<u>CHANGES IN FAMILY STRUCTURE OF THE AGED</u> <u>AND THEIR INTERGENERATIONAL RELATIONS</u> <u>OVER A PERIOD OF TWELVE YEARS</u>

Hanna Weihl



CHANGES IN FAMILY STRUCTURE OF THE AGED AND THEIR INTERGENERATIONAL RELATIONS OVER A PERIOD OF TWELVE YEARS

Final Report

Principal Investigator: Hannah Weihl, M.A. Senior Researcher, Brookdale Institute of Gerontology and Adult Human Development in Israel

Senior Lecturer, Paul Barwald School of Social Work, Hebrew University, Jerusalem

Project supported by a grant from the Ford Foundation received through the Israel Foundations Trustees*. 9/A

* The First and Second Phases on which this project was based, were funded by grants from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare of the U.S. Government.

12-M156-86

0

stedele



1 BACKGROUND AND METHODOLOGY

1.1 Project History

-

This project began in 1966 when the Israeli Ministry of Welfare received a grant from the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare to investigate aging in Israel. The project, as then planned, was part of a cross-national study of aging to be carried out in the U.S., England, Denmark, Poland and Yugoslavia. As Israel, Poland and Yugoslavia were latecomers to the project, they had no part in the planning and had to adhere to the previously-decided methods and questions, though they were free to add a small proportion of new questions.

The original project was not planned as a longitudinal study. Its aim was to obtain basic and comparative information about the aged and their situation in various countries. It was therefore more of a survey than an in-depth study. This study design therefore effects considerable constraints on longitudinal analysis. In Israel it was a nationwide study, based on a representative sample of all Jewish noninstitutionalized and non-rural persons aged 65 or over (in 1966).¹ The surveyed aspects included: health and physical functioning, family and household structure, intergenerational interaction and support, housing, work, retirement and leisure activities. The interviewing was

The population of persons aged 65+ living in rural areas in 1966 was less than 8% of the total population aged 65+. It was decided to exclude them from the study because a) the cost of including them would have been prohibitive, and b) nearly all of these aged live in kibbutzim and moshavim. Both of these organizational units differ enormously from any other living arrangements and this population would have required an analysis of its own.

completed by mid-1967 and a research report was finished two years later.

The second phase of the project was carried out in 1971 with the aid of a grant from DHEW. This phase concentrated on family relations and generational support; it did not include housing, work or retirement. By that time about a quarter of the original sample had died and about 5% could not be traced.

The third project phase was funded by the Ford Foundation in 1978. Interviewing was carried out in the summer of 1979. By that time the population had shrunk to 363 interviewees, constituting 22.1% of the original interview population. Naturally, a very large proportion had died, but there was also a considerable increase in the proportion of persons who could not be located. The questionnaire was cut to include only the essentials for longitudinal comparison and analysis.

This report deals mainly with the longitudinal aspect of the project. For further information, the reader is referred to the previous research reports on the first two stages.²

1

- 2 -

A. Weihl, H., Nathan, T., Avner, U., Investigation of the Family Life, Living Conditions and Needs of the Non-Institutionalized Urban Jewish Aged 65 in Israel, <u>Ministry of Social Welfare</u>, 1970.

B. Weihl, H., Final Report to DHEW, unpublished, 1974. Available at the library of the School of Social Work, Hebrew University, Jerusalem.

1.2 Method

1.2.1 The sample

The universe sampled was the urban³ Jewish population of Israel, born before December 31, 1901, and living in private households (i.e., not in institutions).⁴

1.2.2 Sample design

A two-stage sample design was used. The primary sampling units were voter lists, from which the secondary sampling units were chosen.

A sample of just over 1% of the universe (1,500 cases including fallouts and zero cases) was decided upon, the restriction being due to financial reasons. It was estimated that this would result in 1,200 completed interviews.

The sampling of the e 1,500 cases was carried out in two stages:

- a) Sampling of voter li ts. All voter lists had an equal probability of inclusion. Since it was decided to obtain a mean number of five aged persons per lis, 300 lists were sampled out of a total of 2,093 (every seventh list).
- b) Sampling of the aged in the voter lists obtained in the first stage. The units of investigation were those families that included aged

3 "Urban" was defined by type of municipal organization. All types, except the predominantly rural ones, were included.

