LIVING CONDITIONS AND NEEDS OF RURAL ARAB ELDERLY IN ISRAEL

Principal Investigator:
Hanna Weihl, M.A.
Senior Researcher, Brookdale Institute of Gerontology and Adult Human Development, Jerusalem
Senior Lecturer, Paul Baerwald School of Social Work, Hebrew University, Jerusalem

Research Assistants:
Faizal Azaiza, M.A.
Yaron King, M.A.
Ester Goldsher, B.A.

Project supported by a grant from the Ford Foundation, received through the Trustees of the Israel Foundation
Grant 12/2-13

February, 1986

LIVING CONDITIONS AND NEEDS OF RURAL ARAB ELDERLY IN ISRAEL

Principal Investigator:
Hanna Weihl, M.A.
Senior Researcher, Brookdale Institute of Gerontology and Adult Human Development, Jerusalem
Senior Lecturer, Paul Baerwald School of Social Work, Hebrew University, Jerusalem

Research Assistants:
Faizal Azaiza, M.A.
Yaron King, M.A.
Ester Goldsher, B.A.

Project supported by a grant from the Ford Foundation, received through the Trustees of the Israel Foundation
Grant 12/2-13

February, 1986

Table of Contents

Table of Contents, continued

List of Tables

List of Tables, continued

List of Tables, continued

List of Tables, continued

List of Tables, continued

Chapter 1: RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY

Research Objectives

The objectives of this project were threefold:

1. to obtain knowledge of the modes of intergenerational interaction and support in the rural Arab population of Israel in order to better understand the directions of change in family relations resulting from the process of modernization;
2. to obtain knowledge and insight into the living conditions and needs of the rural Arab aged population of Israel in order to gather basic data for service planning;
3. to obtain knowledge about the relationship between existing services and prevailing basic needs.

The scientific background of the study drew on elements of three areas of sociology - social change, the family, and aging - and on their interrelationships. The major emphasis was on family and household structure and development, as well as on the intergenerational relationships of elderly persons who are part of a social group undergoing rapid economic and political change.

Methodology

Sampling

Rather than use a randomly selected sample of the entire population of rural Arab elderly, it was decided to interview all aged in the sampled villages, i.e., to base the study on a cluster sample. A number of reasons underly this decision: the religious as well as economic heterogeneity of villages, the possibility that smaller

villages would be underrepresented if the entire population were sampled, and the considerably higher cost of a randomly selected sample.

Villages were sampled by size and by religion of inhabitants. In order to preserve the rural aspect of the project, communities of more than 10,000 inhabitants were not included.

Most sampled villages with fewer than 10,000 inhabitants are religiously homogeneous - Moslem, Christian, or Druze. Eighteen villages have a mixed population, usually Moslem and Christian only; only one or two very small villages are all-Christian. This heterogeneity of the population and of the universe of villages, in addition to budgetary constraints, prevented representation in this study of all three types of religiously homogeneous villages. Thus, the sampling universe (Table 1) includes 76 villages, 76% of which are all-Moslem.

The villages to be included in the study were sampled randomly from each of the cells in Table 1, using an appropriate sampling portion for each cell. Three villages of the group of 47 and one village from each of the other cells were sampled. The final study sample thus included six villages with a total population of 17,200 (end of 1982), which should include about 520 persons ages 65 and older.[1] This number of prospective interviewees nearly matched the number estimated in the planning stages of the study (600).

---

[1] The proportion of persons ages 65+ in the non-Jewish population is 3%. (Statistical Yearbook, 1983).

Table 1: The Sampling Universe

Religious Affiliation of Village Population	Size of Village	
	Less than 5,000 inhabitants	5,000 - 10,000 inhabitants
All Moslem	47	11
Mixed	9	9

Data collection

The list of persons to be interviewed was supplied by the National Insurance Institute. This list combined all persons ages 65 and older (according to the Population Registry) with the list of persons receiving old age insurance payments. As expected, the file included names of persons not known in the villages, persons who had moved to other communities, and persons who had not yet reached the age of 65. On the other hand, a few aged persons whose names did not appear on the list were found by the interviewers in the villages they visited, although no concentrated effort was made to find such persons. Therefore, although not all persons ages 65+ were contacted, it is likely that the interviewers were able to reach at least 95% of all persons over age 65 in the sampled villages.

The final list of potential interviewees numbered 552. Among these, 11 (2%) refused to be interviewed, 19 (3.4%) could not be located at the time of the interview, and 3 were hospitalized at that time. Of the 552, therefore, 519 (94%) were interviewed. Thirty-seven (17%) of these could not answer the questions themselves, half

because of deafness.[2] The others were either too ill or confused to respond. Basic information on these elderly was obtained from their caretakers. Another 10 persons began but could not complete the interview. As a result, 472 interviews were completed and 47 were partially completed.

Composing the questionnaire

Since one of the study's goals was to compare the results with pre-existing data on the Jewish elderly population of Israel, the questionnaire of a study of the Jewish aged by Weihl, Nathan, and Avner (1970) was adapted for use in the Arab villages. This study and its two follow-up studies (Weihl, 1980) was chosen as a base line because it is thus far the only one to be based on a representative sample of an entire population and because it encompasses many aspects of living conditions of the aged. A pretest helped to solve some of the problems of adapting the questions to a different culture; other problems were not solved, as some of the results show.

The first draft of the questionnaire was tested in 60 interviews. Some questions were subsequently discarded; others were rephrased. The questionnaire was translated into Arabic for use by the interviewers, who spoke to the elderly subjects in Arabic and noted their responses in Hebrew. This arrangement facilitated the work of the coders, and enabled the principal investigator, who does not speak Arabic, to analyze the data of the study.

---

[2] 3.5% of the total sample.

In the course of the study, two additional subjects were included in the questionnaire: perceptions of old age and the structure of the households in which the interviewees had lived since childhood.

Chapter 2: DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Basic Demographic Data

Age

The population of this study is an old one, older than that of the total non-Jewish population of Israel, and considerably older than the total Jewish population. Twenty-eight percent are over 80 years old (including 13% over age 85), compared with 22% of the non-Jewish and 15% of the Jewish populations (CBS, 1984, Table II/16). In one of the bigger villages (100 people ages 65+) the "old-old" comprise 38% of all persons over age 65.

Sex

Fifty-one percent of the study population are male, compared with 46% of the total non-Jewish population of Israel ages 65+ (CBS, 1984, Table II/16). The percentage in the Christian sector is even less than 46%, as is that in the Jewish population. Thus, women may be under-represented in this study. This was suspected when some interviewers accidentally "found" persons over age 65 whose names were not included in the Population Registry. All of these persons were women, and all of them had identity cards and were officially residents of their respective villages. Although these accidental encounters indicated the need for a door-to-door census, budgetary and time limitations prevented its implementation.

Marital Status

Sixty-one percent of the respondents are married, 35% are widowed, and 2.7% are divorced; 1.3% have never married, which is a small proportion compared with 5% of those ages 65+ in the total non-

Jewish population and 2% in the total Jewish population (CBS, 1985a, Table II/19).

Fifteen percent of the study population have been married more than once, and 15 men (5.6%) have had polygamous marriages.

Married persons are considerably younger than widowed ones: 21% of the married, compared with 41% of the widowed, are age 80 or older. This finding is strongly related to sex: most men, including those over 80 years old, are married, while most women, even those ages 65-69, are widowed (Table 2). In this respect, the study population resembles that of previous studies of the Jewish population.

Table 2: Distribution by Sex, Age, and Marital Status (percentages)

	Men				Women			
Age	Married	Not married	Total	N	Married	Not married	Total	N
65-69	90	10	100	52	49	51	100	55
70-74	95	5	100	73	41	59	100	83
75-79	64	36	100	69	29	71	100	42
80+	68	32	100	72	21	79	100	72
Total	86	14	100	266	35	65	100	252

Children

As expected, the number of children is high: 46 ~~62~~% of all respondents have six or more living children, 13% have one or two only, and 3% are without offspring. There are no up-to-date comparative data on this subject, except for persons with no

offspring: 12% of all Jewish persons ages 65+ have no living children, compared with 1% of all non-Jews of the same age group (CBS, 1985b, Table 13).

Ninety-four percent of the respondents have grandchildren, 44% have great-grandchildren, and 9% have great-great-grandchildren. Thus, the four generation family is well established. Great-grand parenthood is more common among women: 55% of all women have great-grandchildren, compared with 34% of all men; and women reach this status earlier than men: 46% of women under age 75 and 31% of men in this age group are great-grandparents. These differences between the sexes are probably caused by age differences of married couples: 35% of all married men are more than 10 years older than their wives and another 29% are 6-10 years older.

Level of Formal Education

When the study population was young, there were few schools in the rural Arab sector of Palestine. It is therefore not surprising that nearly two-thirds of the study population is illiterate. As Table 3 shows, significantly more women than men are illiterate. In fact, very few women were sent to school, and the few who were are Christians.

Table 4 shows the differences in level of formal education by religion. The Moslem aged, as a group, include the highest number of illiterates, while nearly half of the Christian aged had five or more years of schooling.

Table 3: Level of Formal Education, by Sex (percentages)

Sex	Years of Schooling: No schooling	1-4	5 or more	Total	Number
Male	43	30	27	100	265
Female	82	8	10	100	252
Total	62	20	18	100	517

Table 4: Level of Formal Education, by Religious Affiliation (percentages)

Religious Affiliation	Years of Schooling: No schooling	1-4	5 or more	Total	Number
Moslem	83	13	4	100	304
Christian	26	30	44	100	162
Druze	53	27	20	100	51
Total	62	20	18	100	517

Income

Respondents were asked to rate themselves according to given monthly income brackets. They were also asked to state their sources of income. Eighty-five percent of all respondents claim to live on old age insurance payments only. Many of the men who responded were probably entitled to pensions (as former teachers or policemen), yet they did not mention this source of income; 88% of this group was categorized as receiving an income supplement. Responses to the first question are more reliable since they reflect proportional differences

in level of income; they do not, however, provide a picture of the actual income distribution in the investigated population.

As with education, the three religious groups differ with respect to income: the income of Moslem aged is relatively low compared with that of Christians and Druze ($p < 0.001$). The relationships between income and religion and between income and education are important in the context of this project because most villages are mono-religious and thus distinctly differ from one another with regard to income and education.

Household Types

The population of this study lives in 439 households, 38% of which are mono-generational, i.e., inhabited by persons over age 65 only. The multi-generational households consist mainly of two generations: 44% are two-generational and 18% include three generations. Only one four-generation household was found. This distribution differs considerably from that of the Jewish population, as shown in Table 5.

The CBS survey also reveals that 40% of the households of Jews of non-European origin are multi-generational, as opposed to 12% of the households of Jews of European origin.

Sixty-five percent of all Arab men surveyed, compared with 53% of all women, live in multigenerational households. Thus, comparatively more women live apart from children.

Table 5: Distribution of Household Types in the Study Population and in the Jewish Population Aged 65+ (percentages)

	Study Population	Jewish Population[a]
Monogenerational households		
Couples	18	55
One person	20	26
Multigenerational Households	62	19
Total	100	100

[a] Source: Central Bureau of Statistics, 1982. Survey of Elderly Persons in Households. Special Series 754, Table B, p. 15.

Monogenerational households

Table 5 shows that the structure of this type of household differs very much from its counterpart in the Jewish population: two-thirds of the latter consist of couples, while in the study population there are slightly less couples than single person households. Looking at these data from another perspective, more than half of all couples (58%) live in multigenerational households, many of which include still unmarried young children. Therefore, monogenerational households tend to be occupied by older persons (Table 6).

The age distribution corroborates the previous finding regarding marital status: monogenerational households consisting of widowed persons are the final stage of household development over time. Multigenerational households become monogenerational after all children have left. With the passage of time, the occupants of these households change from couples to elderly widows.

Table 6: Types of Household, by Age of Head of Household (percentages)

Age	Monogenerational Households	Multigenerational Households	Total
65-69	14	22	19
70-74	26	29	28
75-79	24	22	23
80+	36	25	15
Total	100	100	100
Number	168	271	439

Multigenerational households

Multigenerational households differ structurally in many respects - by the number of generations, size of household, age, and marital status of occupants. The following section of this report will examine these aspects as they affect the aged members of multigenerational households.

Most multigenerational households are two-generational, i.e., they include one or two aged parents living with one or more children (but no grandchildren). Table 7 shows the various types of such households, only 30% of which include a third generation.

Nearly 20% of all multigenerational households (which constitute 12% of all households) include young children who are still the legal responsibility of their parents. Many more, over age 18, are unmarried and live with their parents who feel responsible for them,

especially if they are female.[3] Since many of these children are not gainfully employed, they constitute a double liability for their parents.

Probably the most important finding presented in Table 7 is the fact that many households include single children, especially daughters, who are well beyond the average age of marriage and whose likelihood of marrying is slim.[4] Thirty-four percent of all multigenerational households (21% of all households) include at least one such daughter, and some include more than one. The corresponding proportions for men (over age 28 and unmarried) are 14% and 9%, but many of these men may still marry. Table 6 shows that 60% of households with single daughters over age 28 are small - up to four persons; thus, the modal type of this household consists of either an aged couple with at least one unmarried daughter and sometimes a younger child, or a widowed parent with an unmarried daughter and up to three other children. The probability that one of the other children is an unmarried son over age 28 is quite high: 24% of all households which contain at least one single daughter over 28 also include one single son of that age (Table 8).

---

[3] In fact, all single children in the study population who live in Israel, regardless of age, live with their parents.

[4] Age 28 was arbitrarily chosen as a rather high one for marriage in this still rather rural society. Verbal communications with various sources revealed that women over age 25 are unlikely to marry.

Table 7: Types of Multigenerational Households[a], by Number of Persons in Household (percentages)

Number of Persons in Household	All Multi-Generational Households	Including Children Under 18	Including Unmarried Son aged 18-27	Including Unmarried Son Aged 28+	Including Unmarried Daughter Aged 18-27	Including Unmarried Daughter Aged 28+	Including Married Child[b]
2	8	-	1	2	3	17	-
3-4	33	15	24	39	29	43	8
5-6	23	26	39	26	32	18	21
7+	36	59	36	33	36	22	71
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number	271	53	85	39	77	93	82

[a] Since each type may include other categories of children, the total number exceeds 271.

[b] 78 include a married son, 4 a married daughter.

Table 8: Detailed Structure of Two Types of Multigenerational Households (percentages)

a) Aged living with at least one single daughter over age 28.		b) Aged living with married child and family.	
Household includes		Household includes:	
At least one single daughter over age 28.	46	A married child and family.	75
At least one single daughter over age 28 and at least one single son of the same age.	24	At least one single daughter over age 28, and a married child and family.	12
At least one single daughter over age 28 and a married child.	11	At least one child under age 18, and a married child and family.	3
At least one single daughter over age 28 and other children.	18	A married child and family and other children.	7
Total	100	Total	100
Number	93	Number	82

Although there are no up-to-date comparable figures for the Jewish population, the proportion of unmarried adult daughters seems very high. Since most of them have no income, they constitute a financial, normative, and psychological burden on their families. Their main task and sole occupation is the care of their parent(s), on whose income (mostly old age allowance only) they live. It is difficult to envisage their lives once their parents have passed away. This comparative abundance of single women may be a new demographic development: the proportion of older single women in this study population is rather small - 1.4% never-married persons, male and

female.

The size of well over 50% of all multigenerational households exceeds five persons, including children of various ages, most of them well over 20 and many unemployed. Some reports of employment status of sons, especially in one of the villages, are subject to doubt. Reports on the employment status of daughters are more credible, if only because most were at home at the time of the interview. In spite of these doubts, data on the number of breadwinners was computed for each household. Generally, the number rises with the size of the household. On the other hand, in a certain percentage of multigenerational households the sole source of income is an old age allowance for one or two persons (depending on the marital status of the aged residents). Thus the sole income of 38% of the households containing an unmarried daughter over age 28 is the old age allowance of the parent. The corresponding figure for households with children under age 18 is 15% and for households with daughters ages 18-28, 26%.

Further remarks on household types

This research project accepted the definition of household used by the Central Bureau of Statistics, namely, a group of people living permanently in the same house or apartment who cook at least one meal together. This definition has recently been changed to: a group of people who permanently live together in the same apartment and share a common budget. These were the bases used for categorizing type of household; but it became apparent that these definitions do not always fit, since people may live in separate apartments or houses but still cook together on a permanent basis, or use other amenities or services existing in one location only.

There are parents in monogenerational households who never cook (some do not have cooking facilities) and are served by a child's kitchen, usually in close proximity. There are also parents who live in separate houses or apartments, cook their own meals, but never do their own laundry and/or never clean their own floors, not because of incapacity, but because their children help. There are quite a few parents who use the toilet and washing facilities at the homes of nearby children. There are even a few elderly who live close to their children (maintaining separate households in accordance with the definition used) but use electricity (and sometimes water) via the meters of the homes of their children.

These examples demonstrate that it is sometimes impossible to delineate the boundary between mono- or multigenerational households. They suggest that there may be an in-between variant characterized by separate houses but shared budgets and sometimes massive one-way flows of service from one location to the other. Many household functions, on the other hand, are maintained separately, and the most important part of the definition - separate living arrangements - remains valid for the households sampled in this study.

Variation by religion

The three religious groups do not differ in household structure: 34% of Christian households, 40% of the Moslem, and 42% of the Druze households are mono-generational. There are small differences in types of multi-generational households: Moslems tend more to live with young children, and Christians have the highest proportion of unmarried daughters over age 28.

Variation by Income

No differences in income between mono- and multigenerational households were found.

Chapter 3: HOUSEHOLD HISTORY

One of the goals of this study was to historically trace the types of households in which the sampled population has lived. The objective was to note changes in household structure, specifically whether or not the traditional family living arrangement - the joint household - had been replaced by the so-called modern one, the nuclear or conjugal household. It was assumed that in the pre-modern or pre-industrial era, which prevailed when the study population was young, the joint household was the normatively expected as well as the numerically predominant mode. Although the scarcity of empirical evidence may shed some doubt on the validity on this assumption, there is no doubt that a general process of modernization has taken place in the rural Arab sector of Israel.

Fifty to seventy years ago, when elderly investigated were children, the villages sampled were as yet largely untouched by modern technology and new values. There was no electricity, and water had to be carried from a spring or well. There were no roads and no cars, and there was no salaried employment outside the village. Moreover, there were very few schools, no newspapers, and no means of mass communication. The only source of income was agriculture, and its methods were primitive and outdated.

The political organization of the village was based on kinship units only, with one person - the Muhktar - nominated by the government to function as the village's representative. Democratic norms and processes were unknown. The family was organized as a patrilocal and patriarchal unit in which all authority was vested in the father (or grandfather). This was the social environment in which

the study population was socialized and spent its early adulthood. Since then, great changes have occurred in all the areas mentioned. The village economy and political organization have become more "modern". The main source of income is salaried employment, mostly from outside the villages, thus freeing the younger generation from absolute dependence on the father. The following data should be analyzed with this background in mind.

The data on household history are based on three questions:

a. When you were young, less than 10 years old, who lived with you in the same house?

b. When you were 11-18 years old, or until your marriage, who lived with you in the same house?

(For these questions, the elderly were presented with eight categories of kin, beginning with siblings and ending with distant relatives).

c. After your marriage and until now, with whom did you live? Try to remember what happened since your marriage - did you live on your own?, with parents? Did some relatives join or leave the household in the course of these years? If there were changes in household structure, why did they occur?

The main findings, as derived from responses to these questions, are as follows:

a. The modal household in the childhood and youth of the study population was nuclear - it contained two generations only, children and parents (Table 9).

b. Only 15-17% mentioned living with non-nuclear kin, such as uncles and cousins, in childhood.

