage. If such efforts on the part of grandparents were successful, they would also gain greater assurance of remaining engaged with their grandchildren over the long-term because of the greater stability of married than cohabiting families.

This same thinking about long-term outcomes and sustained relationships with grandchildren may explain grandparents' greater odds of instrumental assistance to unmarried than married children—and their substantial practical help to cohabiting daughters. This latter finding is somewhat consistent with Marks and McLanahan's (1993) NSFH1 results that showed that females cohabiting with their children's father were much more likely to receive help from their parents than were men cohabiting with the mother of their children. (Unfortunately, AHPS data do not indicate if the adult child's partner is parent to any of the grandchildren.) Maternal grandparents may be willing to invest more time helping the families of cohabiting daughters than sons because there is greater guarantee of future involvement with grandchildren who are children of a daughter rather than a son. This difference is due to greater instability of cohabiting unions than marriages (Manning et al., 2014), and to the higher odds of reduced contact with grandchildren if a son's union dissolves and the grandchildren end up residing primarily with their mother (Sims & Rofail, 2013).

Cohabiting daughters may receive substantially more instrumental support from grandparents than cohabiting sons for other reasons too. This finding may reflect gate-keeping by these young mothers (Sims & Rofail, 2013) who may be more open to their own parents caring for their children and helping in their homes than their partners' parents—regardless of grandparents' willingness to help. Furthermore, from a socio-biological standpoint (Smith, 1988), the greater time investment of maternal grandparents may be in response to parental certainty. The paternity of grandchildren may be especially questionable when they live in cohabiting rather than married families because cohabitating unions are more unstable and have higher rates of multiple-partner fertility (Guzzo, 2014).

Finally, cohabiting men often live with children to whom they are not biologically related (Guzzo, 2017), even when they have biological children in the home. Grandparents tend to give less support to grandchildren who live in homes that include other unrelated children (Tanskanen et al., 2014).

The results of this study provide mixed support for reciprocity theory, which as noted, posits that support is given in response to support received in the past, or anticipated in the future. On the one hand, this study did not find a consistent association between adult children's education and grandparent support, though others (Fingerman et al., 2009) have argued that parents give greater support to more successful (e.g., more educated) children with future reciprocity in mind. On the other hand, that single and cohabiting children had higher odds of receiving grandparent support is consistent with reciprocity theory, in light of the "greediness of marriage" (Sarkisian & Gerstel, 2008). That is, because marriage pulls children away from engagement with their parents (married children herein had the lowest contact with grandparents of the three groups), grandparents may have given more help to unmarried adult children in anticipation of greater reciprocity (not necessarily in the form of financial support) in the future.

The potential for reciprocity from adult children may also partly explain why cohabiting daughters benefitted from significantly more hours of instrumental support from grandparents than married daughters (89% more), whereas single daughters did not. Even though both cohabiting and single parents received more financial support than married parents, which they likely needed, grandparents may have devoted more time to the families of cohabiting than single daughters because of greater on-going reciprocity with the former group. Indeed, because they have a partner with whom to share childcare and household tasks, cohabitors are more likely than single mothers to be able to occasionally assist their own parents, such as doing errands for them or helping out in times of illness. Cohabiting daughters may also have more opportunities for reciprocity with their parents than married daughters because they likely have weaker obligations to their partners' families than do their married counterparts, thus are less likely to be pulled in two directions when it comes to assisting extended family.

Socioeconomic differences between the natal families of married, cohabiting and single adults were not surprising given the intergenerational transmission of social class, but the fact that unmarried adult children still received more monetary support than married children despite these differences is noteworthy. The commitment of these less-advantaged grandparents to help their children's families, despite the hardship it may have presented, is evident. Grandparents' willingness to make sacrifices, such as withdrawing from their retirement savings or reducing their spending, in order to assist their children and grandchildren has been confirmed in other studies (TD Ameritrade, 2016). Yet, these practices may not be financially sustainable over the long-term. Furthermore, given the significantly lower health ratings of grandparents to single and cohabiting children in this sample, they can also expect to experience earlier morbidity than grandparents to married families, which may further hurt their financial well-being (Margolis & Wright, 2017). Although the AHPS sample is limited to primarily young-old grandparents (under age 75), over time, drains on their finances and physical functioning may jeopardize the support they can provide to their children's families, regardless of how needy their children are or their own desire to help.