"Institutions": any dwellings housing more than four persons aged 65+.

persons. The sampling of these units was split into two subsumples. First, every tenth aged person appearing on the list was chosen for sampling (therefore the final sampling fraction was $\frac{1}{70}$). These aged were interviewed only if they were heads of households, defined as the oldest man living in the household, or the oldest woman in the absence of such a man. All persons aged 65+ living in households where the head was included in the sample, were interviewed. Those aged persons who were sampled but who turned out not to be heads of households, were not interviewed. Furthermore, persons sampled but not living in the area marked as the voting district, ⁵ were excluded. Second, in order to compensate for errors in the poter lists, an area sample was obtained. One-fifth of the voting istrices included in the sample were divided into two areas of estimated equal population. These areas were clearly marked or a man. One of the areas was sampled (equal probability sampling) and a house-to-house screening was undertaken. All persons qualifying by age who were not included in the electoral district's voter lists were marked down for interviewing.

1.2.3 1.2.3. <u>Data_collection</u>

> The research instrument was a personal interview. When the interviewee could not respond (because of illness, deafness or confusion), a shortened interview schedule was presented to the person who took care of him /her.⁶ This schedule covered objective information only, such as

"Voting district": the geographic area of a voter list.

Henceforth referred to as "proxy interviews".

- 4 -

family structure, whereabouts of children, housing and health. This procedure was adopted in all three stages.

The questionnaire was composed mostly of open-ended questions that were coded after the interview. At stages 2 and 3 the same codes were used, though the questions were asked as open ones. As it turned out, there was almost no need to add new categories.

1.2.4 Outcome of the interview process

The original Stage One sample population encompassed 1,778 persons aged 65 or over and resident in their homes. Eighty-eight percent of these were interviewed, including 3% proxy interviews. Table 1.1 indicates the outcome of the three interview phases.

Tracing the original sample population was difficult, tedious and expensive. Because this project was not originally planned as a longitudinal study, no one had bothered to obtain the identity numbers of those persons who entered the sample through the area sampling. Consequently, we could not use the Population Registry to trace those persons who no longer lived at their former addresses and about whom the new residents knew nothing. Our experience with the Population Registry showed that the elderly who move tend not to notify the Registry Office.

- 5 -

2. GEOGRAPHICAL MOBILITY

2.1 Residential-Institutional Mobility

Locating all those persons contacted at the previous stages proved to be a problem that consumed much time and effort. Table 2.1 shows the results of efforts to trace the aged persons surveyed at Stage One.

The differences between Stages Two and Three with regard to tracing the population sample are due both to its attrition and to the fact that over 10% of the Stage Two sample could not be located. It may be assumed that a considerable proportion of these actually live in institutions7, though some have probably moved in with their children without bothering to notify the Population Registry. The proportions of such movements is rather small (see Chapter 3) and thus is probably similarly minute amongst those about whom we have no information. There therefore remains a considerable proportion of untraced persons who can only have moved to institutions. The case for a high percentage of "untraceables" found in institutions is reinforced by data on population to be mobility (Table 2.1) which show that the movement towards institutions between Stages Two and Three was more than twice as large as that between Stages One and Two.

We also assume that about 25% of them died before the Stage Two interviewing began. This assumption is based on the death rate amongst the entire population (48%) and on the fact that no identity numbers were obtained for about 50% of these unlocated persons and they therefore could not be traced via the Population Registry. There was another reason, though of minor dimensions, for the failure to locate sample members at Stage Three. The original sample was based on voting areas. A number of such areas were demolished and rebuilt, or converted into industrial sites. Nobody in these areas knew what had become of the previous residents.