Table 9: Household Structure in Childhood,[a] by Religious Affiliation (percentages)

Religious Affiliation	Type of Household: Two-generational	Three-generational	Extended kin[b]	Total	N
Moslem	55	24	21	100	286
Christian	85	8	7	100	142
Druze	91	7	2	100	44
Total	68	17	15	100	472

[a] Until age 10. The data for age 11 until marriage differ only slightly; however, the proportion of Christian respondents who mentioned living with non-nuclear doubled during this period.

[b] May include two or more generations, but always includes at least one member who is a more distant relative (uncle, cousin, great aunt, etc.).

c. Household structure at childhood and youth differs by religious affiliation: few Christian and Druze respondents mentioned living with grandparents or with extended kin, while both these categories were significantly more prevalent in the households of the Moslem population.

d. Forty percent of the study population established a household of its own at marriage; another 39% first lived for some time with the husbands' parents; and 21% never left their parents' household. These three modes of development of family living arrangement differ by religious affiliation (Table 10).

Table 10: Living Arrangement of Couples After Marriage, by Religious Affiliation (percentages)

Religious Affiliation	Type of Household: Left parents' household at marriage.	Left parents' household after having lived there for some time after marriage.	Never left parents' household.	Total	N
Moslem	36	50	14	100	282
Christian	48	23	29	100	139
Druze	44	19	37	100	44
Total	40	39	21	100	465

e. A detailed description of current household structure was presented in Chapter 2. In the immediate context, however, it is illustrative to repeat that at this late stage in their lives, 17% of the all elderly live in households which contain one or two elderly parents and a married child.[5] This figure includes households in which the elderly live with a married child and his children, as well as with their own young, unmarried children (a household type classified as extended kinship when describing household structure at childhood - Table 9). Thus, comparison of the data on household structure at childhood (and youth) with household structure at old age shows a diminishing proportion of extended kinship households.

The data presented above do not support the assumption that joint or extended kinship households were the mode in pre-modern times; more

[5] Only three households (less than one percent of the total) were of the extended kinship type.

than two-thirds of all households at childhood (and youth) were two-generational or "conjugal", the supposedly typical and functional type in industrial societies. The findings corroborate those of previous case studies of Israeli Arab villages (Rosenfeld, 1965; Cohen, 1965) and are in line with some of the findings and conclusions based on other cultures (Laslett, 1976; Goode, 1970; Shorter, 1975). The data thus challenge the prevailing conception of family and household structure in non-industrialized (traditional, agrarian) societies.

The data show that Moslems were closer to the traditional model than Christians or Druze: significantly more Christian and Druze elderly ($p < 0.001$) claimed to have lived in a two-generational household in childhood (Table 9). Although it may be claimed that Christians are more "modern", there is no supportable explanation for this finding. Regarding household structure, the evidence is contradictory: Table 10 shows that Christians and Druze, as opposed to Moslems, tend significantly ($p < 0.001$) to live in a three-generational household until the parents' death.

The data presented in Tables 9 and 10 suggest three main lines of household development, beginning in childhood.

a. Early childhood and youth in a two-generational household, separation from parents after marriage, and later life in a one-generational household after all children are marrried. This last development may not always occur, since unmarried children - mostly daughters - always remain in their parents household. This first line is more typical of Christians and Druze than of Moslems.

b. Early childhood and youth in a multi-generational or extended kinship household. After marriage, the young couple lives with the

husband's family until the household becomes too big or until the young couple can afford a home of its own.[6] The two-generational household then develops as it does in line a. More Moslems than Christians or Druze are characterized by this line.

c. Early childhood and youth in a two-generational household. After marriage, the young couple does not separate from parents. This line is more typical of Christians and Druze than of Moslems.

These lines describe developments of the past. Because the study population included only those over age 65, no similar data is available on the younger generation. It is commonly known, however, that the young bridegroom of today is expected to build his own house before marriage can even be considered. The data do indicate that as early as 40-50 years ago, the modal trend of newly married children was to separate from parents. Thus, there was little chance for widespread prevalence of the joint, extended multigenerational household. These findings match those of Rosenfeld (1964) for the village he investigated in the 1950s, in which 75% of all households were two-generational and nuclear. He goes on to say that "about half of the sons in Moslem families, and two-thirds of those of Christian families, leave the parents' home after marriage".

---

[6] These were the two reasons given for separating from the multi-generational household.

Chapter 4: WORK AND WORK CAREERS

Labor Force Participation

This project was designed to compare data on work and labor force participation among the rural Arab elderly with that of other sectors of the Israeli population; it does not provide an in-depth investigation of this area. Standard terms and questions were employed in the interviews, but the responses proved to be unreliable.

Of all men interviewed, only 2.5% claimed to have worked during the week preceding the interview. When asked about sources of income, 4.9% of all men mentioned income from work. When work careers were investigated, 9% of all men said that they were working "now", i.e., at age 65 or older, or had been working "some time ago beyond that age". Half of them are self-employed in agriculture; most of the others are tradesmen. On the basis of this contradictory information, it is not possible to state the exact labor force participation, but it is safe to point out that it is low in comparison with the labor force participation of Jewish males ages 65+ which, in 1982, was 25%.[7]

The standard terms and questions concerning employment may be confusing for a mostly illiterate population whose modal lifetime occupation had been agriculture, most of whom had been self-employed (or partially self-employed) most of their lives, and over one-third of whom still own the land on which they work either alone or together with their sons. About 30% of those who own land have leased it and

---

[7] Labor force participation of the non-Jewish male population ages 65+ was 3.3% in 1982. The proportion of the Jewish male population ages 65+ was 25% (Central Bureau of Statistics, 1984 Special Series No. 738, Table 8).

thus probably have some income. Moreover, quite a few told the interviewer that they had legally handed over their land to offspring before the age of 65, so as to be entitled to supplementary income benefits from the National Insurance Institute; some of these elderly work the land with their sons and probably obtain some income in kind or cash. Labor force participation, nevertheless, is low. No women claimed to have worked gainfully during the preceding week, and only very few women had ever worked outside their farms or households. Therefore, the following description of work careers pertains to men only.

Work Careers

The decision to investigate work careers stems from an interest in the changes this formerly agrarian population has undergone in the course of a lifetime. The data obtained justify this decision, as they illustrate the transition from self-employment (mostly in agriculture) to salaried employment (Table 11) and from occupations in agriculture to other occupations (Table 12), such as unskilled salaried work in factories and services (maintenance, food preparation, gardening), construction, and professional work in services (teaching, health care).

Table 12 shows that the proportion of agricultural workers declines considerably with the passage of historical time (and with the increase in age of the investigated population). This decline has two sources, both of them due to changes in the economic system of Israel (and of most of the world): small-scale farming began to disappear as a main source of income and farmers hired themselves out

Table 11: Employment Status of Males in the Course of their Working Lives (percentages)

Age	Self-Employed	Salaried	Other[a]	Total	N
18-34	53	47	-	100	248
35-55	45	55	-	100	247
56-65	36	49	15	100	245

[a] Includes two categories: - early retirees
- men who are both self-employed and salaried

Table 12: Distribution of Occupations of Males in the Course of their Working Lives (percentages)

	Agriculture[c]	Shepherding	Trade	Construction	Police	Unskilled Labor	Prof. labor	Other	Total	N
Age										
12-17	60	8	-	-	-	-	-	32[a]	100	245
18-35	59	-	7	8	5	5	-	16	100	245
36-55	53	-	7	12	2	12	9	5	100	245
56-65	42	-	8	8	2	12	6	22[b]	100	245

[a] Includes 17% who had not worked at that age.

[b] About half of these are early retirees; 5% are employed in industry.

[c] Includes both self-employed and salaried workers.

as employees on bigger farms (in this case, on Jewish settlements). Simultaneously, new occupations with better pay emerged: construction, semi-professions, unskilled and skilled work in industry. Whenever possible, people left their jobs in agriculture, where pay is low and tenure nonexistent, and took jobs which offer one or both of these features. These developments are most evident in the occupational structure of the second generation,[8] though the study data (Tables 11, 12, 13) clearly reflect the impact of these changes on the older generation. Table 13 shows the transition of self-employed to salaried workers: nearly half the elderly who began their working life self-employed (most were farmers) some time later became salaried.

Table 13: Changes in Employment Status of Males in the Course of their Working Lives (percentages)

Self-employed for entire working life; retired after age 60.	24
Self-employed; either retired at about age 55 or spent last period of work as salaried employees.	10
Self-employed until age 35.	11
Salaried employees for entire working life (some retired before age 55).	29
Changed employment status during working life.	22
Never worked (some worked a few years only).	4
Total	100
Number	245

[8] One son only, among all the children of the respondents in this study, was reported to be a farmer.

Two more interesting facts emerge from the data in Table 13:

a. A considerable proportion of the men retired before the usual retirement age of men in Israel (65). Since all interviewees were at least 65 years old in the summer of 1984, this trend could not have been influenced by the present economic recession. It seems that attention should be payed to this phenomenon, which may create economic and social problems if it proves to be a continuing trend.

b. Twenty-nine percent of all men had been salaried employees for all their working lives. This indicates that as early as 45-60 years ago these villages had not been fully agrarian and that some measure of "modernization" had already set in.

Chapter 5: HOUSING CONDITIONS AND STANDARD OF LIVING[9]

This chapter presents a descriptive account of the housing conditions and standard of living of the study population. Data was acquired both through the questionnaire and observations conducted by the interviewers.

Prevalent housing conditions are described first, including data on building type, basic housing facilities, physical condition of the dwelling units, housing density, and types of tenure. Standard of living - as measured by types of water and home heating methods used, types of cooking facilities used, and availability of household appliances and basic furniture - is discussed next. In both sections, differences in findings for monogenerational and multigenerational households will be highlighted.

Housing Conditions

Building type

As shown in Table 14, 63% of all households in the sample live in modern stone or concrete buildings. Thirty-seven percent live in older structures, usually dwellings which lack indoor toilets and showers. Twenty-five percent of these structures are of especially low quality: 9% are tin shacks, 10% are single rooms adjacent to a modern private dwelling, and 6% are located in the basements or cellars of private dwellings.

Table 14 indicates differences in type of building by household type. Most monogenerational households occupy older buildings, while

---

[9] This chapter was written by Yaron King.

the majority of multigenerational households occupy modern buildings which were likely built by the son of the elderly residents.

Table 14: Building Type, by Household Type (percentages)

Building Type	Household Type		Total
	Monogenerational	Multigenerational	
Modern stone or concrete	41	77	63
Older building	59	23	37
Total	100	100	100
Number	155	254	409

Building type and basic housing facilities

As shown in Table 15, the older buildings exhibit lower standards with respect to indoor toilets and showers. Most of the modern stone or concrete buildings have indoor toilets, while most of the older buildings have outdoor facilities. A relatively high percentage of the older buildings have no such facility at all. The location of showers follows the same pattern, however a very high proportion of older buildings have no shower facility at all.

Table 15: Location of Toilets and Showers, by Building Type[a] (percentages)

	Building Type	
	Modern stone or concrete (N = 259)	Older building (N = 150)
Toilets		
Inside dwelling	93	11
Outside dwelling	6	63
No facility	1	26
Total	100	100
Showers		
Inside dwelling	94	15
Outside dwelling	3	34
No facility	3	51
Total	100	100

[a] Proxy interviews not included.

Building type and structural deficiencies/maintenance problems

The survey identified a series of maintenance problems, including dampness in walls or ceilings, plumbing problems, and door or window problems. Among the structural deficiencies noted in the interviews were lack of tiled floors, lack of plaster or paint on walls, and wall cracks.

As indicated in Table 16, the two building types differ by the extent to which they are characterized by structural deficiencies and maintenance problems. Only 13% of the elderly residing in modern

Table 16: Households Reporting Structural Deficiencies and/or Maintenance Problems, by Building Type[a] (percentages)

Building Type	At least one deficiency or problem reported	No deficiencies or problems reported	Total	N
Modern	13	87	100	259
Older	68	32	100	150

[a] Proxy interviews not included.

stone or concrete buildings reported at least one structural deficiency or maintenance problem, compared with 68% of those living in older buildings.

In summary, most of the modern stone or concrete buildings, in contrast to the older buildings, include indoor toilets and showers and are relatively free of structural deficiencies and maintenance problems.

Basic housing facilities

A significant indicator of housing quality used in this study is the extent to which basic facilities (such as toilet, shower, and kitchen) exist, and if so, their location relative to the dwelling.

Toilets and showers

As indicated in Table 17, 63% of the households surveyed have toilets located within the dwelling; 37% either use an outdoor facility or lack one entirely. Lack of indoor facilities is more common among monogenerational households, most of which occupy older buildings. Only 44% of the monogenerational households have toilets

within the dwelling, and one-fifth have no toilets at all.

Table 17: Location of Toilets and Showers, by Household Type (percentages)

	Toilet			Shower		
	Monogener-ational	Multigener-ational	Total	Monogener-ational	Multigener-ational	Total
Inside dwelling	44	74	63	44	78	65
Outside dwelling	37	22	27	20	11	15
No facility	19	4	10	36	11	20
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number	167	269	436	167	269	436

Since findings regarding lack of toilets were not expected, follow-up questions were not initially included in the survey. At a later stage, however, the residents without toilets were asked about the type and location of the facilities they use. It was learned that some use pails and that most use the toilets in the homes of children in close proximity.

The proportion of households lacking indoor toilets (37%) is much higher than that recorded in the 1972 Population and Housing Census, which noted that 21% of the non-Jewish aged lacked a toilet within their dwelling (Central Bureau of Statistics, 1981, p. 176, Table 8D.). This difference may by explained by the focus of this study on rural areas in particular, which are more likely to lack indoor toilets.

The findings on showers, also noted in Table 17, are very similar to those regarding toilets. A much higher percentage of the mono-generational households, however, have no showers.

Sixty-one percent of all households surveyed, as shown in Table 18, occupy units containing both toilets and showers; 33% occupy units containing neither. The differences in housing quality between mono-generational and multigenerational households is once again clearly apparent.

Table 18: Location of Toilets and Showers, by Household Type (Summary Data - percentages)

	Household Type		
	Monogenerational	Multigenerational	Total
Toilet and shower within dwelling	41	72	61
Toilet or shower only within dwelling	6	8	6
No toilet or shower within dwelling	53	20	33
Total	100	100	100
Number	167	269	436

Kitchens

Most of the households surveyed occupy dwellings having a separate kitchen (Table 19). Only 14% lack a separate kitchen or other space designated as a cooking area. Once again, differences appear between the two types of households: more mono- than

multigenerational households lack separate kitchens, a structural characteristic more common in older buildings.

Table 19: Location of Kitchen, by Household Type (percentages)

	Household Type		
	Monogenerational	Multigenerational	Total
Separate kitchen in dwelling	62	86	77
Cooking done in another room	28	9	9
No kitchen or cooking area in dwelling	10	5	14
Total	100	100	100
Number	167	269	436

Use of washing facilities

As shown in Table 20, 59% of all households surveyed use showers, while 41% use a washbasin or sink. Use of bathtubs is almost non-existent.

Table 20: Use of Washing Facilities, by Household Type (percentages)

	Household Type		
	Monogenerational	Multigenerational	Total
Shower	44	68	59
Bathtub	-	1	-
Washbasin or sink	56	31	41
Total	100	100	100
Number	166	269	435

Considerable differences between the two household types are apparent. Showers are used more by multigenerational households, and washbasins or sinks by monogenerational households. This finding can be expected in light of previous data which revealed that a higher percentage of monogenerational households live in older buildings which, for the most part, lack indoor showers.

The combined data show that the elderly who claim to have outdoor showers tend not to use them. They prefer using a washbasin or sink.

Structural deficiencies and maintenance problems

Another aspect of housing conditions is the physical condition (quality of the physical structure and level of maintenance) of the dwelling. The types of structural deficiencies and maintenance problems identified in the survey have been previously noted.

As indicated in Table 21, nearly three-quarters of the households surveyed occupy dwellings of adequate structural quality and with adequate levels of maintenance (based on interviewers' observations and reports by the elderly). However, 28% of the households reported the presence of structural deficiencies and/or maintenance problems. As expected, these conditions are more prevalent in monogenerational households, most of which occupy older buildings. The lower level of maintenance in units occupied by monogenerational households may also be explained by the lack of financial means to make repairs; multigenerational households are likely to have a larger pool of money available for maintaining dwellings adequately.

The most frequently reported maintenance problem (20% of all households) was wall dampness during the winter months. The incidence

Table 21: Structural Deficiencies/Maintenance Problems, by Household Type (percentages)

	Household Type		
	Monogenerational	Multigenerational	Total
Deficiencies and/or problems reported	40	22	28
Deficiencies and/or problems not reported	60	78	72
Total	100	100	100
Number	141	253	394

of plumbing and other maintenance problems was minimal, as were structural deficiencies.

Table 22 indicates the percentage of households reporting specific structural deficiencies. The lack of tiled floors and plastered walls were the most frequently reported (9% and 5% of all households, respectively). Most of these reports came from monogenerational households. A lack of tiled floors, for example, was reported by 16% of the monogenerational households, compared with 6% of the multigenerational households.

Combined indicator of housing quality

The combined indicator includes the location of toilets and showers and the physical condition of the unit (based on reports and observations of structural deficiencies and/or maintenance problems).

Table 22: Reporting of Structural Deficiencies

Type of Deficiency	Percentage of Households Reporting
a. Lack of tiled floors	9.0
b. Lack of plaster on walls or plaster in poor condition	5.0
c. Conditions a and b	3.5
d. Cracks in walls	1.5
e. Walls lack paint or need new coat of paint	3.0

As shown in Table 23, 56% of all households surveyed occupy dwellings with indoor toilets and showers and without structural deficiencies or maintenance problems. Just over half of all households, therefore, enjoy basically adequate housing conditions. Most of these are multigenerational households in which the elderly live in a household equipped and maintained by a son. Monogenerational households generally occupy poorer quality housing.

Housing infrastructure - electricity and running water

Six percent of all households surveyed lack electricity; 5% lack running water, and 3% lack both electricity and running water. The lack of one or both of these features is more common to monogenerational households. In particular, they were found to be lacking only among the older buildings characterized as tin shacks or one-room structures (25% of all old buildings in the sample).

Table 23: Combined Indicator of Housing Quality, by Household Type (percentages)

	Household Type		
	Monogenerational	Multigenerational	Total
Toilet/shower in dwelling; no struct. deficiencies or maint. problems.	39	66	56
Toilet/shower in dwelling; at least one struct. deficiency or maint. problem.	8	10	9
No toilet or no shower in dwelling; no struct. deficiencies or maint. problems.	3	5	4
No toilet or no shower in dwelling; at least one struct. deficiency or maint. problem.	3	2	2
No toilet and no shower in dwelling; no struct. deficiencies or maint. problems.	18	7	12
No toilet and no shower in dwelling; at least one struct. deficiency or maint. problem.	29	10	17
Total	100	100	100
Number	142	252	394

Housing density

Another criterion often used to describe housing conditions is housing density. In the sample, the average number of rooms per dwelling is 2.4; the average number of persons per dwelling is 4.1; and the average housing density, or average number of persons per room, is 1.7. An examination of average housing density by household type indicates a higher average density for multigenerational

households (2.1) than for monogenerational households (1.3).

As shown in Table 24, the majority of the households surveyed (63%) occupy dwellings in which the housing density does not exceed two persons per room. However, 15% of all households (all of them multigenerational) have a density of three of more persons per room. Forty-one percent of the elderly living in multigenerational households lack their own bedroom.

Table 24: Housing Density, by Household Type (percentages)

Household Type	Number of Persons Per Room					
	Less than one	1-1.99	2-2.99	Three or more	Total	N
Monogenerational	34	51	15	-	100	168
Multigenerational	10	39	27	24	100	271
Total	19	44	22	15	100	439

In the 1972 Population and Housing Census (p. 174, Table 17D), a housing density of three or more persons per room characterized 34% of the non-Jewish aged households, a much higher percentage than that found in this study. Although reasons for this difference are uncertain, one possible influence on housing density may be differences in building policy between urban and rural areas. Limitations on vertical and horizontal expansion of dwelling units are more common in urban areas.