The extension of significant grandparental support that was documented to the families of cohabiting and single parents—groups that likely included both never-married and divorced parents—highlights the solidarity and adaptation of multigenerational families in the United States today. Despite warnings that practices like cohabitation and nonmarital childbearing undermine family functioning and weaken family ties (Popenoe, 1993), and evidence that many older adults still possess fairly traditional views about appropriate family forms, this study's results underscore how receptive contemporary grandparents are—at least those in early old age—to meeting the needs of their families, even when their own resources are limited. These findings therefore offer some up-to-date evidence in support of the claim that multigenerational family bonds are extremely salient and valuable (Bengtson, 2001), representing a meaningful source of assistance to young adults faced with economic and labor market challenges that threaten their well-being and that of their children. Of course, these findings do not reveal the extent

to which grandparents' support actually reduces the material deficits faced by young children living with cohabiting and single parents. But, at the least they confirm that these children are not further disadvantaged by grandparents' withholding of support due to their parents' lifestyle choices, which appeared to be the case just a few decades ago (Eggebeen, 2005; Hao, 1996; Marks & McLanahan, 1993).

Supporting Information

Additional supporting information may be found online in the Supporting Information section at the end of the article.

Table S1. Mixed Effects Regressions Predicting Instrumental Support from Grandparents

Table S2. Mixed Effects Regressions Predicting Financial Support from Grandparents

Table S3. Percent Change[+] in Amount of Support Received[1] Associated with Independent Variables in Table 2 (Models II, III) and Table 3 (Model II)

References

Albertini, M., & Radl, J. (2012). Intergenerational transfers and social class: Inter-vivos transfers as a means of status reproduction? *Acta Sociologica*, *55*, 107–123. https://doi.org/10.1177/0001699311431596.

Bengtson, V. L. (2001). Beyond the nuclear family: The increasing importance of multigenerational bonds. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *63*, 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2001.00001.x.

Berry, B. (2008). Financial transfers from living parents to adult children: Who is helped and why? *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, *67*, 207–240. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1536-7150.2008.00568.x.

Brown, S. L., & Wright, M. R. (2016). Older adults' attitudes toward cohabitation: Two decades of change. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B*, *71*, 755–764. https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbv053.

Cooney, T. M., & Uhlenberg, P. (1990). Support from parents over the life course: The adult child's perspective. *Social Forces*, *71*, 63–84. https://doi.org/10.2307/2579966.

Dunifon, R. E., Near, C. E., & Ziol-Guest, K. M. (2018). Backup parents, playmates, friends: Grandparents' time with grandchildren. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *80*, 752–767. https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12472.

Eggebeen, D. (2005). Cohabitation and exchanges of support. *Social Forces*, *83*, 1097–1110. https://doi.org/10.1353/sof.2005.0027.

Eggebeen, D. J., & Davey, A. (1998). Do safety nets work? The role of anticipated help in times of need. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *60*, 939–950. https://doi.org/10.2307/353636.

Eischen, F. F., Monath, A., Hotz, V. J., & Harris, K. M. (2018). *Parents phase 2 (2015–2017) data documentation*. Carolina Population Center.

Fingerman, K., Miller, L., Birditt, K., & Zarit, S. (2009). Giving to the good and the needy: Parental support of grown children. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *71*, 1220–1233. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2009.00665.x.

Geurts, T., Poortman, A. R., & van Tilburg, T. G. (2012). Older parents providing child care for adult children: Does it pay off? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *74*, 239–250. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2011.00952.x.