- 6 -

Table 2.1 Results of tracing interviews

- 1

	Stage Two	Stage Three
Interviewed	X	%
	62.4	32.0
Refusals	3.2	2 0
In old age homes	5.2	2.8
T	1.6	2.6
In nursing homes for the chronically ill	1.1	1.0
In other hospitals	0.8	_
Address unknown	3.3	11.6
Correct address but person not at home ^{a)}	1.1	1.1
Not interviewed because of language problem	s –	2.1
Deceased	26.4	48.0
TOTAL	100 *	
N	100 %	100 %
	1,554	1,144

a) Interviewers were instructed to visit the correct address three times. Table 2.1 indicates that more persons resided in old age homes⁸ than in nursing homes at Stages Two and Three. This finding points to a differential mobility towards institutions, because the original sample (Stage One) was drawn from the non-institutionalized population. This rather unexpected finding is corroborated by the data on mobility between the three stages. Table 2.2 demonstrates that more persons have moved into residential care than into nursing homes, but that the increase in the proportion of nursing home residents at Stage Three as compared with Stage One is larger than the comparative increase in the proportions of old age home residents. Thus, with increased age (eight years difference between Stages Two and Three) more persons move into nursing homes while the number of transfers to residential care diminishes. The impact of age on this movement is highlighted by Table 2.3.

Table 2.2 further shows that apart from a flow towards institutions, the geographical mobility of the aged decreased. While at Stage Two when younger - 7% changed their address (not including 3% who moved with their children), the corresponding Stage Three percentage is only 2%.

The Israeli Law defines old-age homes as "Institutions for functionally independent persons, 65 or more years old" (Institutional Licensing Law 1965).

8

- 8 -

•		Mobility between Stages One and Two as measured at Stage Two	Mobility between Stages Two and Three as measured at Stage Three
	J.	%	%
Address unchanged		81	69
Address changed, unknown		4	17 ^{a)}
Moved into nursing homes		1	4
Moved into old age homes		2	6
In other hospitals		1	_
Lived apart from children - joined households		2	1
Lived apart from children - moved to separate apartment		4	1
Lived with children - moved with them		3	1
Lived with children - separated to own apartment		1	-
Other .		1	1
TOTAL	4	100%	100%
N		1,540	1,127

Table 2.2 Population mobility between the three project stages, by percentage of

. 1

.

An explanation of the high proportion of unlocated persons at Stage Three has been offered above (see p.2).

Table 2.3: Population mobility between project stages, by age (1)

3

		Mobilit Two as	y betwee measured	en Stages 1 at Stag	s One and ge Two	Mobility Three as	between neasured	Stages d at Sta	Two and ge Three	Total death	18	
		70-74	75-79	80+	TOTAL	Living 78-82	persons 83-87	only 88+	TOTAL	Stages 2 and	3 ^{a)}	
	Address unchanged	82.0	80.0	79.0	81.0	72.1	67.6	46.3	66.2	72.7		
	Address changed, unknown	3.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	16.9	17.6	43.9	21.5	12.7		
	Moved into nursing homes	0.5	.1.8	2.0	1.0	1.3	0.6	3.7	1.4	0.4	i	
	Moved into old age homes	1.7	2.5	3.0	2.0	3.1	9.7	4.9	5.3	6.1		
ı	In other hospitals	1.0	1.0	-	1.0	(- 1)	-	-	· _ ·	1.1		
- 10	Lived apart from children - joined households	1.0	2.5	3.0	2.0	0.9	-	-	0.5	0.2	1	
	Lived apart from children - moved to separate apartment	6.0	4.6	2.0	4.0	0.6	0.6	-	0.5			
	Lived with children - moved with them	2.5	2.1	3.1	3.0	3.1	2.3	-	2.4	0.4		
	Lived with children - separated to own apartment	1.0	0.5	1.0	1.0	1.9	1.7	1.2	1.7	0.7		
	Other	1.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	-	-	-	-	-		
	TOTAL	100.0%	100.02	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.02		
	N	781	394	371	1546	319	176	82	577	542		

Since it was not known at what age these people died, they could not be included in any age group.

2.2 Mobility by Age

The effect of age on transfer to institutions has been mentioned above. Table 2.3 indicates the effects of age on all aspects of mobility. These may be summarized as follows:

11

- a) With increased age, people tend to move (without notifying the authorities of their new abode). It can be assumed that part of this change is explained by deaths that could not be verified, and probably in even larger part by transfer to institutions.
- b) The transfer of single generation households to another address declines with age.
- c) The proportion of multigenerational households breaking up as a result of a change in the aged's address (not change to institution) remains stable with increased age.
- d) The rejoining of households nearly disappeared by Stage Three.
- e) The transfer to nursing homes gains in volume with age, whilst that to residential care decreases.