Types of tenure

Ownership of the dwelling is the most common form of tenure in Israel; it is also the most common form among the study population. According to the 1978 Housing Conditions Survey, 66% of non-Jewish household heads aged 65 and older owned their dwellings (Central Bureau of Statistics, 1980, p. 81, Table 23). Although this study was based on a rural rather than urban sample, the data reflect a very similar trend.

As shown in Table 25, most dwellings are owned by their elderly residents, and a significant minority are owned by the family - most often the son - of the elderly. In contrast to Jewish households in urban areas, renting as a mode of tenure among the study population is almost non-existent.

Table 25: Types of Tenure, by Household Type (percentages)

Tenure Type	Household Type		Total
	Monogenerational	Multigenerational	
Owned by elderly	71	65	67
Owned by family of elderly	28	33	31
Rented	1	2	2
Total	100	100	100
Number	151	250	401

Standard of Living

Existence of household equipment and facilities is often used an an indicator of standard of living. The survey used in this study noted prevalence rates for a wide range of items.

Water heating methods

Table 26 indicates that modern water heating facilities are used by nearly 70% of the multigenerational households; in about two-thirds of the monogenerational households, no such facilities have been installed. This difference reflects both differences in financial means available (son's income versus father's income) and differences in building type (in some older buildings, no such facility can be safely installed).

Table 26: Water Heating Methods, by Household Type (percentages)

	Household Type		
	Monogenerational	Multigenerational	Total
Solar heater or electricity	23	52	40
Other[a]	60	31	42
Combination of methods	12	17	16
Do not heat water	5	-	2
Total	100	100	100
Number	166	269	435

[a] Gas burners, alcohol/kerosene burners, or wood-fueled devices.

Home heating methods

In both monogenerational and multigenerational households, wood is the primary means of heating the dwelling (Table 27). It is the traditional method, and costs nothing. Many multigenerational households, which are more affluent, have turned to kerosene, gas burners, or electricity. A small percentage of all households (mostly monogenerational) do not heat their dwellings.

Table 27: Home Heating Methods, by Household Type (percentages)

Type of Fuel	Household Type		
	Monogenerational	Multigenerational	Total
Wood only	57	47	51
Wood, in addition to other means	6	13	11
Kerosene, gas, or electricity	25	37	31
Do not heat unit	12	3	7
Total	100	100	100
Number	141	258	399

Cooking facilities

In the majority of both types of households, cooking is done with gas-fueled facilities (81% of monogenerational and 90% of multigenerational households). Electric stoves are used by only 2% of all households. Those without modern facilities (19% of monogenerational and 7% of multigenerational households) use alcohol or kerosene wicker burners, and some cook their meals by use of wood-fueled facilities,

as was traditionally done. Differences in use of facilities by household type are most likely due to differences in financial means.

Household appliances

The data presented in Table 28 indicate that, when measured by possession of various household appliances, the overall standard of living of the elderly in monogenerational households is lower than that of the elderly who reside with their children.

Table 28: Possession of Household Appliances, by Household Type (percentages)

	Household Type		
	Monogenerational	Multigenerational	Total
Electric heating[a] stove	21	36	30
Kerosene heating[a] stove	30	42	37
Refrigerator	66	90	81
Cooking stove	16	39	30
Washing machine	17	42	33
Radio	46	79	66
Television	27	76	57
Total number of households	168	269	437

[a] The proportion of people who have electric or kerosene heating stoves is higher than the proportion who use them (Table 27).

Some of the data for monogenerational households is striking. One-third manage without a refrigerator; 83% have no washing machine, and less than one-third have their own television set. These deficiencies are often compensated for, however, as shown in other parts of this report. Many elderly living alone receive pre-cooked food from their children; hence, they have little need for refrigerators. Children are also a source of help with laundry, and those who own televisions may satisfy their parents' desire to view television.

Generally, Table 28 shows that the standard of living of the rural Arab population is lower than that of the entire non-Jewish population of Israel. For example, 91% of the non-Jewish population have a refrigerator, 44% a washing machine, and 83% a television set (Central Bureau of Statistics, 1985, pp. 310-11, Table XI/24).

Basic furniture

Table 29 shows that 11% of all households surveyed lack a clothes closet, 12% lack chairs, and 26% lack a table. The lack of this furniture may not be strictly due to lack of funds, but may reflect differences in lifestyle and cultural influences as well.

The lack of basic furniture is more common among monogenerational households, where the elderly may maintain more traditional lifestyles shaped by cultural norms and customs that do not demand the furniture of a modern household. The higher prevalence of such items in multigenerational households is generally due to the more modern lifestyle and higher standard of living of the children with whom the elderly share a home.

Table 29: Possession of Basic Furniture, by Household Type (percentages)

	Household Type		
	Monogenerational	Multigenerational	Total
Clothes closet	81	93	89
Chairs	80	92	88
Table	59	84	74
Total	168	269	437

Summary

In addition to describing the existing housing conditions of the sample population, this chapter portrayed the standard of living maintained by the households surveyed. The selected indicators of housing quality included:

1. Building type occupied.

2. Quality of the dwelling unit, as measured by the presence and relative location of basic housing facilities.

3. Physical condition of the unit, as measured by the extent of structural deficiencies and the level of maintenance.

Overall standard of living was determined by the existence and types of various items of household equipment, such as water and home-heating facilities, cooking facilities, household appliances, and basic furniture.

The majority of households surveyed occupy modern stone or concrete structures, almost all of which are in adequate physical condition and incorporate both indoor toilets and showers. Most of the multigenerational households occupy such buildings. Most

monogenerational households, by contrast, live in older buildings. As a result of deficiencies associated with this building type, the housing conditions of monogenerational households were rated as lower.

A higher proportion of monogenerational households occupy dwellings lacking toilets and/or showers, with a significant number lacking even outdoor facilities. In addition, more monogenerational households lack separate kitchen facilities.

Although the physical conditions of most of the dwellings were judged to be adequate, about one-fifth of the households reported structural deficiencies and/or maintenance problems. As expected, such problems tend to occur more among monogenerational households.

In summary, it is important to note that just over half of all households surveyed in under basically adequate houses. They occupy dwellings which have both indoor toilets and showers and which lack structural deficiencies or maintenance problems. These conditions, however, vary by household type: two-thirds of the multigenerational households, compared with about one-third of the monogenerational households, enjoy such conditions.

Regarding standard of living, it was found that elderly living with children (whose standards of living are often higher than that of their parents) are on a higher level than elderly residing alone. For instance, fewer monogenerational households make use of modern water heating and cooking facilities; they also possess fewer appliances and less furniture.

The differences in standard of living between the two household types can be attributed to several factors, including the financial means available to each and building type. Both can either facilitate

or restrict installation of more modern household facilities. Differences in lifestyle may also be a factor. Elderly living alone tend to maintain a lifestyle shaped by traditional cultural norms and customs. Multigenerational households, by contrast, reflect a more modern lifestyle, set by the children with whom the elderly live.

Chapter 6: HEALTH[10]

The health condition of the study population was investigated by using measures of physical health, such as prevalence of sensory impairments and oral health problems, and by self-evaluation of health. In addition, measures of functional health, such as mobility and functional ability levels related to performance of self-care and physical activities, were used; these measures are based on self-reports by the elderly surveyed.

The second section of the chapter will focus on the housebound (including bedridden) elderly, including data on the extent of their contact with specific health services. The final section will include data on the extent and type of health insurance coverage and the extent of contact with Kupat Holim (sick fund) clinics.

Measures of Health Condition

Mobility level

As indicated in Table 30, 77% of the elderly surveyed are ambulatory, 16% housebound, and 7% bedridden. The housebound and bedridden thus represent a significant minority of the study population.

In a 1982 national survey of the elderly, 10% of the Jewish elderly were found to be housebound and 1% bedridden (Central Bureau of Statistics, 1985, Table 2, p. 38). Therefore, compared with the national study - which employed similar working definitions - the study population includes a much higher proportion of both housebound and bedridden elderly.

---

[10] This chapter was written by Yaron King.

Table 30: Self-reported Mobility Level ,by Age and Sex (percentages)

	Mobile[a]	Limited in Outdoor Mobility[b]	Housebound[c]	Bedridden[d]	Total	N
Males						
65-69	73	17	10	-	100	52
70-74	63	25	8	4	100	73
75-79	55	20	9	6	100	69
80+	29	42	21	8	100	72
Total	54	29	12	5	100	266
Females						
65-69	42	45	9	4	100	55
70-74	37	44	19	-	100	84
75-79	24	44	22	10	100	41
80+	8	39	29	24	100	72
Total	28	43	20	9	100	252
Males and Females	41	36	16	7	100	518

[a] Able to walk both in and outside the home without assistance and without limitation of distance.

[b] Able to walk both in and outside the home without assistance, but limited to a radius of 200 meters from the home.

[c] Cannot leave home without assistance (for at least one month) but can walk in the home without assistance.

[d] Confined to bed or wheelchair (for at least one month) and cannot walk without assistance.

Table 30 shows that mobility level tends to decrease with increasing age among both men and women. This finding is similar to those found in studies of the urban Jewish elderly population in Israel, both at the national level (Weihl et al., 1970) and community level (Cohen and Morgenstein, 1976; Zilberstein et al., 1981).

Table 30 also indicates that a higher proportion of women than men are housebound or bedridden, and that with increasing age, the proportion of bedridden persons increases more dramatically among women than among men. This trend was also noted in the study conducted by Weihl et al. (1970). The proportion of women who are fully mobile (without distance limitation) is considerably lower than the corresponding proportion of men, a difference that begins to appear in the 65-69 age cohort.

Functional ability

Functional ability is measured by the ability to perform various activities of daily living without assistance. The activities used in this study included personal care tasks, such as dressing and showering/bathing, and activities associated with ambulatory capacity, such as walking outside and negotiating stairs. Bedridden elderly were excluded from this portion of the survey.

Table 31 indicates that the proportion of elderly who cannot perform these tasks without help increases with age, a trend also found in other surveys (Weihl et al., 1970; Central Bureau of Statistics, 1985). An examination of data for the total study population reveals that the activities requiring the greatest need for assistance are negotiating stairs, walking outdoors, and getting on and off a bus. A smaller proportion of elderly require assistance in

Table 31: Need for Assistance with Activites of Daily Living, by Age and Sex (percentages)[a]

	Males	Females	Total
Dressing/undressing			
65-69	4	4	4
70-74	3	11	7
75-79	7	17	10
80+	19	31	28
Total	8	15	11
Showering/bathing			
65-69	6	8	7
70-74	4	14	9
75-79	10	20	14
80+	27	37	32
Total	12	19	15
Putting on socks			
65-69	4	4	4
70-74	2	10	6
75-79	5	17	9
80+	19	33	25
Total	7	15	11
Going up/down stairs			
65-69	10	12	9
70-74	16	24	17
75-79	23	29	25
80+	27	43	34
Total	13	27	20

Table 31, continued

	Males	Females	Total
Getting on/off bus			
65-69	8	16	12
70-74	6	27	17
75-79	10	31	18
80+	30	45	37
Total	13	29	21
Walking outside			
65-69	10	20	15
70-74	7	28	19
75-79	15	23	18
80+	29	44	36
Total	15	29	21

[a] Bedridden excluded.

personal care tasks. The major sources of assistance for the incapacitated are the spouse or other members of the family; the few incapacitated elderly who have no family are assisted by neighbors.

An examination of functional ability level by sex reveals that in almost every age cohort, for each of the activities listed, more women than men require assistance. This trend was also noted in the studies cited above.

Self-evaluation of health

Respondents were asked to rate their health as very good, good, fair, poor, or very poor. For the purpose of data analysis, their

responses were merged into three categories: good, fair, or poor. The primary goal of the data analysis was to determine the extent to which demographic, socio-economic, and health variables influence self-evaluation of health.

Table 32 indicates that only 23% of the study population rate their health as good. The distribution of responses is quite similar to that of the Jewish elderly in Israel reported by Weihl et al. (1970). More men than women reported good health, a trend that corresponds to those reported by Weihl and by Shanas et al. (1980), in a study of elderly in Britain, Denmark, and the U.S.

Table 32: Self-evaluation of Health, by Sex (percentages)

	Good	Fair	Poor	Total	N
Males	29	35	36	100	248
Female	16	39	45	100	231
Total	23	37	40	100	479

A significant relationship was found between age and self-evaluation of health (Table 33). The perceived quality of health steadily declines with age, but among the old-old cohort (ages-80 and older) the evaluations become considerable more negative. The higher prevalence mobility and functional limitations among the old-old (see Tables 30 and 31) may account for this decline in self-assessment of health.

Table 33: Self-evaluation of Health, By Age (percentages)

	Good or Fair	Poor	Total	N
65-69	67	33	100	102
70-74	64	36	100	152
75-79	62	38	100	101
80+	47	53	100	124

$x^2 = 11.18$ d.f. = 3 $p < 0.02$

A significant relationship was also found between self-assessments of economic situation and self-evaluation of health.[11] Table 34 shows that a high rating of current economic situation is associated with a more positive health rating; those who rated their economic situation as poor also tended to rate their health as poor. The same significant trend was found in the relationship between income level and self-evaluation of health. Greater financial means may expand the number of health-related resources available to the elderly. In addition, higher income may be associated with more optimistic attitudes toward health, as well as toward other aspects of life.

[11] Respondents were asked to rate their current economic situation as good, fair, or poor.

Table 34: Self-Evaluation of Health, by Self-assessed Ecomomic Situation (percentages)

Assessment of Economic Situation	Evaluation of Health: Good	Fair	Poor	Total	N
Good	48	33	19	100	104
Fair	19	44	37	100	230
Poor	12	29	59	100	143
Total	23	37	40	100	477

$x^2 = 67.85$ d.f. = 4 $p < .001$

Since low income is associated with and is possibly a consequence of low level of education, a relationship between level of education and self-evaluation of health could be expected. As shown in Table 35, lack of schooling is associated with low self-evaluation of health.

Table 35: Self-evaluation of Health, by Educational Level (percentages)

Educational Level	Evaluation of Health: Good	Fair	Poor	Total	N
No formal education	18	37	45	100	294
1-4 years of schooling	32	39	29	100	96
5-16 years of schooling	31	32	37	100	87
Total	23	37	40	100	477

$x^2 = 14.84$ d.f. = 4 $p < .01$

Thus far, it has been shown that several socio-economic variables are significantly related to self-evaluation of health. A significant relationship was also found between selected health variables, such as mobility level and chewing problems, and self-evaluation of health (Tables 36 and 37).

Table 36: Self-evaluation of Health, by Mobility Level (percentages)

	Evaluation of Health				
Mobility Level	Good	Fair	Poor	Total	N
Mobile	47	40	13	100	206
Limited in outdoor mobility	8	45	47	100	179
Housebound/bedridden	-	14	86	100	94
Total	23	37	40	100	479

$x^2 = 197.90$ d.f. = 4 $p < .001$

Table 37: Self-evaluation of Health, by Reported Existence of Chewing Problems (percentages)

	Evaluation of Health				
	Good	Fair	Poor	Total	N
Reported chewing problems	17	34	49	100	241
Did not report chewing problems	29	41	30	100	235
Total	23	37	40	100	476

$x^2 = 19.03$ d.f. = 2 $p < .001$

Table 38 summarizes the results of the bi-variate analysis. The gamma coefficient is also included and points to the strength of the relationship between paired variables.

Table 38: Summary of Bi-variate Analysis: Self-evaluation of Health Paired with Selected Independent Variables

Independent variables	Chi-square Test significance (P) level	Value of the gamma coefficient
Age	$p < .02$	not available
Self-assessment of economic situation	$p < .001$	.465
Self-reported income level	$p < .01$	.225
Educational level	$p < .01$	.214
Mobility level	$p < .001$	.804
Chewing problems	$p < .001$	.321

It appears that the strongest relationship is that of mobility level and self-evaluation of health. Another health variable, existence of chewing problems, significantly influences self-evaluation of health. Among the socio-economic variables examined, the effect of self-assessment of economic situation on self-evaluation of health is particularly noticeable.

In a study of a national sample of Jewish elderly by Azaiza (1984), the extent to which health and socio-economic variables influence self-evaluation of health was examined by multivariate analysis. The relationship between health variables and self-

evaluation of health was shown to be stronger than the relationship between socio-economic variables and the dependent variable.

Sensory impairments

Problems of vision and hearing, the two areas examined in this study, increase with age among the study population (Table 39).

Table 39: Reported Hearing and Vision Problems, by Age (percentages)

Age	Type of Problem	
	Hearing	Vision
65-69	21	49
70-74	27	44
75-79	37	64
80+	51	65
Total	34	55

Visual impairment

Fifty-five percent of the elderly reported vision difficulties; about one-third of them (19% of the total study population) use eyeglasses. Thus, 36% of the elderly are aware of vision problems but do not use eyeglasses, despite the likely need for them. The main reasons given for not having eyeglasses were lack of money to purchase them and "no need" for them. Less frequently cited reasons were embarrassment over using eyeglasses and the feeling the they would be of no help.

Twenty-one percent of the total study population use eyeglasses.

This proportion is very low compared with that of Jewish elderly studied by Weihl et al. (1970, Part I), 73% of whom were found to use eyeglasses. The same proportion was found in a survey conducted by Davies et al., (1979, p. 21 Table 10) in a Jerusalem neighborhood.

There are several apparent reasons for the low use of eyeglasses in the study population. Illiterate people are not likely to need eyeglasses unless they do handicraft work, and the proportion of illiterate persons in the study population is very high (see Table 3). Responses to various open-ended questions on leisure time and household activities, moreover, reveal that handicrafts or needlework are rarely done. Quite a few respondents mentioned embarrassment over having to wear glasses, a feeling that appears to characterize the younger generation as well. The cost of eyeglasses appears to be of minor importance as an explanatory factor for their non-use.

Hearing impairment

Thirty-five percent of the elderly reported hearing problems; 2% of them use a hearing aid. Weihl et al. (1970) noted that the percentage of Jewish elderly who reported using a hearing aid was 6%.

Table 40 clearly indicates that, as with eyeglasses, there is a high level of resistance to using a hearing aid.

Oral health problems

Sixty-one percent of the total study population reported having dentures; nearly one-quarter of them claimed that their dentures were not in good condition. A similar percentage of Jewish elderly who reported having dentures was cited by Weihl et al. (1970).

Table 40: Reported Hearing Impairment, by Use of Hearing Aid (percentages)

	Reported hearing impairment[a]
Use a hearing aid	2
Do not use (claim not to need)	44
Do not use (due to lack of money)	41
Do not use (reasons unknown)	12
Total	100
Number	163

[a] Proxy interviews were excluded from the data. Half of the elderly interviewed via proxies were deaf.

The high percentage of denture wearers indicates that the study population attaches more importance to the acquisition and use of dentures than to that of hearing aids or eyeglasses, even though the cost of dentures may be relatively high. This is probably due to the basic need to eat solid foods. In addition, socio-cultural factors which encourage use of dentures may account for the high proportion of users.

Fifty-one percent of the elderly reported chewing problems. Since over half of this group (55%) use dentures, these dentures may not be in good condition. Those who reported chewing problems but did not have dentures cited lack of money as the main reason for not purchasing them. Other reasons, cited much less frequently, were no need for dentures, poor condition of gums, and objection to wearing dentures.

Sixty-eight percent of the elderly reported having had a dental

checkup, though three-quarters of them had not visited a dentist in the past four years. Thirty-two percent had never had their teeth professionally checked. In one of the villages included in the study, 82% of the elderly had never had a dental checkup.

Eighty-two percent of those who have dentures, compared with 53% of those who do not, had had a dental checkup. However, these two groups did not differ with regard to the date of their last dental checkup; the majority in both groups had not seen a dentist in the past four years.

Self-reported changes in health condition

The elderly were asked: "In the past five years, have any changes taken place in your health, mood, or general state of mind?". Sixty-seven percent responded affirmatively.