Guzzo, K. B. (2014). New partners, more kids: Multiple-partner fertility in the United States. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *654*, 66–86. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716214525571.

Guzzo, K. B. (2017). Shifts in higher-order unions and stepfamilies among currently cohabiting and married women of childbearing age. *Journal of Family Issues*, *38*, 1775–1799. https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X16664180.

Hao, L. (1996). Family structure, private transfers, and the economic well-being of families with children. *Social Forces*, *75*, 269–292. https://doi.org/10.2307/2580765.

Harknett, K. S. (2006). The relationship between private safety nets and economic outcomes among single mothers. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *68*, 172–191. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2006.00250.x.

Hogerbrugge, M. J. A., & Dykstra, P. A. (2009). The family ties of unmarried cohabiting and married persons in the Netherlands. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *71*, 135–145. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2008.00585.x.

Kalil, A., & Ryan, R. M. (2010). Mothers' economic conditions and sources of support in fragile families. *Future of Children*, *20*(2), 39–61. https://doi.org/10.1353/foc.2010.0009.

Laughlin, L. (2013). Who's minding the kids? Child care arrangements: Spring 2011. In *Current*

population reports (pp. P70–P135). U.S. Census Bureau. Retrieved from https://www.census.gov/prod/2013pubs/p70-135.pdf.

Luo, Y., LaPierre, T. A., Hughes, M. E., & Waite, L. J. (2013). Grandparents providing care to grandchildren: A population-based study of continuity and change. *Journal of Family Issues*, *33*, 1143–1167. https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X12438685.

Manning, W. D., & Brown, S. L. (2006). Children's economic well-being in married and cohabiting parent families. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *68*, 345–362. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2006.00257.x.

Manning, W. D., Brown, S. L., & Stykes, J. B. (2014). *Same-sex and different-sex cohabiting couple relationship stability*. Working paper series. Bowling Green State University, The Center for Family and Demographic Research. Retrieved from https://www.bgsu.edu/content/dam/BGSU/college-of-arts-and-sciences/center-for-family-and-demographic-research/documents/working-papers/2014/WP-2014-17-Manning-v2-Same-Sex-Different-Sex-Cohabiting.pdf.

Margolis, R., & Wright, L. (2017). Healthy grandparenthood: How long is it, and how has it changed? *Demography*, *54*, 2073–2099. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-017-0620-0.

Marks, N. F., & McLanahan, S. S. (1993). Gender, family structure, and social support among parents. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *55*, 481–493. https://doi.org/10.2307/352817.

Martin, J. A., Hamilton, B. E., Osterman, M., Driscoll, A. K., & Drake, P. (2018). Births: Final data for 2016. *National Vital Statistics Report*, *67*(1), 1–55.

McGarry, K. (2016). Dynamic aspects of family transfers. *Journal of Public Economics*, *137*, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2016.03.008.

McLanahan, S. (2004). Diverging destinies: How children are faring under the second demographic transition. *Demography*, *41*, 607–627. https://doi.org/10.1353/dem.2004.0033.

Meggiolaro, S. (2018). Child care by grandparents in married and cohabiting couples: Evidence from Italy. *The British Journal of Sociology*, *69*, 580–600. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12292.

MetLife. (2011). *The Metlife Report on American grandparents: New insights for a new generation of grandparents*. Retrieved from https://www.aarp.org/content/dam/aarp/livable-communities/old-learn/research/metlife-report-on-american-grandparents-2011-aarp.pdf

Mollborn, S. (2009). Norms about nonmarital pregnancy and willingness to provide resources to unwed parents. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *71*, 122–134. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2008.00584.x.

Musick, K., & Michelmore, K. (2018). Cross-national comparisons of union stability in cohabiting and married families with children. *Demography*, *55*, 1389–1421. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-018-0683-6.

Pew Research Center. (2018). *The changing profile of unmarried parents*. Retrieved from https://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2018/04/25/the-changing-profile-of-unmarried-parents/

Pilkauska, N. V., & Alvarado Urbina, A. (2014). *The value of support: Private safety nets among families with young children*. Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the Population Association of America, Boston.