2.3 Mobility by Ethnic Origin

Table 2.4 shows that the most mobile ethnic group are Sephardim from Turkey, Bulgaria, Greece, or born in Israel, and that they move most often into residential care. Moreover, this group possessed the highest rate of transfer to institutions at both measurement points.

Table	2.4:	Population	mobility,	by	ethnic	origin	(%)	

	Stage One recorded	Stage One population as recorded at Stage Two			Stage Two population as recorded at Stage Three			
	European origin	Middle- Eastern origin	Balkan and Israel	European origin	Middle- Eastern origin	Balkan and Israel		
Address unchanged	81.3	81.1 3	76.0	72.4	69.9	60.7		
Address changed, unknown	3.2	4.7	4.5	14.6	20.6	19.1		
Moved to old age home	2.0	0.7	7.3)	6.8	1.3	12.4		
Moved to nursing home	1.8 4.	5 0.5 2.6	0.6 8.5	3.9710.	8 2.9 4.5	2.2 / 14		
In other hospitals	0.7	1.4	0.6	0.1)	0.3	0.3		
Lived apart from children - joined household	1.9	1.6	3.4	0.9	2.6	2.2		
Lived apart from children - moved to separate apartment	6.2	3.0	2.2	1.0	0.1	3.4		
Lived with children - moved with them	1.4	4.7	2.2	0.1	0.7	-		
Lived with children - separated	0.9	0.9	1.7	0.1	0.7			
Other	0.6	1.4	1.7	-	-	-		
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.02		
N	938	429	179	691	306	89		

Those aged of Middle-Eastern origin have the lowest rate of transfer to institutions, as well as the lowest increase in this transfer rate at Stage Three. This may be due to a lack of ethnically-oriented residential facilities for this sector of the aged population.

2.4 Mobility by Type of Household

The analysis of mobility by type of household shows one significant, though not unexpected fact. The proportion of those who lived in a single generation household and moved into institutions is considerably higher than the corresponding proportion amongst those who lived in multi-generational households. At Stage Two the proportions were 4.1% and 1.1% respectively, and at Stage Three - 10.8% and 7.1%. This finding may well be due to the higher proportion of aged who had no children and transferred to institutions, their household arrangement being monogenerational by definition.

3. HOUSEHOLDS OF THE AGED: CHANGES OVER A TWELVE YEAR PERIOD

3.1 Household Description

In the course of a lifetime people live in various kinds of households. Looked at from the point of view of the individual, there are two basic types: a situation where one is in a position of dependence, with little or no authority concerning household affairs, and the other, in which the individual occupies a position of authority and independence. The former type is irrelevant to the present discussion, while the second, in its later chronological stages, is very much the subject of interest.

- 14 -

The concern here is with households consisting of persons aged 65+, most of whom have living children.¹ Not all of these children are adults. Most of these elderly person: live apart from their children,² but a considerable proportion share their living arrangements with a child. These multigenerational households are of two types:

an elderly person (or couple) living with young unmarried children;³
an elderly person (or couple) living with a married/widowed child (and his family).

Phase One investigated a 1% representative sample of Jewish urban noninstitutionalized persons aged 65+. Twelve percent of this population had no living children and another 9% had no children living in Israel.

Thirty-four percent of all men and 44% of all women of the original sample lived in multigenerational households.

Beighteen percent of multigenerational households were composed of one or two aged persons living with at least one child under 21 years old. Twenty-four percent lived with a young unmarried adult child. Such is a static description of the households of aged persons, but when the longitudinal project was launched this photography of the distribution of household types was not the central interest.

The questions that arose while studying these data were the following. How, why, and when do these various types of living arrangements emerge (and disappear)? Is there any mobility between them? What are the lines of development from the "baseline", i.e. the household inhabited by parents and adult children, untile the death of both parents? Why do some children separate from their parents while others remain with them? Are these developments patterned by cultural norms of traditional versus modern societies? Not all of these questions can be dealt with on the basis of the data available from this project. This chapter mainly concerns itself with describing the lines of household development.

3.2 Cross-Sectional Analysis

The distribution of the two basic types of households at the three project phases (Table 3.1) shows that:

- a) multigenerational households constitute a large minority at all three project stages. Even among those over age 78, 26% lived in multigenerational households.
- b) the proportion of multigenerational households diminishes considerably with increased age - and,
- c) this decrease is higher in three than in two generation households.