Age and sex of the respondents were not found to significantly influence their reports of changes in health condition. However, this variable is significantly affected by religious affiliation. Considerably more Moslems reported changes than did Christians and Druze (Table 41). These differences may be attributed to differences in the health, socio-economic, or lifestyle characteristics of Moslems, as opposed to Christians and Druze.

Housebound Elderly and Their Contact with Health Services

The housebound (including bedridden) elderly, who make up 23% of the study population, have the greatest need for assistance and services. As mentioned previously, this is a higher percentage than that noted in the Jewish elderly population (Central Bureau of Statistics, 1985). One possible explanation is the age structure of the study population; about one-half are ages 75 and older. The

Table 41: Reported Changes in Health Condition in the Past Five Years, by Religious Affiliation (percentages)

Religious Affiliation	Reported changes	Did not report changes	Total	N
Moslem	76	24	100	288
Christian and Druze	53	47	100	190
Total	67	33	100	478

$x^2 = 28.1$ d.f. = 1 $p < .001$

comparatively high proportion of bedridden persons (7%, compared with 1% in the Jewish aged population) may be due in part to the relative lack of institutional arrangements or financial means to secure institutional placement, if such an option exists.[12]

Over half (56%) of the housebound elderly have been so for four years or more, while only 5% reported that they had become housebound within the past six months.

In an open-ended question, the housebound were asked to state the reasons for their current health condition. Most cited multiple health problems, the most frequent of which were general weakness (58%), leg fracture or other leg problems (29%), vision problems (26%), and joint problems (20%). Ten percent of the housebound (2% of the total study population), including proxy interviews, claimed to suffer from states of disorientation or confusion.

12 Social services in the sampled villages reported that two elderly persons had been admitted to institutions. Three persons on the list of elderly to be interviewed were reported to live in institutions.

Forty-two percent of the housebound live alone, and 58% reside with children. Surprisingly, the proportion of housebound elderly living alone is higher than that of mobile elderly living alone (42%, compared with 30%). Although it may be assumed that the housebound who live alone are a high-risk group with unmet needs for assistance, this is not the case for the rural Arab elderly population. Most of them benefit from the informal support and assistance of their children, who often live in close proximity (see Chapter 8).

The housebound elderly were asked when they had last been visited by a physician. Thirty-eight percent stated that they had received a visit in the last month, 20% more than a month but less than three months ago, and 42% over three months ago. One-third of the housebound (but not bedridden), compared with one-half of the bedridden, had been visited by a physician within the last month.

The housebound were also asked if they received visits from a nurse from either Kupat Holim or another health service organization. The majority (81%) did not. Of the remaining 19%, only 3% reported receiving regular visits by a nurse.

Focusing specifically on the bedridden elderly, 44% receive visits by a nurse, but only one-fifth of these visits occur regularly. According to Kupat Holim procedures, the bedridden are to be under the constant supervision of a nurse. It is thus apparent that some of the bedridden elderly are not receiving a service to which they are entitled and which is required.

Although the need for and frequency of visits by health care providers may depend on the condition of the elderly, the fact remains that 35% of the bedridden elderly were last visited by a physician

over three months ago, and 56% are not visited by a nurse. The health service system, therefore, may not be meeting the entire range and level of existing need for services.

Health Insurance and Kupat Holim

Health insurance

Nearly all the elderly surveyed (99%) are covered by health insurance. Three-quarters are partially covered by the National Insurance Institute's income supplement program, and the remainder are fully insured.

Almost 97% of the insured are members of the Kupat Holim of the General Federation of Labor (Histadrut). The remainder are insured through other sick funds.

Extent of contact with Kupat Holim services

Most of the elderly (94%) turn to Kupat Holim doctors when the need for medical care arises. Of this group, about one-fifth turn to private physicians as well. Six percent of the study population depend solely on the services of a private physician. Therefore, a significant minority of the study population use the services of private physicians, although proportions vary by village.

Chapter 7: THE STRUCTURE OF INTERGENERATIONAL CONTACTS

Geographical Distribution of Children

The Arab rural family was a fertile one half a century ago. Sixty-two percent of the elderly residents surveyed have more than six children (Table 42). Most of these children (88% of all sons and 68% of all daughters) live in the village in which they were born, demonstrating the patrilocal and endogamous qualities of this society.[13] Sons marry and stay in their native villages unless they emmigrate to another country or, in very rare instances, their academic and professional goals cannot be pursued in the village or its surroundings. Some daughters marry men from other villages and therefore relocate, but more than 60% of the daughters in all six villages investigated live in the village in which they were born.

Table 42: Geographical Distribution of Children, by Sex (percentages)

Sex of Children	Proximity of Children				
	Live in village	Live in another location in Israel	Live in another country	Total	N
Male	88	6	6	100	1411
Female	68	29	3	100	1294
Total	78	18	4	100	2705

[13] The same principles prevailed in the older generation. Most of the sample population were born in the villages they lived in when interviewed. Nearly all of those born elsewhere were women.

The concentration of most children in the same locality - even though not all of the villages are small - largely determines the structure of intergenerational contacts.

Contact with Children Not Living with Parents

Only a very small proportion of all aged persons had not seen at least one child not living with them during the week preceding the interview. In fact, most of them had seen many of their children during that period. This proportion - over 90% - of persons who have frequent contact with children is higher than that of both the entire Jewish population and different sections thereof (Weihl, 1971); it is apparently the highest percentage recorded in which this indicator of intergenerational contact was used.

In general the data indicate that the overwhelming majority of rural Arab aged have ongoing daily contact with many of their children and grandchildren who do not live with them. A very small group of aged - not more than five to six percent - claims to see children infrequently (had not seen a child for more than two months) and attributes this lack of contact to "bad relations" or "lack of interest to see children", or states that the children live "far away" (although some of these children live in the same locality).

Patterns of Intergenerational Visiting

Information on this subject was obtained from a number of questions. The general impression, again, is that intergenerational interaction is frequent - about 50% of the older generation visit

their children often, 29% visit sometimes, and 21% hardly ever.[14] Nearly 80% answered the question, "On what specific occasions do your children visit you?" thus: "No specific occasions or reasons; they visit daily (or always)" or "My son drops in nearly every day". About 60% named sons and the same proportion named daughters among their visitors during the week preceding the interview; 74% mentioned grandchildren.

The impression gained from looking at these findings is that intergenerational contact occurs mainly in the homes of the aged and is initiated by the second and third generation. The data on intergenerational support in monogenerational households (see Chapter 8) strongly underline this impression: children, or members of their families (grandchildren, in-laws), constantly visit their aged relatives to do all kinds of household chores. This pattern of children visiting parents more than parents visiting children resembles that found among Jewish aged of Near Eastern (Islamic) origin (Weihl, 1980).

Visits of parents to children are, obviously, affected by the functional capacity of the parents - the less mobile aged visit children infrequently and mostly on specific occasions only, such as births, marriages, deaths, illness, or religious holidays. This association between mobility and visiting explains the finding that age of parent is related to the degree to which parents visit their children - functional incapacity increases with age.

---

[14] These findings are very similar to those found among Jewish aged (Weihl, 1980).

Visits of parents to children are significantly related to income of parents: frequent visits are more prevalent among parents with comparatively high income (Table 43), irrespective of sex. This finding, too, is similar to that for the Jewish elderly in Israel reported by Weihl (1980).

Table 43: Parents' Visits to Children, by Income Level of Parents (percentages)

Income Level	Frequency of Visits to Children: Often	Seldom or never	Total	N
High	64	36	100	117
Low	46	54	100	313
Total	51	49	100	430

$x^2 = 5.38$ df = 1 $p < 0.05$

Research on the Jewish aged (Weihl, 1980) showed that visits of parents to children are affected by the parents' level of formal education. No such relationship was found in this study, probably because few of the elderly had more than six years of schooling. Likewise, religious affiliation was not found to affect patterns of parents' visits to children.

As stated, visits of children to parents are very frequent. Eighty percent of the respondents reported that at least one of their children visits them "daily" or "always". About 65% stated that they had been visited by sons, and/or daughters, and/or grandchildren

during the week preceding the interview. The data on intrafamilial support reveals that 36% of persons in monogenerational households are assisted daily in household maintenance tasks by a member of a child's family. Obviously, such assistance involves the visit of this helper to the aged person's home.

Visits of children to parents are affected by the number of children: the higher the number of children, the higher the probability that at least one child visits the parents frequently (Table 44).

Table 44: Visits of Sons and Visits of Daughters in the Week Preceding the Interview, by Number of Children (percentages)

	Sons				Daughters			
	Did not visit parent	Visited parent	Total	N	Did not visit parent	Visited parent	Total	N
Number of Children								
1-6	41	59	100	215	50	50	100	215
7 +	22	78	100	232	33	67	100	232
Total	31	69	100	447	41	59	100	447
	$x^2 = 9.32$				$x^2 = 6.3$			
	df: 1				df: 1			
	$p < 0.01$				$p < 0.02$			

Table 44 seems to indicate that more aged persons are visited by ons than by daughters. While this may be true, it is important to ote that 32% of all daughters, compared with 12% of all sons, have

left the parents' village.

Parents' sex, level of formal education, and level of income do not affect childrens' visits to parents, as reported by parents.

By cross-tabulating the two variables - children visiting parents and parents visiting children - a new variable was constructed, describing patterns of mutual visiting. The distribution of this variable (Table 45) again reflects the intensity of intergenerational contact. Forty-eight percent of all parents visit children often and are visited by them "constantly".[15] Thus, half of the population report a two-directional, highly intensive interaction, while only 19% report a two-directional yet nonintensive interaction.

Patterns of mutual visiting are affected by the degree of mobility (Table 45) and level of income of parents (Table 46). Intensive mutual visits are more frequent among ambulatory elderly, compared with those whose capacity to move about is restricted. Consequently, the third pattern - children visiting constantly, parents infrequently - increases in volume among those whose capacity is restricted. This indicates the existence of a kind of compensatory mechanism: when parents' capacity to move about decreases, the intensity of children's visits increases.

Table 46 shows that two patterns of mutual visiting are affected by income of parents, though in opposite directions: constant mutual visiting, the most intensive pattern of interaction, is more frequent among high income parents, while the pattern of children's constant

---

15 Expressed in answers such as: We see the children "always", "daily", constantly," "on no special occasions"; or "They drop in all the time", etc.

Table 45: Mutual Visiting Patterns, by Mobility of Parents (percentages)

Mobility	Constant mutual visits	Occasional mutual visits	Children visit constantly, parents occasionally	Parents visit constantly, children occasionally	Total	N
Fully mobile	66	12	17	5	100	188
Restricted mobility	40	22	32	6	100	158
Housebound (incl. bedridden)	19	25	51	4	100	67
Total	48	19	28	5	100	413

Table 46: Two Types of Mutual Visiting Patterns, by Level of Income of Parents (percentages)

	Constant mutual visiting	Other Patterns	Total	N	Children visit constantly, parents occasionally	Other Patterns	Total	N
ncome evel								
ow	37	63	100	115	40	60	100	115
edium	48	52	100	176	26	74	100	176
igh	63	37	100	115	21	79	100	115
Total	49	51	100	406	28	72	100	406

$X^2 = 14.82$
df: 2
$p < 0.001$

$x^2 = 10.44$
df: 2
$p < 0.001$

visits/parents' occasional visits is more frequent low income parents. These findings are in line with those presented in Table 43 on parents' visits to children: those who visit often have higher incomes.

These data on the structure of intergenerational contacts show that contact between parents and children who do not live with them is frequent as well as intensive. The parents' home is the usual place of contact. Parents visit children too, but this pattern of intergenerational contact is dependent on income: parents whose income is low tend to visit children infrequently, but they are compensated for by frequent visits of children.

Chapter 8: INTERGENERATIONAL SUPPORT

The flow of intergenerational support, though two-directional, is not symmetric: in cases where the generations live apart from one another, more children provide help to parents than parents to children (Table 47). This assymetry is not surprising, since parents living alone need children's help more than those who use the services of their children's households. In light of this basic difference, it was surprising to find that 44% of parents who do live with children receive help from children not living with them.

Table 47: Flow of Intergenerational Support, by Household Type (percentages)

	Type of Household	
Direction of Support Flow	Monogenerational	Multigenerational
Parents to children	22	32
Children to parents	61	44

Comparisons with data on the Jewish population (Weihl, 1980) are of doubtful validity, since those data were collected over a decade ago when the economic situation was very different, and since they were obtained from a population ages 70+, older than the Arab population investigated here. The comparison data may, nevertheless, indicate two basic differences between the populations. First, the volume of help flowing from children to aged parents in the Arab rural population is much greater than that in the Jewish population. Secondly, considerably more Jewish aged parents living in

monogenerational households (41%) extend some support to their offspring.

The following analysis of intergenerational support is based on responses to two types of questions. The first inquired whether children or parents usually extend help to the other generation (without specifying the type of help), and the other was a series of questions on specific areas of help.

Table 47 shows that many parents in both types of households claim to be helped by children. It was expected that this flow of support would be influenced by age of parent and by indices of health and functional capacity, but the data did not bear out this hypothesis, which was based on findings for the Jewish population (Weihl, 1971, 1980). These relationships were expected in monogenerational households especially, because the declining functional capacity of elderly living alone brings about the need for assistance from the "outside", i.e., from children or from statutory services.

The lack of relationship between health indices and help of children to parents living in monogenerational households may be due to the fact that the proportion of parents helped by children by far exceeds the proportion of incapacitated parents. Table 47 shows that 61% of parents in this household type receive help from children[16]. The proportion of housebound (including bedridden) is 22%. Another 20% need help with negotiating stairs, 11% need help with dressing,

---

[16] These data are corroborated by another question in the survey.

and 15% need help with washing themselves.[17] Given these data on functional incapacity, it is difficult to imagine why more than half of all persons in monogenerational households would need help with household maintenance activities. It therefore seems that the supply of help greatly exceeds the demand (i.e., the need). Further evidence of this will be presented later in this chapter.

There are indications that religious affiliation may affect the flow of help from children to parents who live in monogenerational households. More Moslem (49%) than Christian (36%) parents in both household types mentioned being customarily helped by children, but this difference is not statistically significant. Although the lesser degree of assistance among Christians may be due to cultural norms, it should be remembered that the economic status of this group is somewhat higher than that of the Moslem aged, and there may therefore be less need for help from children.

Further insight into the issue of need for versus supply of help is gained by examining the question of why children do not help parents. In both households, about 35% of those who are not helped by children claim not to need such help. This leaves 65% of parents with perceived needs which are not met by children. Among them there are significantly more Moslem parents, more parents whose income is low, and more housebound. (These categories overlap somewhat). By definition, the latter two categories consist of elderly who have overt needs. Thus, probably a quite high proportion of parents who perceive needs and are not helped by children objectively need help.

---

[17] These categories of functionally incapacitated elderly overlap somewhat with both each other and with the category of housebound elderly.

Children's Assistance to Parents

The broad spectrum of types of childrens' help may be broken down into three categories, two of which are instrumental:

a. Household maintenance tasks (cooking, cleaning, laundry, shopping, errands).

b. Financial assistance.

c. Emotional support.

In this project, all three areas were tapped via a number of questions, some of them direct ("Do your children provide you with regular financial assistance?") and some indirect ("Who usually cleans the floors in your house?").

Monogenerational households

1. Household maintenance

Examination of all the data gathered in this study leads to the conclusion that assistance of offspring to parents living alone is widespread. "Offspring" is a more suitable word than children, since more than 80% of those who extend help in the household maintenance area are grandchildren, mainly teen-aged granddaughters. They cook (or bring cooked food from their parents' homes), clean, and do the shopping and laundry. Some of them help handicapped grandparents who cannot manage some activities of daily living by themselves. It is highly probable that most of these instrumentally oriented encounters carry a strong expressive element: the task is an instrumental one, but the encounter between grandchild and grandparent(s) is in itself an expressive one and thus may also be emotionally supportive.

There is much evidence that in the area of household maintenance the help of offspring is massive, with regard to both the number of

parents receiving help and the variety of activities for which help is extended. Sixty percent of parents in monogenerational households receive household maintenance help from offspring; about half of them are helped by more than one person. Thirty-six percent are assisted in one way or another on a daily basis.

Specifically, members of the family:

- do the laundry of 48% of all parents.
- clean the homes of 40% of all parents.
- shop for 38% of all parents.
- cook for 30% of all parents.

On the basis of these figures, it is not surprising that a high proportion of elderly in monogenerational households, including an unexpectedly high proportion of women, do not perform basic household tasks by themselves (Table 48).

Table 48: Performance of Specific Household Chores by Elderly in Monogenerational Households in the 24 Hours Preceding the Interview, by Sex (percentages

	Men (N = 82)	Women (N =105)	Total (N = 187)
Cooking	9	59	36
Cleaning	4	48	28
Dishwashing	6	58	35
Shopping[a]	27	19	22

[a] Shopping is the one task which men perform more than women. In traditional Moslem society (rural and urban), women rarely shop.

The data on household maintenance indicate that help by grandchildren and children probably far exceeds objective needs, as expressed by actual difficulties with performance of the various tasks. Nevertheless, there is evidence of a relationship between objective needs and offered help. Table 49 shows that more housebound than ambulatory parents receive help with preparation of meals (the same is true for help with all other household maintenance activities). Similarly, cleaning and laundry services performed by offspring are affected by age of parent: the old-old (ages 75+) are helped more than the young-old.

Table 49: Assistance with Cooking, in Monogenerational Households, by Mobility Level (percentages)

	Person Who Cooks			
Mobility Level	Aged or spouse	Other family member	Total	N
Ambulatory	85	15	100	131
Housebound	60	40	100	55
Total	70	30	100	180

$x^2 = 7.73$ df = 1 $p < 0.01$

The most important other factor which influences the pattern of support from children to aged parents are cultural norms. A review of both the survey data and other information gathered in the interviews gives the impression that many of the elderly, especially women, do very little in terms of household chores or other "work". Hardly any of them mentioned sewing or mending as an activity they perform. Only

8% affirmed that they had taken care of grandchildren in the 24 hours preceding the interview. It thus seems that many women have "retired" from their main roles as housewives and mothers and haven taken on the role (probably a culturally normative one) of the "honored elderly" who is exempted from work and served by children, grandchildren, and children-in-law.

2. Financial Assistance

Thirty-seven percent of the aged residing in monogenerational households claim to receive financial assistance from children, although none of them receives such help on a regular basis. Financial assistance is not affected by age of parent, by health indicators, or by level of parents' income. All of these findings differ from those found in the Jewish poulation (Weihl, 1980). Considerably fewer Jewish parents (in all three phases of that study) were found to be financially supported by children;[18] in addition, income of parents was significantly related to their children's financial support, in the expected direction - more of those with low incomes were assisted by children, and quite a high proportion received regular financial help. The absence of these relationships among the Arab rural population may be due to the irregularity of this help, which is possibly received in small amounts.

---

[18] This is not surprising, since many more aged Arab parents are eligible for income supplements - over 80%, compared with less than 40% in the Jewish population (National Insurance Institute, "Recipients of Old Age Pensions, by Localities", 1982, Table 5).

3. Emotional Support

Fifty-three percent of parents living in monogenerational households mentioned emotional support when asked an open ended question about areas of children's help to parents.[19] This, too, is a much higher proportion than that found by Weihl (1980) for the Jewish aged population.[20] Emotional support is not affected by any of the following independent variables: age, sex, marital status, income, functional capacity, and self evaluation of health. It is also not related to feelings of loneliness.

Parents in monogenerational households were also asked, "When you need advice on anything, do you turn to any of your children?". Forty-four percent answered affirmatively. This variable, too, is affected by none of the above-mentioned variables, except income: more low income parents than higher income parents turn to children for advice ($p < 0.02$). The advice variable is also affected by religious affiliation: considerably more Moslem parents turn to children for advice than do Christian or Druze parents (Table 50). As pointed out in Chapter 2, Moslem aged tend to be categorized in the lower income brackets. Religious affiliation, therefore, is probably the more influential factor, unless most advice sought relates to financial affairs. This is not very likely, as other data indicate.