Popenoe, D. (1993). American family decline, 1960–1990: A review and appraisal. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *55*, 527–555. https://doi.org/10.2307/353333.

Sarkisian, N., & Gerstel, N. (2008). Till marriage do us part: Adult children's relationships with their parents. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *70*, 360–376. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2008.00487.x.

Seltzer, J. A., Lau, C. Q., & Bianchi, S. M. (2012). Doubling up when times are tough: A study of obligations to share a home in response to economic hardship. *Social Science Research*, *41*, 1307–1319. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2012.05.008.

Silverstein, M., & Bengtson, V. L. (1997). Intergenerational solidarity and the structure of adult child-parent relationships in American families. *American Journal of Sociology*, *103*, 429–460. https://doi.org/10.1086/231213.

Silverstein, M., Conroy, S. J., Wang, H., Giarrusso, R., & Bengtson, V. L. (2002). Reciprocity in parent-child relations over the adult life course. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B*, *57*, S3–S13. https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/57.1.S3.

Silverstein, M., & Giarrusso, R. (2010). Aging and family life: A decade review. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *72*, 1039–1077. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00749.x.

Sims, M., & Rofail, M. (2013). The experiences of grandparents who have limited or no contact with their grandchildren. *Journal of Aging Studies*, *27*, 377–386. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaging.2013.09.002.

Smith, M. S. (1988). Research in developmental sociobiology: Parenting and family behavior. In K. B. MacDonald (Ed.), *Sociobiological perspectives on human development* (pp. 271–292). Springer.

Smock, P. J., & Manning, W. (2010). New couples, new families: The cohabitation revolution in The United States. In B. J. Risman (Ed.), *Families as they really are* (pp. 131–139). W. W. Norton.

Smock, P. J., Manning, W. D., & Porter, M. (2005). "Everything's there except money": How money shapes decisions to marry among cohabitors. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *67*, 680–696. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2005.00162.x.

Suitor, J. J., Pillemer, K., & Sechrist, J. (2006). Within family differences in mothers' support to adult children. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B*, *61*, S10–S11. https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/61.1.S10.

Swartz, T. T., Kim, M., Uno, M., Mortimer, J., & O'Brien, K. B. (2011). Safety nets and scaffolds: Parental support in the transition to adulthood. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *73*, 414–429. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00815.x.

Tanskanen, A. O., Danielsbacka, M., & Rotkirch, A. (2014). Multi-partner fertility is associated with lower grandparental investment from in-laws in Finland. *Advances in Life Course Research*, *22*, 41–48. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.alcr.2014.04.003.

Taylor, P., Funk, C., & Clark, A. (2007). *Generation gap in values, behaviors: As marriage and parenthood drift apart, public is concerned about social impact*. Pew Research Center. Retrieved from https://www.pewresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2010/10/Marriage.pdf.

TD Ameritrade. (2016). *Millennial parents research and the support received from their parents*. Retrieved from https://s1.q4cdn.com/959385532/files/doc_downloads/research/2017/Millennial-Parents-Survey-Key-Findings.pdf

Uhlenberg, P., & Hammill, B. G. (1998). Frequency of grandparent contact with grandchild sets: Six factors that make a difference. *The Gerontologist*, *38*, 276–285. https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/38.3.276.

United States Census Bureau. (2020). *U.S. marriage and divorce rates by state*. Retrieved from https://www.census.gov/library/visualizations/interactive/marriage-divorce-rates-by-state.html

Yahirun, J. J., & Hamplova, D. (2014). Children's union status and contact with mothers: A cross-national study. *Demographic Research*, *30*, 1413–1444. https://doi.org/10.4054/DemRes.2014.30.51.

Zarit, S. H., & Eggebeen, D. J. (2002). Parent-child relationships in adulthood and later years. In M. H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting: Children and parenting* (2nd ed., pp. 135–161). Erlbaum.