- 15 -

_		Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3
	Monogenerational households	60	69	74
	Multigenerational households			
	Two-generational households	23	18	17
	Three-generational households	17	13	9
	TOTAL	100%	100%	100%
	N	1,283	899	333

Table 3.1: Distribution of types of households (%)

The data indicate a gradual disappearance of multigenerational households, especially of those containing three generations. The result is an increase of households inhabited by either an older couple or a single aged person. The comparison of the distribution of subtypes of monogenerational households across the three phases (Table 3.2) shows, as one would expect, a marked decrease in the proportion of married couples and a marked increase of widowed aged of both sexes living alone.

Table 3.2: Distribution of subtypes of monogenerational households (%)

 •	Phase One	Phase Two	Phase Three
Married couples	65	62	45
Unmarried men	6	9	19
Unmarried women	25	25	34
With other elderly persons ^{a)}	4	4	2
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%
N	765	619	248

a) With siblings, cousins, parents, or others.

This increase in households constituted of unmarried aged persons living along is highlighted by the following figures: they stood at 17% of all households at Phase One, 23% at Phase Two, and 39% at Phase Three, at which point the population was over 78 years old.¹ The steady increase of this type of household with advancing years should be of interest to the authorities who plan services for the aged; this type of household is the most prone to require support if the functional capacity of its sole occupant deteriorates.

Analysis of the same data by cultural origin shows interesting differences between the two major ethnic groups.

Table 3.3 shows that the distribution of households among the sample population of European origin underwent less change over the duration of the project than that of the population of Middle Eastern origin, though thedirection of their change is the same. The increase of monogenerational households in this groups was twice as large as that registered in the population of European origin; the decrease of bigenerational households is 12% compared with 3% in the other group. Only the decrease in trigenerational households among those of European origin exceeds that of the Middle Eastern group. The attrition in the proportions of bigenerational households is due to the departure of the (young) children who were still living with their parents at Phase One and separated afterwards, leaving the parents in monogenerational households. This change occurs more frequently among those on non-European origin, as indicated by the much higher proportion of households with young unmarried children than in the European group (Table 3.4).

1

- 17 -

It should be pointed out that even at the advanced age, 39% of cll households included married couples, amongst them 5% in multigenerational households.

Phases	Eur	opean O	rigin	Middle	-Eastern	Origin		
1 111000	1	2	3	1	2	3		
Monogenerational households	71	80	81	36	45	<u>_</u> 55	2	
Bigenerational households	15	12	13	38	31	26		
Trigenerational households	14	8	6	. 26	24	19		
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%		
N	731	543	221	347	254	78		
Bigenerational households Trigenerational households TOTAL N	15 14 100 x 731	12 8 1007 543	13 6 100% 221	38 26 100% 347	31 24 100% 254	26 19 100% 78		

Table	3.3:	Distribution	of	households,	by	cultural	origin*	(%)
-------	------	--------------	----	-------------	----	----------	---------	----	---

* In order to obtain more clearly defined groups, those born in Israel, the Balkans and Turkey whenever a distribution is constructed using 'Cultural Origin' as a variable, here and forward.

Origin	With young dependent child ^a)	With young independent child ^b)	With married son	With married daughter	Others ^{d)}	TOTAL	N
European							
Phase 1	12	24	15	33	14	100%	245
Phase 2	11	22	16	47	4	100%	135
Phase 3 ^{a)}							42
			~				
Middle-Eastern							
Phase 1	27	33	24	11	15	100%	264
Phase 2	20	27	29	17	8	100%	150
Phase 3 ^{c)}							34

Table 3.4:	Distribution of multigenerational	household subtypes
	over the three project phases, by	cultural origin (%)

a) Dependent child; less than 21 years old.

b) Young independent child: unmarried and over 21 years old. This includes mainly young people, although a few middle-aged children living with their parents are included in this category.

c) Percentage not computed because N too small.

d) Living with widowed, separated or divorced children, or living with grandchildren only.