---

19 The term "emotional suport," though not used explicitly by the respondents, was chosen to describe such statements as, "The children keep up my morale".

20 Eighteen percent of the Jewish elderly ages 70+ mentioned emotional support when asked the identical question. This variable was found to be related to both age and income of parents.

Table 50: Parents in Monogenerational Households who Turn to Children for Advice, by Religious Affiliation, (percentages)

Religious affiliation	Turn to child	Do not turn to child	Total	N
Moslem	51	49	100	109
Christian and Druze	30	70	100	60
Total	44	56	100	169

$x^2 = 3.61$ df = 1 $p < 0.10$

Multigenerational households - financial and emotional support

Aged living in multigenerational households are not dependent on the help of children not living with them when their capacity to care for themselves declines. The household in which they live provides for them, unless the children are very young. The offspring who live apart from elderly in multigenerational households do not usually have to provide instrumental household services, but they may be active in the two other broad areas - financial and emotional support. Twenty-three percent of the aged in multigenerational households are helped financially by children not living with them, and 28% claim to receive emotional support from these children. The respective proportions in the Jewish population were 12% and 14%. Thus, in multigenerational households as well, support of children to parents in the rural Arab population exceeds that prevailing in the Jewish population.

The comparatively high percentage of parents living with a child who are financially supported - most of them irregularly - by a child living in another home was unexpected. It is difficult to understand

the need for this support. It may constitute small amounts of money which parents use for gifts to grandchildren or for their personal needs. Such assistance may be an important addition to the pocket money of the elderly, since more than 75% of all parents living with a child contribute all of their income to the household.[21]

Financial support by children living apart from their parents is not influenced by income of parent or by the type of multigenerational household in which parents live. It was thought that this support may be given to aged parents who provide for a young family or to parents who live with unmarried (mostly not working) daughters, but these hypotheses proved to be wrong. On the basis of the available data, it is not possible to identify the factors at play in this area.

There is further evidence of financial transfers from the younger to the older generation in multigenerational households: 32% of parents ask their children for money when in need. Two-thirds of these turn to a child they live with, especially if this child is a married son.[22] This finding is somewhat unexpected, since it seems likely that parents would more easily turn to an unmarried working son, one who has no familial obligations of his own. Probably here, too, cultural norms are at play.

In multigeneratonal households, as well as in the Jewish population, emotional support (determined by responses to an open

---

21 It should be recalled that 18% of all elderly parents in multigenerational households live with children under age 18, and quite a few more (those who live with unmarried daughters) function as heads of the household.

22 Statistically significant ($p < 0.01$).

ended question) is not related to either the physical or financial needs of parents; neither is it more abundant in any specific type of multigenerational household.

Another source of evidence of emotional support in multigenerational households were responses to the question, "Who, among the children who do not live with you, takes care of you the most?". Fifty-seven percent of the parents reported having a solicitous child[23] (mostly sons). Table 51 shows that considerably more Moslems than Christian and Druze claim to have a solicitous child outside the home.

Table 51: Existence of Solicitous Child Outside the Multigenerational Household, by Religious Affiliation (Percentages)

Religious affiliation	No solicitious child mentioned	Solicitious child mentioned	Total	N
Moslem	37	63	100	139
Christian and Druze	52	48	100	107
Total	43	57	100	240

Not significant.

Having a solicitous child largely overlaps with receiving emotional support from children: 82% of those who receive emotional support have a solicitous child.

[23] One-fifth of the respondents could not point to a specific child, stating that all care for them to the same degree. Another 14% named their eldest son as the one who is the most solicitous.

Parents' Assistance to Children

Table 47 shows that more parents in multi- than in monogenerational households customarily extend help to children not living with them. In the Jewish population (Weihl, 1978, second phase) the higher proportion was found in the monogenerational households, 41%, compared with 27% in multigenerational households. This difference was explained by differences in age and income: the Jewish elderly living in monogenerational households were generally younger, more of them were (married) men, and their incomes were higher. Thus, they were believed to be more able, both physically and financially, to extend help to children. No such differences were found between the two types of Arab rural households, but this fact does not explain the larger degree of help to children (living apart from parents) by parents who live with at least one child.

Help to children living apart from parents is related in both household types to health factors: housebound aged, and those who rate their health as "bad" tend ($p < 0.01$) not to help children. In multigenerational households, this variable is also affected by income: more low-income parents do not provide help ($p < 0.04$).

Two main areas of help to children were mentioned: caring for grandchildren (23% in multi- and 15% in monogenerational households) and giving of presents (9% and 5%, respectively). Few parents in monogenerational households mentioned extending financial aid to children not living with them. Thus, the main flow of help from the older to the younger generation seems to be directed toward grandchildren and probably has a distinctly expressive flavor. On the other hand, there is evidence that quite a few women living in

multigenerational households participate in household maintenance activities: 16% mentioned having cooked on the day preceding the interview, and 12% mentioned having cleaned the house. Some of these women may not consider these activities as constituting "help" to children.

Patterns of Mutual Aid

The flow of intergenerational support may be two-directional (from parents to children and vice versa), it may be uni-directional in either direction, or there may be no transfer at all. By cross-tabulating the two variables - "help of parents to children" with "help of children to parents" - the frequencies of all four patterns were obtained.

Table 52 shows that the distribution of these patterns differs by household type. The modal pattern in the monogenerational household is children to parents only, while the modal pattern in multigenerational households is no help in either direction. This main difference seems to be the logical one. Parents living alone are apt to need children's help, especially if parents are declining physically and/or mentally. And, in fact, the data show that this pattern is significantly affected by the degree of mobility of the aged parent: those whose mobility is restricted (including the housebound and bedridden) tend significantly ($p < 0.05$) to receive help from children, rather than provide it. On the other hand, parents living with children are more protected and therefore less in need of "outside" help.

Table 52: Patterns of Mutual Aid, by Household Type (percentages)

Household type	Two-directional help	No help	Children to parents only	Parents to children only	Total	N
Mono-generational	17	35	44	4	100	168
Multi-generational	23	46	21	10	100	269
Total	21	42	30	8	100	437

Bad housing conditions are more characteristics of monogenerational households (Table 23). It is therefore not surprising that those who dwell in older houses, many of which lack basic amenities and some of which are barely adequate, tend significantly toward the pattern of children to parents only. Nearly half of the elderly in monogenerational households are characterized by this aid pattern (Table 53).

Table 53: Patterns of Intergenerational Support, by Type of Dwelling (Percentages)

	Mutual Aid Patterns			
Type of Dwelling	Children to parents only	Other patterns	Total	N
Old house	41	59	100	162
Modern house	23	77	100	273
Total	30	70	100	435

$x^2 = 8.13$ df = 1 $p < 0.01$

Religous affiliation affects patterns of intergenerational support. The children-to-parents only mode (Table 54a) characterizes Moslem households, while among Christians and Druze, the modal pattern is that of no intergenerational support (Table 54b). These findings concur with others on differences between religious groups; Moslems tend towards closer ties and more instrumental and emotional support from children.

Table 54a: Patterns of Intergenerational Support, by Religious Affiliation - Children to Parent Pattern (percentages)

Religious affiliation	Children to parents only	Other patterns	Total	N
Moslem	36	64	100	266
Christian and Druze	21	79	100	171
Total	30	70	100	437

$x^2 = 6.04$ df = 1 $p < 0.02$

Table 54b: Patterns of Intergenerational Support, by Religious Affiliation - No Aid Pattern (percentages)

Religious affiliation	No aid	Other patterns	Total	N
Moslems	35	65	100	266
Christians and Druze	52	48	100	171
Total	42	58	100	432

$x^2 = 6.24$ df = 1 $p < 0.02$

These findings indicate that childrens' help is directed toward those in need, and that many of the recipient parents acknowledge that their children pay attention to their needs. It should be remembered that the specific categories of instrumental aid discussed did not include parents' use of the washing, cooking, laundry, and toilet facilities of sons. Nevertheless, parents may have been thinking of this type of help when answering the question, "Do your children customarily help you?". This would partially explain the high percentage of parents who responded to this question affirmatively.

Intergenerational Expressive Interaction

The purpose of this portion of the study was to gather basic information on the prevailing patterns of interaction in the heavily value-laden areas of family advice-seeking and decisionmaking. The commonly accepted image of the traditional family is of a patriarchal division of labor and authority - the father is endowed with the decisionmaking power, on the basis of traditional values and because he owns the means of production. The family's interest and father's will, for instance, direct the choice of spouse for children (with little or no input from the latter) and determine fiscal decisions, such as how to spend or invest money (though fathers often consult with their sons in financial matters). Fathers expect their sons to consult and obey them; in short, they expect to command all authority (Lutfiyya, 1966, 1970; Beck, 1970; Rosenfeld, 1964). These traditional family values have been exposed to "modern" influences for quite some time. This study intended to investigate the changes that have taken place, including the patterns of intergenerational

interaction that have developed. The questionnaire included several questions in this area, four of them open-ended. One question applied only to those living in monogenerational households and shall not be included in the following discussion.

1. Do your children seek your advice? If so, on what subjects?

2. Do you seek your children's advice? If so, on what subjects?

3. Let us assume that one of your children or grandchildren wishes to marry and chooses a spouse. You do not agree with this choice and say so. Would they accept your opinion, or at least consider your objections?

4. Young people today tend to choose a spouse themselves. Do you agree with this arrangement? (closed question).

5. When the family has some money available for purchasing equipment such as a car or truck, building a new house or renovating the old one, developing a business, etc., does your opinion count? Whose opinion is the decisive one?

6. Young people today tend to decide on their own how to invest their money. Do you agree with this situation? (closed question).

There is one common tendency discernible in the answers to all but one of these questions (number 4): the sexes differ significantly in both areas - advice-seeking and decisionmaking. Women tend to be uninvolved in decisionmaking about choice of spouse for children or grandchildren ($p < 0.001$), and they are uninvolved in financial decisionmaking ($p < 0.001$).[24] Eighty percent of women, compared with

---

24 "Involvement" includes all answers which indicated participation of the respondent in the decisionmaking process. The responses range from "I decide" to "They consider me, or ask my opinion, but act according to their own opinion".

51% of men ($p < 0.001$), are not asked for advice by children, while 62% of women, compared with 48% of men, do not seek advice from their children ($p < 0.05$).

The rate of children seeking advice from parents is influenced by the level of formal education of parents. Table 55 shows that parents who had no schooling tended not to be consulted by children. Further analysis showed that this relationship is significant among women only, probably because so many more women are uneducated. This relationship is important because it focuses attention on the younger generation's contribution to the structure and content of intergenerational relations: uneducated parents are not considered resourceful.

Level of formal education of parents does not affect advice-seeking in the direction of parents seeking their children's advice. We note that the difference between men and women is a much smaller one than for advice-seeking in the other direction of flow, initiated by children, and that more parents seek advice from the younger generation than vice versa.

Cross-tabulation of the two variables of intergenerational advice-seeking results in delineating four patterns of such interaction (Table 56), thereby highlighting the difference between the sexes. Nearly 60% of women reported no advice-seeking interaction in either direction, and only 16% mentioned two-way advice-seeking,[25] compared with 41% of men ($p < 0.001$). Inasmuch as women are engaged

---

[25] More Druze than Moslem or Christian women are engaged in counseling in both directions.

Table 55: Children's Advice-seeking from Parents, by Parents' Level of Formal Education and Sex, (percentages)

	No schooling	Some schooling	Total
Men			
Parent consulted by child.	43	56	50
Parent not consulted by child.	57	44	50
Total	100	100	100
Number	102	140	242
		Not significant	
Women			
Parent consulted by child.	15	39	20
Parent not consulted by child.	85	61	80
Total	100	100	100
Number	175	38	213
	$x^2 = 5.73$	df = 1	$p < 0.02$
Men and Women			
Parent consulted by child.	26	52	34
Parent not consulted by child.	74	48	66
Total	100	100	100
Number	277	178	455
	$x^2 = 16.6$	df = 1	$p < 0.001$

Table 56: Patterns of Intergenerational Advice-seeking, by Sex (percentages)

	Men	Women	Total
Two way advice-seeking	41	16	29
One-way advice-seeking, initiated by children	10	4	7
One-way advice-seeking, initiated by parents	11	22	16
No advice-seeking	38	58	48
Total	100	100	100
Number	242	211	453

in an advice-seeking interaction with children, it is more of a one-directional flow from the older to the younger generation - 38% compared with 20% in the opposite direction. The advice-seeking interaction of older men with their children is patterned quite differently: the proportions of flow are equal in both directions.

Religious affiliation affects patterns of intergenerational advice-seeking (Table 57). The lowest rate of two-way advice seeking and the highest rate of no advice-seeking was found among the small group of Druze aged parents, indicating that intergenerational interaction in this area is low, or put differently, the gap between the generations seems to be rather wide.

Among the Moslem population there is a pronounced high rate of one-way advice-seeking - parents to children; the other direction is similar in volume in all three groups.

Table 57: Patterns of Intergenerational Advice-seeking, by Religious Affiliation, (Percentages)

	Moslems	Christians	Druze	Total
Two-way advice-seeking	29	33	17	29
One-way advice-seeking, initiated by children	7	7	5	7
One-way advice-seeking, initiated by parents	23	6	7	16
No advice-seeking	40	54	71	48
Total	100	100	100	100
Number	273	138	42	453

Tables 58 and 59 illustrate the relationship of sex to patterns of decisionmaking interaction. Table 58 shows that most women (over 80%) agree that the young should choose a spouse independently and that about the same proportion are not involved in decisionmaking about choice of spouse. This lack of involvement may reflect the traditional pattern (which prescribes that women are exempted from decisionmaking and advice-giving). Men seem to be torn between adherence to their traditional role and the new ways of the younger generations. Nearly two-thirds of men who agree that children's choice of spouse should be arrived at independently nevertheless take part in these decisions. The sense of participation, however, may be just that - the child's or grandchild's choice of spouse may already match the parent's choice, and the parent is left with the feeling that his or her opinion has been considered seriously. Table 59, which also includes data on financial decision-making, reveals the

same pattern: nearly two-thirds of the women are not involved in either area of decisionmaking, while men are nearly equally distributed between being involved in both areas or not being involved in either.

Table 58: Involvement of Parent in Choice of Children's Spouse and Satisfacti with Childrens' Independent Choice of Spouse, by Sex (percentages

	Men	Women
Parent agrees that children should independently choose a spouse and takes part in this decision.	43	25
Parent agrees that children should independently choose spouse and does not take part in thid decision.	30	57
Parent does not agree that children should independently choose a spouse and takes part in this decision.	11	1
Parent does not agree that children should independently choose a spouse and does not take part in this decision.	16	17
Total	100	100
Number	228	211
	$x^2 = 6.37$	$x^2 = 9.14$
	df = 1	df = 1
	$p < 0.012$	$p < 0.0025$

Table 59: Involvement of Parent in Choice of Children's Spouse, and in Financial Decisionmaking, by Sex (percentages)

	Men	Women
Involved in making both types of decisions.	39	17
Involved in choise of spouse; not involved in financial decisionmaking.	15	10
Involved in financial decisionmaking; not involved in choice of spouse.	13	19
Not involved in making either type of decision.	33	64
Total	100	100
Number	228	211
	$x^2 = 40.19$	$x^2 = 49.13$
	df = 1	df = 1
	$p < 0.0000$	$p < 0.0000$

These findings are qualified to some extent by religious affiliation: fewer Moslem women are involved in financial decison-making than Christian women (p , 0.02). Moslem men, more than Christian or Druze men, seek advice from their children ($p < 0.002$), and fewer agree with the modern norm of the child's independent choice of spouse ($p < 0.005$). These findings probably indicate that Moslems, more than Christians and Druze, continue to adhere to the traditional family values.

Involvement in financial decisionmaking, as well as in decisions concerning choice of spouse are related to age of parent: old-old (ages 75+) parents tend to be less involved than the young-old (Tables 60 and 61).

Table 60: Involvement in Choice of Children's Spouse by Age (percentages)

Ages	Involved	Not involved	Total	N
65-79	45	55	100	333
80+	27	73	100	111
Total	45	55	100	444

$x^2 = 5.6$ d.f. = 1 $p < 0.05$

Table 61: Involvement in Financial Decisionmaking, by Age (percentages)

Ages	Involved	Not Involved	Total	N
65-69	51	49	100	96
70-74	44	56	100	142
75-79	42	58	100	96
80-84	30	70	100	66
85+	17	83	100	48
Total	40	60	100	448

$x^2 = 19.55$ d.f. = 4 $p < 0.0006$

These findings may indicate that parents, as they age, disengage themselves from accepting responsibility and from performing their long-established roles; or they may represent the parents' rejection

of the modern values of the younger generation.[26] When considering these possibilities, it should be remembered that many of the younger parents in the study population still care for young children, and others live with older unmarried children (especially daughters) for whom they feel responsible. These parents regard themselves as heads of households and families, and they take on all the responsibilities of this status. Perhaps, at the end of this stage in the life cycle, in old age, parents enjoy the relief from burdensome resonsibilities and accept the fact that the younger generation behaves independently. On the other hand, old parents may reject the independent ways of the young, feel powerless to impose their will, and react by avoiding situations that would confront them with their loss of authority. Both of these explanations fit some of the propositions put forward by the theory of disengagement.

It appears that in this short discussion more questions have been raised than answers given. The patterns of interaction described by the study population cannot be compared with those prevailing fifty years ago because there are no previous baseline data on this subject. Presumably, the sex differences were even more extreme, and the small proportion of women who today claim to take part in major decisions concerning the household and the family may mark the beginning of a new development. The finding that level of education affects only one of six variables reflects a missing link in this study: research on intergenerational interaction should not be one-sided; this inter-

---

26 The most frequent response (over 40%) to questions involving both types of decisions was: "The children decide on their own; they don't consider me".

action cannot be understood without collecting data from both generations, including information on education of children. Presumably, the older generations has changed less than the younger, but changes in the children affect the interaction between the generations and are reflected in their parents' behavior and attitudes.

Chapter 9: ATTITUDES TOWARD LIVING ARRANGEMENTS

The home, including its physical as well as human components, constitutes the main life space of aged persons, both physically and emotionally. The elderly spend most of their time, carry out most of their instrumental activities, and interact most with other people in the home. The proportion of time spent at home increases with age until, for many people, all time is spent there. Therefore, the components of the household - its physical structure, the services it renders, the human elements, and the prevailing emotional atmosphere - are increasingly important to the wellbeing of the elderly.

This study examined these components via the perceptions of the elderly in the study population.[27] The perceived advantages and disadvantages of one's household, and the reasons for satisfaction or dissatisfaction, may serve as a basis for understanding the ways that aged persons think about and are influenced by their immediate life space.

The questionnaire included four questions aimed to tap attitudes toward living arrangements:

1. Are you satisfied with your present living arrangement? (closed question).
2. What are the advantages and disadvantages of the type of household (mono- or multigenerational) in which you live? (open-ended question).
3. What do you consider to be the most preferable living arrangement for the elderly: living with children, living

---

[27] The physical aspects of housing are discussed in Chapter 5.

apart from children, or living in a home for the aged? (closed question).

4. If you became incapacitated and needed help with your daily activities, which of these living arrangements would you prefer? (closed question).

An overall view of the responses to these questions indicates that the present living arrangement (the one in which the respondent now lives) is the preferred one. The overwhelming majority in both mono- and multigenerational households is satisfied with the current arrangement. Most respondents also consider their current household type to be the preferable one for older people, and nearly all respondents in both household types perceive advantages in their respective living arrangements; the proportion who perceive disadvantages is very small (Table 62).

Table 62: Attitudes Toward Living Arrangements, by Household Type (percentages)

	Household Type	
	Monogenerational	Multigenerational
Satisfied with present living arrangement.	84	93
Prefer present household type.	82	74
Prefer to remain in present household if incapacitated.	78	87
Perceive advantages to present living arrangement.	92	92
Perceive disadvantages to present living arrangement.	65	36

same pattern: nearly two-thirds of the women are not involved in either area of decisionmaking, while men are nearly equally distributed between being involved in both areas or not being involved in either.

Table 55: Involvement of Parent in Choice of Children's Spouse and Satisfact with Childrens' Independent Choice of Spouse, by Sex (percentage

	Men	Women
Parent agrees that children should independently choose a spouse and takes part in this decision.	43	25
Parent agrees that children should independently choose spouse and does not take part in thid decision.	30	57
Parent does not agree that children should independently choose a spouse and takes part in this decision.	11	1
Parent does not agree that children should independently choose a spouse and does not take part in this decision.	16	17
Total	100	100
Number	228	211
	$x^2 = 6.37$	$x^2 = 9.14$
	df = 1	df = 1
	$p < 0.012$	$p < 0.0025$

These data on high rate of satisfaction may be somewhat misleading. More detailed analysis (Tables 63, 64) shows that this satisfaction is qualified when compared with statements about the preferred arrangement for the elderly. Nearly one quarter of those who live in multigenerational households and express satisfaction do not perceive this living arrangement as the preferable one for older people (Table 63); and one out of seven persons who perceive no disadvantages to living in a multigenerational household believe that elderly persons should live on their own (Table 64). The trends found in monogenerational households are similar. This incongruence reflects underlying negative perceptions of current living arrangements. It appears that quite a few respondents, though satisfied with and comfortable in their present situation, would prefer to live differently if possible.[28]

There are other indications that expressed satisfaction with living arrangements (especially living apart from children) is qualified. A high proportion (65%) of respondents living apart from children perceive disadvantages in this household type. Nevertheless, most of these respondents believe it to be the preferable living arrangement for the elderly (Table 64). For these people - 49% of all those living in monogenerational households - the advantages of living apart from children exceed the disadvantages, despite the potential sense of insecurity regarding the instrumental aspects of this

---

28 Most aged (87% of those living with children and 79% of those who are not) say that they need help with activities of daily living. The wish among those who live alone to join their children is affected by limitations on mobility: housebound elderly living alone tend to say that they would like to join their children.

Table 63: Satisfaction with Living Arrangement and Preferred Living Arrangement for Elderly, by Household Type (percentages)

	Household Type	
	Monogenerational	Multigenerational
Satisfied with living arrangement; prefer monogenerational household for aged people.	75	22
Satisfied with living arrangement; prefer multigenerational household for aged people.	9	71
Not satisfied with living arrangement; prefer monogenerational household for aged people.	8	4
Not satisfied with living arrangement; prefer multigenerational household for aged people.	8	3
	N = 168	N = 271
	x^2 = 13.4	x^2 = 6.6
	df = 1	df = 1
	p < 0.001	p < 0.01

Table 64: Perceived Disadvantages of Present Living Arrangement and Preferred Living Arrangement for Elderly, by Household Type (percentages)

	Household Type	
	Monogenerational	Multigenerational
Perceive disadvantages; prefer monogenerational household for aged persons.	49	16
Perceive disadvantages; prefer multigenerational household for aged persons.	15	20
Do not perceive disadvantages; prefer monogenerational household for aged persons.	33	9
Do not perceive disadvantages; prefer multigenerational household for aged persons.	2	55
	N = 162	N = 262
	x^2 = 3.73	x^2 = 14.3
	df = 1	df = 1
	p < 0.10	p < 0.001

household type. Although many elderly in multigenerational households also perceive disadvantages yet prefer this type of household, there are two important differences: the proportion who mention disadvantages is much smaller - 36% compared with 64%; and among these, the proportion who prefer their current living arrangement, despite its disadvantages, is also smaller - 55% compared with 77%.

These differences in perception reflect a basic difference between the two household types. When living with adult (usually married) children, the elderly must adapt, at least to some degree, to the children's way of life, as well as to the fact that household management is no longer in their hands. They lose autonomy and gain security, as there is little need to cope with problems of daily living. This household type may be somewhat overly protective, yet some aged persons respond positively to this quality - they enjoy being dependent. The monogenerational household, on the other hand, demands initiative and autonomous behavior, including exercise of responsibility and effective coping with the various aspects of household management. Probably the most important of these aspects is decisionmaking.

While considering these points, it should be remembered that only 29% of the rural Arab elderly in multigenerational households live with a married child. Most of the others live with adult unmarried children, and it is this group that tends more to regard this living arrangement negatively (Table 65). They may have difficulty coping adequately with what they deem an unfair or unacceptable situation. The status of "never married" is heavily stigmatized in this society, and both generations feel the effects.

Table 65: Preferred Living Arrangement for Elderly, by Actual Living Arrangement of Parents in Multigenerational Households (percentages)

	Preferred Living Arrangement for the Elderly			
	With children	Apart from children	Total	N
Actual Living Arrangement				
With married child	87	13	100	78
With other child	68	32	100	189
Total	74	26	100	267

$x^2 = 5.09$ df - 1 $p < 0.02$

Factors Affecting Preferred Living Arrangement of Elderly in Multigenerational Households

Table 63 shows that most residents of both households types generally prefer the type in which they live. This preference is influenced by a number of factors, depending on household type.

One factor, already discussed, is the structure of the multigenerational household (Table 65). Elderly living with unmarried children have a less positive attitude toward the multigenerational household. Another demographic, as well as structural, factor affecting attitudes toward the multigenerational household is the marital status of the parent(s) residing there: widowed parents, irrespective of sex, tend to prefer this household type over the other, while nearly one-third of the married parents indicate dissatisfaction with living with children (Table 66). It seems that for married parents the security of the marital relationship (or

simply the fact that they live together) overrides the fear of being cut off from ongoing contact with offspring.

Table 66: Preferred Living Arrangement for Elderly, by Marital Status of Elderly in Multigenerational Households (percentages)

	Preferred Living Arrangement for Elderly			
	With children	Apart from children	Total	N
Marital Status				
Married	69	31	100	186
Widowed	84	10	100	94
Total	74	26	100	280

$x^2 = 3.53$ df = 1 not significant

Among the factors mentioned as disadvantages, only one was found to be statistically significant: intergenerational stress. Nearly two out of three parents who mentioned this factor do not prefer the multigenerational household (Table 67). Feelings of loneliness also influence attitudes toward living in a multigenerational household, although the relationship is not statistically significant. Not surprisingly, parents in multigenerational households who always feel lonely (despite the presence of their family) are prone to prefer the monogenerational household (Table 68). There is no indication in the data that feelings of loneliness are induced by intergenerational stress.

Table 67: Preferred Living Arrangement for Elderly, by Perceived Intergenerational Stress (Multigenerational Households) - percentages

	Preferred Living Arrangement for Elderly			
	With children	Apart from children	Total	N[a]
Perceived Intergenerational Stress				
Mentioned as disadvantage	37	63	100	40
Not mentioned as disadvantage	69	31	100	55
Total	56	44	100	95

[a] N = all respondents who mentioned disadvantages.

$x^2 = 4.7$ df = 1 $p < 0.05$

Table 68: Preferred Living Arrangement for Elderly, by Feelings of Loneliness (Multigenerational Households) - percentages

	Preferred Living Arrangement for Elderly			
	With children	Apart from children	Total	N
eelings of Loneliness				
lways	56	44	100	39
ften or Sometimes	77	23	100	241
Total	74	26	100	280

$x^2 = 3.6$ df = 1 not significant

In summary, it seems that the quality of relationships with children is the most important factor influencing the preference of household type by elderly in multigenerational households. Although there is a negative impact of intergenerational stress, there is also a positive influence of residing with a married child (or vice versa - living with adult unmarried children causes stress, worry, and disputes).

Factors Affecting Preferred Living Arrangement of Elderly in Monogenerational Households

Two independent variables are significantly related to the preferred living arrangements of elderly who live apart from children[29]: feelings of loneliness and autonomy in performance of household maintenance tasks.

Although the direction of the impact of feelings of loneliness (Table 69) seems to be the reverse of that prevailing in multigenerational households (Table 68), it is, in fact, the same. In both cases, residents who frequently feel lonely tend more than those who do not to prefer a household type other than their current one. It seems as if feelings of loneliness inspire a desire for change, an escape from an undesirable situation. In this sense, feelings of loneliness probably constitute an expression of a more general, wider-based feeling of dissatisfaction.

Autonomy in performance of household maintenance tasks is the other independent variable found to be significantly related to

---

29 Including childless elderly, but these are very few (see Chapter 2).

preference of living arrangement. Elderly in monogenerational households who do their own cleaning and cooking tend to prefer this living arrangement for the elderly, implying that autonomous living is preferable to dependency (Table 70).

Table 69: Preferred Living Arrangement for Elderly, by Feelings of Loneliness (Monogenerational Households) - percentages

	Preferred Living Arrangement for Elderly			
	With children	Apart from children	Total	N
Feelings of Loneliness				
Often	27	73	100	84
Sometimes	10	90	100	100
Total	18	82	100	184

$x^2 = 4.68$ df = 1 $p < 0.05$

Table 70: Preferred Living Arrangement for Elderly, by Autonomy in Cleaning Tasks (Monogenerational Households) - percentages

	Preferred Living Arrangement for Elderly			
	With children	Apart from children	Total	N
Resident cleans own home.	11	89	100	109
Someone other than resident cleans home.	27	73	100	71
Total	17	83	100	180

$x^2 = 3.87$ df = 1 $p < 0.05$

Analysis of the second question regarding attitudes toward living arrangements resulted in two sets of data: the specific advantages and disadvantages mentioned, and the categorization of responses by whether or not advantages/disadvantages were perceived.

Table 62 shows that more than 90% of the residents in both household types perceive advantages in their respective living arrangements. The lack of distribution of this variable prevents further analysis. The disadvantages mentioned by residents of both household types do not hamper their stated desire to live in their present households. In multigenerational households, 86% of those who do not perceive disadvantages, compared with 55% of those who do, prefer this living arrangement for elderly persons. The corresponding proportions for monogenerational household are 94% and 77% (Table 64).

A number of factors affect the perception of disadvantages by residents of monogenerational households, factors which are noticeably absent in the responses from multigenerational households (Table 71). This difference is partly explained by differing bases for dissatisfaction, as shown in Table 72.

Table 71 indicates that perception of disadvantages is linked to the instrumental aspects of the monogenerational household: functional incapacity, as expressed by restricted mobility, increases with age and causes dependence on others who are not easily available in this type of household. This finding corresponds with the data on specific types of disadvantages as presented in Table 72. The perception of disadvantages in living apart from children among Moslems concurs with the finding that Moslems living in this household type tend more than Christians and Druze to prefer the multigenera-

Table 71: Variables Affecting Perception of Disadvantages, in Current Living Arrangement, by Household Type[a] (percentages)

Affecting Variable	Monogenerational	Multigenerational
Age: % of perceived disadvantages increases with age.	$x^2 = 4.74$ $p < 0.05$	-
Level of mobility: % of perceived disadvantages increases with increase of restriction of mobility.	$x^2 = 13.98$ $p < 0.001$	-
Religious Affiliation: Moslems tend more to perceive disadvantages.	$x^2 = 4.83$ $p < 0.05$	-
Feeling of Loneliness: % of perceived disadvantages increases with increased feelings of loneliness.	$x^2 = 5.48$ $p = 0.02$	-
Building Type: % of perceived disadvantages is higher among elderly in older houses.	$x^2 = 4.29$ $p < 0.05$	$x^2 = 3.65$ $p = 0.10$

[a] Variables which do not affect the dependent variable in both households are not presented.

tional household for the elderly.[30] Feelings of loneliness are an expression of dissatisfaction and therefore concur with perception of disadvantages.

Table 72 lists specific advantages and disadvantages mentioned by the study population. Instrumental components of wellbeing are of primary concern to residents of both households. Elderly living in multigenerational households underline the availability of services as an advantage, while the non-availability of household help is high on

30 $x^2 = 3.16$; $p < 0.10$

instrumental advantages of this household type were mentioned, although "peace and quiet" may be read as an instrumental factor. (As mentioned, the elderly in multigenerational households are disturbed by noise).

While these findings on the Arab rural population are, on the whole, similar to those of the Jewish population (Table 73), there are some differences. The proportion of Jewish respondents mentioning disadvantages of monogenerational households exceeds the proportion of those who mention advantages. The positive qualities of this household type - lack of intergenerational stress and the sense of not being a burden on children - are phrased differently by the Jewish elderly: living apart from children is a safeguard for maintaining good relations with children, while emotional support is emphasized as a positive attribute of the multigenerational household.

Table 72: Perceived Advantages and Disadvantages of Both Household Types (percentages)

Monogenerational Household N = 186		Multigenerational Household N = 267	
Advantages:			
Peace and quiet	42	Daily help	58
Autonomy	33	Participation in family life	16
Privacy	21	Mutual help	19
Lack of intergenerational stress	18	Help during illness	25
No burden on children	18	Not boring	15
		Emotional support	9
		No need to worry about anything	9
Disadvantages:			
Lack of help with household chores	28	Noise of children	20
Lack of help in case of illness	24	Stress and disputes	15
Boredom	17	Restriction of autonomy	4
Loneliness	15	Restriction of privacy	6
No ongoing participation in family life	3		

the list of disadvantages of residents of monogenerational households. Non-instrumental aspects are perceived as a major advantage in monogenerational households; in multigenerational households, they are of secondary importance only.

The monogenerational household is positively perceived by its expressive attributes - its contribution to the positive self-image of the elderly - as well as by its role in monitoring intergenerational relations in order to keep intimacy at a distance. The elderly emphasize both their wish to avoid becoming a burden on children and their desire to avoid exposure to stressful situations. No clear-cut

Table 73: Perceived Advantages and Disadvantages of Both Household Types (Jewish Elderly) - percentages[a]

Monogenerational Household		Multigenerational Household	
Advantages:			
Safeguards good relations with children	30	Emotional support	62
Autonomy	22	Help when ill, financial support	30
Privacy	19	Participation in family life	19
Peace and quiet	20		
	(N = 250)		(N = 271)
Disadvantages:			
Lack of help in household and when ill	48	Restriction of autonomy and privacy	33
No ongoing participation in family life	30		22
Loneliness, boredom	44	Stress, being a burden on children	24
	(N = 279)		(N = 119)

Weihl, 1980. Unpublished data. Note also the different phrasing of the question: main attribute, compared with attributes in general.

Chapter 10: PERCEPTION OF AGING

Data on the study population's perceptions of aging were obtained from one open-ended question: "People say that aging has positive as well as negative aspects. What do you consider positive about aging, and what do you consider negative?". Content analysis of the responses resulted in a list of positive aspects and a list of negative aspects (Table 80). In addition, the responses were classified as to whether or not positive aspects were mentioned. Seven percent of all respondents mentioned positive aspects only, 43% mentioned both positive and negative aspects, and 50% referred to negative aspects only.

On the basis of these data, a new variable - perception of aging - was constructed. Its components include elderly who mentioned only negative aspects of aging and those who mentioned both positive and negative aspects (including the seven percent who referred to positive aspects only). The distribution of these categories indicates that the study population tends to emphasize negative aspects and, on the whole, to perceive the process of aging negatively. Closer analysis of the data shows that this perception is affected by four sets of variables: demographic (sex and level of formal education), health (mobility level and self-evaluation of health), cultural (religious affiliation) and expressive interaction with children.

Men's outlook on aging is significantly more positive than women's (Table 74). This finding concurs with men's more positive self-evaluation of health (Table 32) and with their tendency to feel less lonely than women.[31]

---

[31] Statistically significant ($p < 0.05$).

Table 74: Perception of Aging, by Sex (percentages)

	Perception of Aging			
	Perceives negative aspects only	Perceives negative and positive aspects	Total	N
Men	42	58	100	233
Women	53	42	100	202
Total	50	50	100	435

$x^2 = 5.78$ df = 1 $p < 0.02$

These differences between the sexes are partly explained by differences in educational level. This variable affects the perception of aging of males only, probably because only 18% of all women have had any schooling. Fifty-three percent of all men who ever attended school, compared with 34% of those who did (for any period) perceive negative aspects only ($p < 0.02$).

Not unexpectedly, health problems are related to negative perception of aging. Thirty percent of the mobile elderly, compared with 70% of the housebound, mentioned only negative aspects of aging ($p < 0.0001$). Self-evaluation of health affects perception of aging the same way (Table 75). The relationship between health problems and negative perceptions of aging is reflected in the list of negative aspects mentioned by the respondents: 64% of those who mentioned negative aspects referred to health problems (Table 80).

Self evaluation of health is not an objective health index. As shown by Weihl (1980), it is affected by socioeconomic factors such as education and income levels, by cultural origin, and by feelings of

Table 75: Perception of Aging, by Self-evaluation of Health (percentages)

Self-evaluation of health	Perception of Aging: Perceives negative aspects	Perceives negative and positive aspects	Total	N
Good	19	81	100	104
Fair	52	48	100	159
Poor	66	34	100	172
Total	50	50	100	435

$x^2 = 56.44$ df = 2 $p < 0.0001$

loneliness. The relationship with loneliness is interesting in the context of perception of aging. Those who report frequent feelings of loneliness tend to present low self-evaluations of health (and to have low incomes).[32] They feel "low" and express their low morale in response to questions which allow ventilation of feelings, such as self-rating or self-evaluation of health, income, level of loneliness, and the like. The reflection of this low morale syndrome in the data on perception of aging, therefore, was expected. A strong relationship was found between feelings of loneliness and perception of aging: the less lonely tend significantly ($p < 0.0001$) to report positive elements of aging. A similar relationship was found between self-evalutaion of economic situation and perception of aging: 72% of

[32] This relationship with income was found among the Jewish aged as well. All of these relationships, for both populations, are statistically significant.

those who rated their economic situation as "good", compared with 35% who rate their situation as "bad", mentioned positive elements of aging ($p < 0.0001$).

Table 76 shows that Christian and Druze aged, more than Moslems, tend to perceive positive elements in the process of aging. This relationship is affected by level of formal education: Moslem perceptions of aging are significantly affected by this variable, while Christian and Druze perceptions are not (Table 77). When the three religious groups are combined, the relationship with education is significant, since 80% of those who never attended school are Moslem. It seems, therefore, that level of formal education is a better predictor of perception of aging than religious affiliation: no schooling (illiteracy) prevents the perception of positive elements of aging.

Table 76: Perception of Aging, by Religious Affiliation (percentages)

Religious affiliation	Perception of Aging		Total	N
	Perceives negative aspects only	Perceives negative and positive aspects		
Moslem	55	45	100	258
Christian and Druze	42	58	100	177
Total	50	50	100	435

Not significant

Table 77: Perception of Aging, by Religious Affiliation and Educational Level (percentages)

	Moslem				Christian and Druze				Total			
	Perceive negative aspects only	Perceive positive & negative aspects	Total	N	Perceive negative aspects only	Perceive positive & negative aspects	Total	N	Perceive negative aspects only	Perceive positive & negative aspects	Total	N
Educational Level												
No schooling	60	40	100	211	48	52	100	52	58	42	100	263
At least one year of schooling	30	70	100	47	40	60	100	125	40	60	100	172
Total	55	45	100	258	42	58	100	177	50	50	100	435
	$x^2 = 16.34$ df = 1 $p < 0.00$				Not significant				$x^2 = 9.30$ df = 1 $p < 0.01$			

One of the indicators of cross-generational expressive interaction used in this study was intergenerational advice-seeking, a two-part variable based on whether parents or children initiate the interaction. Both directions of advice-seeking affect perception of aging in the same way, irrespective of sex[33]: elderly who are not consulted by children, as well as those who do not initiate giving advice, tend to perceive aging negatively (Table 78).