- 19 -

3.3 Household Development

So far, this cross-sectional analysis indicated that the main direction of household development is that of multigenerational households breaking up into two separate homes, leaving the aged parent(s) to live alone. This event may occur at different points in the life cycle. There exists empirical evidence, that the children of the majority of those aged 65+ have attained adulthood and left the home (either married or single) years before the parent reached that age. The present data indicate that this is, in fact, the case: 63% of those who were 65-69 years old at Phase One (the figure includes those with no living children, about 10%) already lived in monogenerational households. Because of the higher number of children and the significant différences in age between spouses in the population of non-European crigin,² this event in family development often occurs at a later age in this group.

The second line of family development, not documented in the above data, presents a case in which the generations have never separated: the aged parent and the adult child (generally married, but sometimes single) continue to live together in the same household. The data show that 81% of all persons living in multigenerational households at Stage Two had never separated from their children.³

When asked if they had ever considered separation, 47% answered that they would probably separate in the future, when the last child married, while 38% indicated that living together was for them an irreversible arrangement. These figures may indicate the proportions of those who

See Report of Phase One, Table 1.6.

This includes parents living with young children. The question was not asked at Phase One because at that time we were not yet aware of its

- 20 -

prefer the second line of household development - that of non-separation of the generations; but, even if statistically correct, it would be unwise to use this as a prediction inasmuch as another population would differ in cultural composition and educational level.

Nineteen percent of all those living in multigenerational households at Phase Two reported that they had rejoined households after a period of living separately (this period included the five years between Phases One and Two, but was in most cases a much longer period).

The reasons for rejoining households were: Moving in with children because of death of spouse 25% Moving in with children because of health 13% Moving in with children because of difficulties in living alone 13% Children moving in with parents because of children's problems (widowed, separation, financial) 23% Children moving in with parents because of parental 12% problems Households joined because of housing authority policy 4% TOTAL 100% N 52

These data indicate that:

a) The rejoining of households operates in two directions: parents move into their children's home, and vice versa.

b) The death of a spouse is the most frequent reason for re-establishing

a joint household, but only a small proportion⁴ of widowed persons actually make such a move.

This third line of development nearly disappeared in Phase Three. Only 12 Phase Two monogenerational households had become multigenerational households at Phase Three, a number that constituted 5% of all Phase Three multigenerational households.

The longitudinal analysis corroborates the above findings, i.e., that there is little movement from mono- to multigenerational households. The data show that between Phases One and Two, 9% of those who survived and had previously been living in mongenerational households, lived in multigenerational households at Phase Two. The corresponding proportions of mobility between Phases Two and Three was 5%. In accordance with the cross-sectional analysis, the proportion of those whose household composition changed in the other direction - from multi- to monogenerational households was considerably higher. This proportion stood at 28% at both intervals.

3.4 Conclusions

On the basis of the above data it is now possible to map out the lines of household development beginning at the point in the family life cycle that is often cited as the "launching" stage, i.e., the stage at which all the children have become young adults. Two main lines are clearly discernable:

- 22 -

⁴ This proportion constitutes 6% of widowed persons living alone, but is actually smaller because it is computed from a population that includes those aged with no living children.

4: INTERACTION WITH CHILDREN

4.1 Introduction

There are two dimensions to the interaction between the generations of a family: structure and content. Factors such as: the interaction situs, frequency and with which child it occurs, relate to the structural aspect. Questions such as why they meet and what passes between them (instrumental versus expressive transfers) relate to the second dimension. Obviously, these two aspects are interrelated. For example, frequent contacts may well reflect on the quality of the relationship.

Research on intergenerational relations has, until now, focused mainly on the structural dimension, both because it is easier to investigate and because structure often indicates content. When this project began in the mid-60's, the emphasis was on structure and the instrumental content of interaction, such as mutual help patterns and financial support. Only at phase two of the project were a few questions added to the probe in the expressive direction.

When this research was initiated as a longitudinal study, it was assumed that the type of household in which the aged parents lived was a major factor in their living conditions. Living with a child involves daily contact and an inbuilt support system in case of need. Household services are extended irrespective of whether or not the aged parent contributes physically or financially towards his/her maintenance. Living separately from children differs in both these respects: the independence of this living arrangement necessitates activity and

- 24 -

enterprise in the area of household maintenance and in the maintenance of contact with children. Living apart from children offers independence, privacy and autonomy at the cost of security. This short discussion of the differences between the two types of households explains why we chose to focus our analysis upon this variable.