Table 78: Perception of Aging, by Pattern of Advice-Seeking Between Children and Parents (percentages)

	Perception of Aging			
	Perceives negative aspects only	Perceives negative and positive aspects	Total	N
Children seek advice of parents	32	68	100	149
Children do not seek advice of parents	57	43	100	267
Total	48	52	100	416
$x^2 = 12.05$	d.f. = 1	$p < 0.001$		
Parents seek advice of children	39	61	100	191
Parents do not seek advice of children	56	44	100	225
Total	48	52	100	410
$x^2 = 6.48$	d.f. = 1	$p < 0.02$		

[33] This is an important finding, since sex affects both variables: women tend to give advice less than men, and they are consulted for advice less by children (see Chapter 6).

These findings are corroborated by others: involvement[34] of parents in decisionmaking concerning major areas of household and family activity (such as choice of children's spouse or financial decisions) affects perception of aging in the same direction. The rate of positive perception of aging is significantly higher among parents who are involved in making such decisions (Table 79).

Table 79: Perception of Aging, by Involvement of Parent in Financial Decision-making (percentages)

	Perception of Aging			
	Perceives negative aspects only	Perceives negative and positive aspects	Total	N
Involved in financial decisionmaking	29	71	100	165
Not involved in financial decisionmaking	62	38	100	145
Total	49	51	100	410

$x^2 = 40.5$ df = 1 $p < 0.0001$

These findings indicate that parents' involvement with children in a wider sense than advice-seeking only, that is, emotionally meaningful intergenerational interaction) enhances their perception of positive aspects of aging. When the flow of expressive interaction is disturbed, when parents feel disconnected from important aspects in

[4] "Involvement" is defined in Chapter 6.

the lives of their offspring, their morale is low and consequently their perception of aging tends to be negative. This conclusion concurs with the finding that nearly half of the elderly who perceived positive aspects of aging mentioned generational continuity (Table 80).

Table 80: Perceived Positive and Negative Aspects of Aging (percentages)

Positive Aspects (N = 191)	
Generational continuity	48
Age confers status in society	18
Accumulated life experience	17
No work responsibilities	13
Return to religion	13
Age confers status in the family	12
Negative Aspects (N = 356)	
Deterioration of health	64
Changes in functional capacity	29
Feeling of boredom, loneliness	20
Feeling of approaching end	14
Being a burden on children	12
Loss of autonomy	11

A review of the lists of positive and negative aspects of aging mentioned by the respondents (Table 80) reveals that two-thirds of those who referred to negative aspects mentioned declining health. All other negative elements were referred to by less than one-third of the respondents. Hence, health, or the decline thereof, is the

outstanding negative element mentioned. All other elements, though important in content, appear as much smaller concerns. The mention of boredom in this context, as well as in the context of negative attributes of the monogenerational household, should be more carefully examined as a possible key to better understanding aging in specific populations. Finally, retirement from work was not mentioned by any respondent as a negative aspect of aging.

On the positive side, there are two outstanding findings. The first is the high proportion of respondents who mentioned the importance of generational continuity, of seeing one's seed prosper and grow. Nearly half of those who mentioned positive aspects referred to this element. Thus, the most important positive aspect mentioned, and perhaps the most meaningful for the elderly interviewed, seems to be this view of the future - the continuation of life through one's family. The unique finding is that over 10% of the respondents admit to feeling comfortable without the responsibilities connected with work.

More generally, three of the positive elements mentioned evidently stem from the traditional normative system: age confers status in the family, age confers status in society, and life experience is accumulated with age.

This link with traditional values is interesting, particularly because the study's findings do not show that the parent's status in the family is high. It seems as if, in order to find positive elements of aging, the respondents drew on "old" values which have lost much of their influence in the current social environment of the rural Arab village. The absence of comparative data prevents fuller interpretation of these findings.

Chapter 11: DIFFERENCES BETWEEN VILLAGES

A number of findings were compared in order to examine the hypothesis that large communities are more affected by the process of modernization than small ones. It is known, for instance, that educational facilities in small villages are often inferior to those of larger ones. Municipal services - including the supply of water and electricity - were less developed in small villages 40-50 years ago, as were salaried work opportunities. Social control is more effective in small, homogeneous units. The power structure is less diversified and is interwoven - or even identical - with kinship structure. All of these factors contribute toward resistance to innovation and change. It was also hypothesized that openness to change differs by religious affiliation. It is generally believed that Christians are more "modern" than Moslems, probably because they are better educated.

Of the six villages sampled, three (Villages 4, 5, and 6) are small localities, all of them homogeneously Moslem. The smallest has 400 inhabitants, the biggest about 1,500. None has an official municipal status, there is no municipal organization, and therefore only elementary municipal services (such as water supply) are available. There are hardly any shops. Two of the three villages do not contain a Kupat Holim (health fund) clinic, though most of the inhabitants are members, and none contains a school for children over age 12. One of the three is not served by public transportation, probably because there is no main road. Because of the small number of aged in each, as well as many other shared characteristics, these three villages have been combined into one for comparison purposes.

Village 3 was originally sampled as a heterogeneous small village, because among its approximately 4,000 inhabitants there is a small minority of Christians.[35] While analyzing the data, it was discovered that the population of this village is heterogeneous on quite another basis: half of the aged population reported having been evacuated from a village destroyed in 1948 and subsequently settling in this one. This displaced population differs from the village's native elderly reisdents in many ways, among them housing conditions. They therefore constitute a distinct sub-group, revealing that Village 3 is inhabitated by two populations of elderly.

Village 2 is a heterogenous, bigger village which is served by a municipal council. The majority of the residents are Christians; of the two minorities - Druze and Moslem - the latter is the smaller in number. The Christians and Druze of this village are the only representatives of these religions in this study.[36]

Village 1 is all-Moslem and is comparable in size to Village 3. It has its own municipal council, but welfare services are delivered directly by the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs.

---

35 Ten of the 105 elderly interviewed in Village 3 are Christians; the others are Moslems.

36 It should be remembered that this group does not statistically represent the overall population of rural Druze or rural Christians. Therefore, data comparing this village with the others by religion may reflect the population of this village only.

Household History

The analysis of household history by religious affiliation has shown a relationship between these two variables: fewer Christians than Moslems lived in multigenerational extended households in childhood (Table 9). In order to neutralize this influence of religious affiliation, the three small all-Moslem villages were compared with the larger homogeneous Moslem village. This comparison shows that considerably fewer elderly persons in the small villages spent their childhood in nuclear, or two-generational, households, more of them having lived at that time with grandparents and/or other kin (Table 81). This difference probably indicates that over sixty years ago the smaller villages had a more traditional household structure than the bigger one.

Table 81: Moslem Villages, by Size and Type of Household (at Ages 11-18 of Study Population) - percentages

	Big Village (1) (N = 101)	Small Villages (4, 5, 6) (N = 74)	Total (N = 175)
Two-generational household	81	66	75
Three-generational and extended household	19	34	25
Total	100	100	100

Examination of household composition after marriage shows that the inhabitants of the small villages do not differ from those of the bigger one: approximately 50% of the respondents of all villages

lived for some time after marriage with parents before establishing a household of their own, and about one third separated from parents at marriage.

Differences in Family and Household Structure

One of the indices of modernization is the structure and size of both family and household. "Modern" people have fewer children and live in small, nuclear households; their aging parents tend to live in a home of their own. According to these criteria, the study population, as a whole, is not a modern one: over 60% live in multigenerational households, and the number of children is very high (Tables 82 and 83). However, the smaller villages (less than 5,000 inhabitants, by sampling criteria) differ from the bigger ones: considerably more households are multigenerational, and the proportion of residents with ten or more children is by far the highest. Both of these findings are in line with the hypothesis that smaller communities tend to be less affected by modernizing factors.

Detailed analysis of the multigenerational households shows that the three small villages have the highest proportion of households including children under age 18, as well as the highest proportion of households including unmarried daughters over age 28. Moreover, as shown in Table 84, the children of the aged in the small villages are generally younger than those of the aged in the bigger ones. Both of these demographic differences are due not to a younger age structure of the old population in the small villages, but rather to two other demographic factors, both of them culturally defined: more aged in the small villages have been married more than once (24%, compared with 13% in the bigger, all-Moslem village) and more of the men have

had polygamous marriages in the past (20%, compared with 5%). The second of these demographic trends is not a modern one.

Table 82: Household Types in the Sampled Villages (percentages)

Villages	Household Type		Total	N
	Monogenerational	Multigenerational		
1	44	56	100	87
2	39	61	100	202
3	39	61	100	85
4,5,6	28	72	100	65
Total	38	62	100	439

Table 83: Number of Children per Elderly Resident in the Sampled Villages (percentages)

Villages	Number of Children					Total	N
	None	1-3	4-6	7-9	10+		
1	3	8	32	45	12	100	101
2	4	13	43	30	10	100	238
3	3	17	30	35	15	100	105
4,5,6	5	12	33	25	24	100	75
Total	4	13	37	33	13	100	519

Table 84: Ages of Children in the Sampled Villages (percentages)

Villages[a]	Age of Children: Under 18	19-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Total	N
1	4	24	33	26	9	3	100	592
2	3	16	33	31	12	4	100	1141
4,5,6	10	28	29	24	8	1	100	432

[a] Village 3 is not included because of the high proportion of parents who did not reveal the ages of their children.

These differences in size and composition of the multigenerational household are also expressed in the number of persons per household (Table 85). The proportion of small households (1-2 persons) in the small villages is by far the lowest - 28%, compared with over 40% in the other villages; the proportion of large households is the highest. These findings, too, support the hypothesis suggesting that smaller villages are less affected by the influence of modernizing factors. Size and composition of household and family, as well as marriage patterns, indicate that the smaller villages tend more than the bigger ones to adhere to traditional norms.

Table 85: Number of Persons per Household in the Sampled Villages (percentages)

Villages	Number of Persons in Household						
	1	2	3-4	5-6	7+	Total	N
1	21	28	18	9	24	100	87
2	18	27	23	17	14	100	202
3	24	19	14	15	28	100	85
4,5,6	19	9	26	9	37	100	65

Work and Occupational History

Table 86 shows that homogeneous villages, irrespective of size, differ from heterogeneous villages with regard to types of occupation of men during their working lives. A difference between small and large homogeneous villages appears only at ages 55-65, when the proportion of men working in agriculture in the smaller villages is less than that in the bigger one. This decrease is due to a high rate of early retirement:[37] 26% of the aged men in the smaller villages, compared with 16% in the bigger one, reported that between ages 55 and 64 they had stopped working. Early retirement from unskilled agricultural work is likely due to the increased strain of physical labor on the aged.

When asked about their last work before retirement, 71% of the men in the small villages reported having worked in agriculture,

[37] The early retirement is probably from salaried employment only. Many of these men own land which they probably continue to cultivate in old age.

Table 86: Men Working in Agriculture in Three Periods of Their Working Lives, by Sampled Villages (percentages)

Villages	Age Periods		
	18-34	35-54	55-65
1	75	74	53
2	38	30	23
3	54	41	37
4,5,6	83	74	43

compared with 29% and 44% in the two heterogeneous villages. This corroborates the findings presented in Table 86: the predominant occupation of men in Moslem villages, throughout their working lives, was agriculture.

The two homogeneous villages differ by occupational structure of men, a variable that also differentiates between these two villages and the heterogeneous one. The level of education of the aged in Village 2 (heterogeneous) is considerably higher than that in the other villages (Table 87). Moreover, Druze citizens may serve in the professional army and the police force. These two factors open otherwise closed occupational opportunities. The occupational structure of the aged in Village 3 is probably determined to a large extent by the fact that about half of them are refugees from another village and do not own land.

The findings on work and occupational history do not sustain the hypothesis relating modernization to size of village. They do, however, indicate that homogeneous Moslem villages differ from

heterogeneous ones both in occupational structure and in a marked tendency toward early retirement, due to lack of occupational opportunities for older men.

Table 87: Level of Formal Education, by Sampled Villages (percentages)

Villages	Years of Formal Education				
	None	1-4 Years	5+ Years	Total	N
1	70	20	10	100	100
2	42	27	31[a]	100	227
3	86	12	2	100	103
4,5,6	90	7	3	100	75
Total	64	10	26	100	505

[a] Includes the 7% of the aged in this village who have had more than eight years of formal education.

Participation in Household Maintenance Activities

Multigenerational households

Villages differ by size as well as by type of population in participation in household maintenance activities such as cooking, cleaning, doing the laundry, and shopping. Considerably fewer aged living with children in the small, homogeneous Moslem villages participate in such tasks than do aged living in the same household type in both of the bigger Moslem villages (Table 88). The highest proportion of participants in all such activities is found in Village 2, the majority of which is Christian. Analysis of these data by religious affiliation indicates that the Druze in Village 2,

regardless of sex, are the most active participants in these activities.

Regarding care of grandchildren, participation of the aged in the small villages exceeds that of the others: only 19%, compared with about 40% in the other villages, claim never to engage in this activity. This difference may be partly due to the larger households in the small villages (Table 85), which implies a large number of grandchildren in the home who are likely to be under the care of their grandmother.

Table 88: Elderly in Multigenerational Households who Perform Cooking and Cleaning Tasks, by Village (percentages)

Villages	Cooking	Cleaning	N
1	40	31	55
2	50	45	127
3	32	13	53
4,5,6	18	20	55

Monogenerational households

Performance of household maintenance tasks by aged living-apart from children is independent of size of village. Table 89 shows similar rates among villages which are either homogeneously Moslem or the majority of which are Moslem. In Village 2, in which the Moslem aged constitute a small minority, fewer aged perform household maintanence tasks themselves. Thus, independent household maintenance seems to be affected by religious affiliation: more Christians and

Druze than Moslems perform basic household tasks themselves. Further investigation is likely to reveal the same pattern for multigenerational households.

Table 89: Elderly (and/or their spouses) in Monogenerational Households who Perform Cooking and Cleaning Tasks, by Village (Percentages)

Villages	Cooking	Cleaning	N
1	67	47	45
2	86	73	79
3	55	55	40
4,5,6	50	50	20

Intergenerational Support

Analysis of the flow of help from children to parents shows that religious affiliation is a more important factor than size of population in explaining differences between villages. The findings presented in Table 90 for monogenerational households are consistent with those of Table 89 in that Village 2, the majority of which is Christian, differs from the others. Considerably fewer parents in this village customarily receive help from children. This consistency probably reflects the fact that aged who live apart from children and manage their own households do not often require children's help. This situation, however, applies to one village only, the majority of which is Christian. In Moslem villages, help of children to parents is reportedly extended regardless of a parent's ability to manage his or her own household.

Table 90: Parents in Both Household Types who Customarily Receive Help from Children not Living with Them, by Village (Percentages)

Village	Monogenerational Households	N	Multigenerational Households	N
1	74	45	58	53
2	42	79	33	118
3	74	40	62	48
4,5,6	77	20	36	50

Financial assistance extended by children to parents varies by village, but no systematic pattern is discernible in either household type. The proportion of children of the aged in Village 1 who extend financial assistance to their parents is considerably higher than that of any other village. There is no variation by village in the flow of help from the older to the younger generation.

Villages differ by patterns of intergenerational help (Table 91).[38] The modal pattern in monogenerational households in Village 2 is "no mutual help",[39] while that of all other villages is one-directional - from children to parents. In multigenerational households, the volume of help from parents to children is greater than in monogenerational households, especially when the two-directional flow is included. Looking at the data in this way,

[38] This variable was constructed by combining two variables: help of children to parents and help of parents to children.

[39] All three religious groups in this village demonstrate the same trend.

Village 2 and the small homogeneous villages differ from the others; over 50% of the aged in these religiously varied villages neither extend help nor receive help from children. Thus, religious affiliation does not explain differences in patterns of intergenerational help.

Table 91: Patterns of Intergenerational Support in Both Household Types, by Village (percentages)

Villages	Two-directional support	Children to parents only	Parents to children only	No help	Total	N
Monogenerational Households						
1	14	60	7	19	100	43
2	17	25	4	54	100	69
3	15	59	3	23	100	30
4,5,6	24	47	-	24	100	17
Multigenerational Households						
1	36	22	4	38	100	53
2	18	15	14	53	100	118
3	31	32	8	29	100	48
4,5,6	12	24	8	56	100	50

Perception of Aging

Perceptions of aging differ among the sampled villages (Table 92). The homogeneous Moslem villages differ among themselves by size: more aged in the small villages tend to perceive negative aspects only ($p < 0.005$). The three religious groups in Village 2 differ from each other: most (73%) of the small Moslem population perceives negative aspects only, compared with only one-third of the Druze. The aged in Village 3, most of whom are Moslems, perceive aging quite negatively, and this view is shared by the two populations of the village. Though the difference between Moslems and the other religious groups is statistically significant (Table 76), the data indicate that other factors are involved, including size of village.

Table 92: Perception of Aging, by Sampled Villages (percentages)

Village	Perceive negative aspects only	Perceive negative and positive aspects	Total	N
1	34	60	100	86
2	45	55	100	190
3	71	29	100	89
4,5,6	56	44	100	72

Housing Conditions

Housing conditions are not affected by size of village: the small, homogeneous Moslem villages are similar in this respect to the bigger, homogeneous Moslem village. In the heterogeneous villages, housing conditons vary by sub-group: the small Moslem population of

Village 2 lives in much worse conditions than either Christian or Druze (Table 94), and the housing conditions of the immigrants to Village 3 are much worse than those of the aged born there (Table 93). These differences prevail despite the fact that 97% of all households in both heterogeneous villages occupy houses owned by the aged residents or by one of their children.

Table 93: Housing Conditions of Aged in Village 3, by Origin of Population (percentages)

	Born in village	Born in destroyed village	Total
Type of Building			
Old house	34	62	48
Modern house	66	38	52
Total	100	100	100
Number of households	38	39	77
Location of Toilet			
Inside building	74	44	57
Outside building	14	31	23
No toilet	12	28	20
Total	100	100	100
Number of households	41	42	83
Location of Shower			
Inside building	71	38	54
Outside building	10	17	13
No shower	19	45	33
Total	100	100	100
Number of households	41	42	83

Table 94: Housing Conditions of Aged in Village 2, by Religious Affiliation (percentages)

	Moslems	Christians	Druze	Total
Type of Building				
Old house	58[a]	19	24	25
Modern house	42	81	76	75
Total	100	100	100	100
Number of households	22	121	38	181
Location of Toilet				
Inside building	38	79	78	73
Outside building	28	20	20	21
No toilet	34	1	2	6
Total	100	100	100	100
Number of households	29	131	41	201
Location of Kitchen				
Separate room	55	92	95	87
Part of living room	31	2	5	7
Outside building	14	6	-	6
Total	100	100	100	100
Number of households	29	131	41	201
Fuel Used for Heating in Winter				
Wood only	83	12	46	30
Other	62	48	49	52
Total	100	100	100	100
Number of households	29	131	41	201

[a] Half of these households occupy tin shacks.

Table 94, continued

	Moslems	Christians	Druze	Total
Type of Water Heating				
Solar or electricity	28	52	51	48
Other	62	48	49	52
Total	100	100	100	100
Number of households	29	131	41	201

Just over half of the households of aged in homogeneous Moslem villages occupy modern houses, built to include sewage systems, showers, toilets, etc. The other households occupy various types of mostly unsuitable buildings; most are one-room buildings built many years ago, lacking facilities which are today considered indispensible. Thus, over 50% of all households in these villages lack inside toilets, including some which also lack outdoor facilities (17% in the bigger village and 12% in the smaller ones). Thirty-eight percent lack both toilets and showers inside their houses. Fifteen percent of the aged cook in the room they live in, and about the same percentage cook outside or do not cook at all.

Other aspects of living conditions vary by size of village. More households in the bigger village use modern cooking equipment; 91% use gas or electricity, compared with 73% in the small villages. On the other hand, fewer households in the bigger village use modern heating equipment (such as electricity, gas, or kerosene), preferring

the traditional method of burning wood, which can also be used for cooking. These differences may be due to a higher proportion of monogenerational households in the bigger, all-Moslem village.

The variation of housing conditions in each of the heterogeneous villages is rather striking. Table 93 shows the difference between immigrants to Village 3 and the original population: the latter tend to live in modern buildings which include showers and toilets.

In Village 2, there are marked differences between Moslems, on the one hand, and Christian and Druze on the other. Housing conditions of the latter two are better, and they tend to use modern equipment (Table 94). Moreover, the housing conditions of Moslem households in this village tend to be worse than those of the Moslem households of other villages.

Since such differences in housing condition were not expected, no questions were prepared to investigate possible reasons. One explanation may be differences in income over the life span, but there are no data on this subject.

For practical purposes, service providers should be alerted to the fact that the aged of the minority populations in these villages seem to have worse living conditions than those belonging to the majority.

In summary, it can be noted that in some respects - notably demographic (family and household) structure - size of village is a differentiating factor: small villages are closer to the traditional model. In other areas, there is no influence of size of village, yet that of religious affiliation is clearly discernible. The first of these findings validates the hypothesis concerning the relationship between modernization and size of village, at least in relation to the

present generation of Arab elderly. The second finding, too, expresses the influence of non-modern norms; adherence to religious beliefs and traditions is not an attribute of modern societies.

Chapter 12: CONCLUDING REMARKS

One of the objectives of this research project was to obtain knowledge and insight into the living conditions and needs of the rural Arab aged population. Generally, these objectives have been reached. The data, though not statistically representative of Israel's rural Arab population, provide insight into their living conditions. Most of the elderly live with children; those who do not, live very close to more than one child, since most children live in the same village. This geographical propinquity, combined with the fact that this population has many children (and grandchildren), ensures close and frequent contact with family members - children, children-in-law, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren. The nature of this contact is basically supportive, both instrumentally and emotionally. None of the elderly contacted were physically neglected, including the few who have no close relatives to care for them; neighbors and distant relatives take care of these few.

The proportion of childless aged (half of whom were never married) is negligible, only three percent. These are high risk categories in terms of potential need for services. Some of these elderly are fully dependent on the goodwill of neighbors or distant kin, and there are indications that some of these helpers would like to be relieved. The proportional number of elderly in this category is likely to increase, as the unmarried daughters become old and economically dependent on their brothers.

The housing conditions of elderly who live apart from children are often inadequate and, in many instances, appalling. About one-third of all households are located in old buildings, most without

connection to sewage systems. Only 11% of such houses have indoor toilets, and 26% have neither an indoor nor outdoor facility; in only 15% a shower is located inside the house, and 51% have neither an indoor nor outdoor shower. The standard of living of many elderly, as expressed by the availability of household appliances, is rather low. Thirty-four percent of all monogenerational households, for example, manage without a refrigerator, and in 73% there is no television set.[40] A small proportion of households lack basic furniture: 12% lack chairs, and in 26% there is no table. The lack of these items may be due to differences in lifestyle rather than to economic distress.

Economic distress is probably widespread. Seventy-eight percent of the respondents receive income supplements from the National Insurance Institute[41], a fact which places most of the study population in the lowest income bracket. Some of these low income elderly live with young children who do not yet work, others with adult non-working daughters who have no income of their own (Table 7). Such households are probably characterized by an acute shortage of income, unless other children support their parents on a regular basis. Little evidence of this support was found. The interviews reveal that some forms of in kind support, such as food grown on a shared plot of land, do exist. The volume of in kind support is

---

40 The respective proportions in multigenerational households are 10% and 76%.

41 This data was contained in the list of persons ages 65+ in each village supplied by the National Insurance Institute; the figure matches those published by the Institute in Recipients of Old Age Pensions by Localities, 1982, Table 5.

unknown, since the questionnaire did not contain questions on this subject.

Judging from the study's findings, health needs are met when immediate curative intervention is called for. Nearly all the elderly are health insured and use clinics and hospitals. In the three bigger villages, private medical care is available and used: about 6% use only private medical services, and about 18% turn to both private and Kupat Holim services. The use of private services by Kupat Holim members presumably indicates some degree of dissatisfaction with the public services.

Two of the smaller villages have no Kupat Holim clinics; the residents travel to a nearby town for medical services. This lack of accessability limits the use of medical services to urgent needs only.

The proportion of bedridden elderly is very high - 7%, compared with 1% in the Jewish population. The proportion of housebound, too, is higher in the study population. This is due to at least three factors: the age structure of the investigated population (28% are over age 80), the tendency to prefer to remain at home[42], and the lack of long-term care institutions culturally suitable for this population. A fourth factor may also be at play - lack of services designed to locate the populations at risk and prevent their deterioration, and, if necessary, to make patients and families aware of the various long-term care services available, including institutions.

---

[42] Based on impression rather than scientific testing.

Health services to the housebound (including bedridden) are irregular and scarce. Their supply differs by village: where no Kupat Holim clinic operates, no nursing services are available. Thirty-five percent of the bedridden reported having been last visited by a physician over three months ago; 44% reported visits by a nurse, but only one-fifth of these visits occur on a regular basis.

Domiciliary services to the housebound are nonexistent.[43] All services needed - cleaning, preparation of food, personal care, nursing - are rendered by the family or by neighbors. Social workers report that there are requests for home help and help with personal care, but in most cases these requests cannot be answered. In only one village does the proportion of aged served by the welfare office approximately equal that of a Jerusalem neighborhood; this is the one village of the six in which the welfare service is part of the municipal administration. Ninety-four percent of all respondents have never had contact with a social worker. Since nearly 80% of this population qualifies for income supplements, this proportion seems to be very high.

Very few of the interviewed elderly mentioned (directly or indirectly) bad relations with children. Presumably, there are more such cases than can be detected on the basis of a research project such as this one. These families, though few, may need help in achieving supportive relationship. When considering the demographic data in light of these cases, as well as those of the few never-married and divorced aged, it seems that health and welfare services

---

[43] Other rural areas have lately begun to offer such services.

cover neither the range of needs nor the range of people in need. There is a need to extend medical services, especially to the housebound, and there is an urgent need to develop domiciliary services for the same group.

The other main aim of the study was to obtain knowledge about the modes of intergenerational interaction in order to better understand the directions of change in family relations resulting from the process of modernization.

The flow of instrumental support from children to parents is massive compared with that in the Jewish population and other European populations (Shanas et al., 1968), both in the number of parents who receive help and in the volume of help extended. About half of the 60% of parents in monogenerational households who receive help with household maintenance tasks are helped by more than one person, and more than half of this group is assisted on a daily basis. Over 80% of the helpers are grandchildren. These figures exceed by far those found in the study of the Jewish population. They also exceed the proportion of handicapped parents who may need assistance with some or all household maintenance tasks[44]. It seems, therefore, that the statistically prevailing pattern is one which prescribes honoring the older generation by respecting it and serving it. Presumably, this is the traditional normative pattern, but the lack of evidence prevents confirmation of this assumption.

There is evidence in the data that help extended by children to parents living alone is related to needs of parents: more of those

---

[44] There is no difference in this respect between the sexes.

whose mobility or capacity to perform specific activities of daily living is restricted receive help from children than do parents whose functional capacity is not impaired.

Financial assistance to parents who live alone is comparatively widespread though irregular, which probably indicates that the amounts of assistance are small. There is evidence of economic assistance in kind. Many families have plots of land on which they grow their own vegetables and fruit. The work is done mostly by the second and third generations, with the aging father occasionally participating in the work. The father's household, however, is supplied with the products. Likewise, 30% of the elderly living alone do not cook; prepared meals are often brought to them by children. Electricity and water meters are sometimes shared, since houses are often built next to or on top of each other. The extent of these types of "sharing" is not known, since these findings were not anticipated. The impression, based on a review of the interviews and discussions with the interviewers, is that such forms of sharing are not negligible.

A surprisingly high proportion (23%) of parents who live with children are financially supported (irregularly) by children not living with them.[45] Since no further questions were asked, details such as the purpose of this support, its size, and its uses are not known. This finding is further evidence of the responsibility children feel for the welfare of their aged parents.

More parents in multigenerational than in monogenerational households assist children not living with them, mainly in two areas:

---

[45] The corresponding proportion in the Jewish population is 12%.

caring for grandchildren and giving presents. For both generations, these two areas are both expressive and instrumental. The difference in rates of assistance by household type is surprising and difficult to explain[46]; this finding is one of many that should be re-investigated.

Intergenerational assistance may be two-directional or one-directional in either direction, or there may be no assistance in either direction. The two household types differ with regard to the distribution of these four patterns. In monogenerational households, the mode (44%) is one-directional, children-to-parents. This was to be expected, since many parents in these households are dependent to some extent on the help of children. The modal pattern in multi-generational households (46%) is "no assistance" in either direction, which is also to be expected since parents living with children are usually provided for and often do not feel they have obligations to children not living with them.

The finding that these assistance patterns are affected by religious affiliation leads to another distinguishing variable: more Moslem than Christian and Druze parents are helped by children (irrespective of household type), and more of the latter two religious groups adhere to the "no assistance" pattern. This cultural difference recurs throughout the various data on expressive components of intergenerational interaction. Thus, significantly more Moslem

---

46 In the Jewish population, the difference is reversed: more parents in monogenerational households extend help to children not living with them.

parents in both household types turn to a child when in need of advice, and more of them in multigenerational households have a solicitous child not living with them. Fewer Moslem than Christian or Druze men agree with the modern norm of the child's independent choice of spouse.[47]

These findings regarding religion indicate that Moslem aged parents (especially men) appear to be more involved with their children, a conclusion which can also be drawn from the fact that fifty-two percent of Moslem parents seek advice from their children, compared with 39% of Christians and 22% of Druze. The proportion of cases of no intergenerational advice-seeking is lowest among Moslem parents (40%) and highest among Druze parents (71%), with Christian parents in-between (54%). These data may reflect differential change from traditional patterns characterized by frequent family interaction and family cohesiveness, a change which affects Christian and Druze more than Moslems. On the other hand, the religious groups may have differed normatively from each other before the impact of modernizing factors. The data do, however, indicate that the parents of all three religious groups are aware of the younger generation's tendency toward distancing and independence from parents, and this awareness is more pronounced among Christians and Druze than among Moslems.

Women differ from men in the areas of advice-seeking and decisionmaking on central family issues. Most women feel, and probably are, excluded from these areas, irrespective of religious origin. These findings match those of one of the few studies on rural

---

[47] All the relationships mentioned are statistically significant.

Palestinian Arab villages - Lutfiyya, 1966 - which described rural Moslem women as having no say in economic as well as intra-familial matters. According to that study, women are considered to be less wise than men and are excluded from meetings in which such matters are discussed, although husbands and sons may discuss these subjects privately with their wives and mothers before arriving at a decision.

There is some evidence that the second generation holds educated mothers in higher esteem: significantly more women with some schooling[48] than women who never attended school are consulted by their children for advice. Even so, less than 50% of educated mothers are consulted when advice is needed. These findings indicate that women, possibly more than men, adhere to their traditionally prescribed role.

Involvement and interaction with children on the non-instrumental level is an important influence on the morale of old parents. When there is no advice-seeking relationship and when parents are not involved in decisionmaking on major familial issues, they tend to perceive the process of aging negatively - they regard their actual, present situation as unrewarding. This finding concurs with another, that the most frequently mentioned positive element of aging is generational continuity, the satisfaction derived from watching one's own offspring grow and prosper. Watching may not be enough. One has, so it seems, to be involved with the lives of one's children, to feel that children consider the relationship with parents to be important

---

[48] Most of these women are Christians. The effect of religious norms may be stronger than the effect of literacy.

and meaningful. This is neither a modern nor a traditional need. It is a basic human need which conforms with the norms of a society which prescribes deference to the elderly and ensures that the young seek advice from the elderly (even if the advice is not taken). The exchange of advice ensures engagement of the older generation in the affairs of the younger ones. Respect and honor to the elderly is, in this sense, a mechanism of engagement; or, from the view of the older generation, the power held by the aged (which may stem from their ownership of the means of production and/or from the normative pattern) ensures active intergenerational involvement.

Regarding modernization, the data tend to bear out the hypothesis that the normative, traditional mode is more characteristic of small localities. This is reflected in the data on differences in family and household structure over time. In other areas of family interaction, no such evidence can be provided, probably due to the many other variables at play and the un-refined method of analysis used in this study. The study does contribute information on the differential influence of religion, but these differences are not necessarily indicative of differences in degree of modernization; they may have existed before the onset of modern influences.

The findings on household history generally corroborate the doubts expressed by some writers, notably Laslett (1976), as to the validity of the assumption linking traditional (or pre-industrial) societies with large, extended or joint family households. Goode (1970) mentions that the conjugal household has existed in India for many decades; he quotes Rosenfeld's (1950) study of an Arab village in Israel, saying that "the overwhelming majority of the families were nuclear or conjugal". Cohen (1965) did not find many joint households

in his study of Israeli Arab villages in the late 1950s, and he claims that they probably did not constitute a majority in the decades before his investigation. His assessment concurs with this study's data on household history, which show that in the 1920s and the beginning of the 1930s most of the childhood households of the study population were conjugal, i.e., consisting of parents and young children. One might argue that by that time modernization had already set in, but historical facts reject this argument. Fifty to sixty years ago, there were hardly any roads in the country, and none of the villages could be reached by car. There was no water supply to the Arab villages, no electricity, and the only source of income was the land, which was tilled (to use Lutfiyya's, 1966, phrase) as in biblical times.[49]

The data do, however, show that at least fifty years ago there was a marked difference with regard to household structure between Christians and Druze, on the one hand, and Moslems on the other: considerably more Moslems grew up in households that were not conjugal. The finding that this difference has disappeared, that the proportion of multigenerational households is the same for all three religious groups, probably points toward change in the Moslem population of this study, mainly in villages of more than 5,000

---

49 Lutifiyya used this expression when describing a Moslem village near Ramalla in the 1960s.

inhabitants.[50]

The changes in occupational structure during the working lives of the male population of this study, as well as the differences in family and household structure between small and larger Moslem villages, indicate the impact of modernization. The income of the younger generation is no longer derived from agriculture; and, although most of the older men began their working careers in agriculture, usually self-employed, most% ended their careers as salaried laborers, mostly in other localities (Table 11).

It is not possible to detect the impact of these modernizing changes on intergenerational interaction, mainly because the literature on family interaction in traditional societies is very scarce and always normatively descriptive. Thus, Lutfiyya (1966), in his book Baytin, a Jordanian Village, refers to the status of the elderly in general terms, without citing empirical evidence to support these statements. There are no answers to such questions as: How do people adhere to traditional norms? How many actually do adhere to them? What deviations exist, and why?

In the study on Arab rural elderly there are also no answers to such questions, though empirical data have been collected. We know, for example, the proportion of persons not involved in decisions concerning the choice of spouse for their children, but it is not known how this proportion compares with that in other societies,

---

50 A number of problems are involved in making this assumption. For instance, how does the difference in life expectancy affect household structure? Sixty years ago, few children had living grandparents. In addition, the study population is one of survivors, and we therefore lack knowledge about all households of sixty years ago.

including pre-modern societies. In other words, there is no comparable data and no starting point in time with which to draw comparisons.

The findings of this study may reflect a change in attitudes and norms, assuming that responses would have been much more uniform in the past, but there is no way to validate this assumption.

Bibliography

Avizur, M. 1977. "Change in the Status and Role of the 'Elderly'". In "The Political Life of the Arab Village". Gerontologia January-March.

Azaiza, F. 1984. Self-Assessment of Health by the Elderly: Related Variables and Changes Over Time Jerusalem: Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Paul Baerwald School of Social Work.

Beck, D.F. 1970. "The Changing Moslem Family of the Middle East". In Lutfiyya, A. and Churchill, C., eds., Readings in Arab Middle Eastern Societies Cultures The Hague: Monten & Co.

Central Bureau of Statistics. 1980. Survey of Housing Conditions, 1978 Special Series No. 641. Jerusalem.

Central Bureau of Statistics. 1981. The Aged in Israel, Data from Stage B of the Census Census of Population and Housing 1972 Series, No. 17. Jerusalem.

Central Bureau of Statistics. 1985a. Statistical Abstract, 1984 No. 35. Jerusalem.

Central Bureau of Statistics. 1985a. Survey of Elderly Persons in Households, 1982 Special Series 754. Jerusalem. (Hebrew)

Cohen, A. 1965. Arab Border Villages in Israel Manchester University Press.

Cohen, S., and Morgenstin, B. 1976. Living Conditions of the Elderly: Beersheba, Petach-Tikva, and Yavne, Part A Survey No. 17, Jerusalem: National Insurance Institute.

Cowgill, D., and Holmes, L. 1972. Aging and Modernization New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Davies, A.M.; Fleishman, R.; Mor, V.; and Factor, H. 1979. "Aging in Baka: A Profile". Jerusalem: Brookdale Institute of Gerontology.

El-Daghestani, K. 1970. "The Revolution of the Moslem Family in the Middle Eastern Countries". In Lutfiyya, A., and Churchill, C., eds., Readings in Arab Middle Eastern Societies and Cultures The Hague: Monten & Co.

Fadel-Girgis, M. 1982. The Family as a Source of Support (Egypt). Paper submitted to the Gerontological Society of the United States.

Ginat, J. 1976. Changes in the Family Structure in the Arab Village Shiloah Institute, Tel Aviv University.

Goode, W. 1970. "Families in Arab Islam". In World Revolution and Family Patterns New York: The Free Press.

Habbash, A. 1977. Processes of Change and Modernization in the Arab Family The Institute of Work and Welfare, Hebrew University.

Habibi-Shlewet, L. 1975. "Application of Modern Social Services for the Aged in Israeli-Arab Villages". The Gerontologist 15(6): 560-561.

Laslett, P. 1976. "Societal Development and Aging". In Binstock, R., and Shanas, E., eds., Handbook of Aging and the Social Sciences New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Lerner, D. 1958. The Passing of Traditional Society: Modernizing the Middle East New York: The Free Press.

Lutfiyya, A. 1966. Baytin: A Jordanian Village The Hague: Monten & Co.

Lutfiyya, A. 1970. "The Family". In Lutfiyya, A., and Churchill, C., eds., Readings in Arab Middle Eastern Societies and Cultures The Hague: Monten & Co.

Nedeljkovic, Y. 1970. Old People in Yugoslavia Belgrad: Institute of Social Policy.

Pritrowski, J. 1970. Old People in Poland Research report (tables only) to U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Razek, S. 1978. "Old Age in Nazarath: Living Conditions and Use of Services". M.A. thesis, University of Haifa.

Rosenfeld, H. 1964. They Were Peasants Israel: Hakibbutz Hameuchad.

Rosenfeld, H. 1965. "Process of Differentiation and Separation of the Extended Family. Jerusalem: The Institute of Applied Social Research.

Rosenfeld, H. 1965. "Changes of the Social Structure of the Arab Village (Taibe)". Jerusalem: The Institute of Applied Social Research.

Shanas, E. et al. 1968. Old People in Three Industrial Societies Atherton Press.

Shorter, E. 1975. The Making of the Modern Family New York: Basic Books.

Smolic-Krkovic, N. 1972. Old People in Croatia Research report (tables only) to the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Weihl, H. 1981. "Changes in Family Structure of the Aged and Their Intergenerational Relations over a Period of Twelve Years". Research Report to the Ford Foundation.

Weihl, H.; Nathkan, T.; and Avner, U. 1970. "Investigation of the Family Life, Living Conditions and Needs of the Non-institutionalized Urban Jewish Aged 65+ in Israel". Jerusalem: Ministry of Social Welfare.

Zilberstein, Y. et al. 1981. "Social and Medical Needs of the Frail Elderly: Service Needs and Their Cost, Part A, Bnei Brak". Special Projects No. 13. Jerusalem: National Insurance Institute. (Hebrew)

Zivkovic, M. 1977. "Problems of the Rural Aging Population". (mimeo)

מכון ברוקדייל: הספריה
את הספר יש להחזיר עד

תאריך	תאריך	תאריך
		0 9 מאי 1987