The relationship between parent and grown children should be examined from two ends simultaneously, i.e. as seen by both generations. This was done only in phase two, when we interviewed the son/daughter with whom the parent lived. No interview was made of the children of those aged persons who kept a separate household. This report will not refer to the children's viewpoint because the material is incomplete and cannot be compared longitudinally.

4.2 Contact with children

One of the focal questions of the cross-national study (phase one) was "when did you last see one of your children (not living with you)?" All countries participating in the study reported a high proportion who had seen at least one child during the week previous to the interview.

Table 4.1 shows that in Israel the proportion increased along with the project phases, particularly among those who share a household with at least one of their children.

- 25 -

-	Phase One	Phase Two	Phase Three
Monogenerational household	79	2.5	
Multigenerational	1 77	//	85
household	69 7 73	78	85

Table 4.1 Proportions of parents who had seen at least one child during previous week, by type of household (%)

These data indicate that contact with children is frequent, that it probably increases with age (the population having become older with each interview), that only a small proportion has little contact with their children and that these contacts are not affected by the type of living arrangements.

An analysis of contacts with children by type of household and marital status (Table 4.2) shows that more married persons, at all three phases, had contact with at least one child during the week preceding the interview. This particulr difference was more marked in multigenerational households.

Table 4.2: Proportions of parents who saw at least one child during the week preceding the interview, by type of household and marital status

Type of Marital	Phas	Phase One		se Two	Phase Three		
Household Status	Married	Not Married	Married	Not Married	Married	Not	
Household Multiseperational	80	77	76	81	87	82	
Household	83	61	83	76	x ^a	84	

a) Not computed because N too small.

The distance to the nearest child's residence did not affect interaction; neither did the cultural origin, income and level of education. Contact increased somewhat among parents who had four or more children, especially when the dependent variable was phrased "Did you see any of your children yesterday or today?"

4.3 Location of contact with children

At phases Two and Three the following closed question was asked, "Do you customarily visit your children?" (Answers: often, seldom, never). The answers show a marked difference by type of household and small differences between the phases. Those living in monogenerational households tended to visit their children more frequently than those living with other children (significant at a 0.001 level). Approximately every third parent living with a child claimed never to visit the home of some other child.

lable	4.3:	Parents'	visits	to	child's	home.	bv
		by type	of house	eho]	ld (%)	,	-,

		Pha	se Two		Phase Three					
Type of Household	Often	Seldom	Never	Total	N	Often	Seldom	Never	Total	N
Monogenerat- ional	49	33	18	100%	483	37	41	22	100%	205
Multigenerat- ional	28	40	32	100%	196	25	37	38	100%	205

- 27 -

These patterns were consistent at both phases. There was a slight shift towards less visiting with the passage of time, which may be due to increased functional difficulties. This explanation is based on the relationships found, in both phases, between the frequency of visits and parental age on the one hand - the younger age cohorts paying more visits $(x^2 \text{ significant at } 0.05)$ - and the visitation frequency and difficulties with managing stairs on the other.

The differences between the two types of households are of a more complex nature and are partially due to the influence of other independent variables, such as cultural origin and income. At both phases and in both types of households, the European parents tended to visit their children more than those of Middle-Eastern origin (Table 4.4). The same pattern held true for income level; those with higher incomes tended to visit their children more than those from the lower income strata - again at both phases and in both types of households (Table 4.5).

Table 4.6 demonstrates that income affects visiting patterns irrespective of cultural origin. In both ethnic groups, parents whose income is comparatively high tend to visit their children more frequently than those whose income is lower. This finding indicates that income is probably a better predicator of visiting patterns than cultural origin, though the interdependence of these variables should be remembered. The same picture is obtained when the type of household is held constant, but the introduction of a fourth variable diminishes the absolute number in some categories (especially at phase Three) to a

- 28 -

Table 4.4 :	Parental visits	to children's	home, by
	type of househol	d and cultural	origin (%)

Phase Two

Cultura	llousehold		D			a second s							
Cultura			Doesn't				Doesn't	the second s		Colored Colored Colored	Doesn't		
	1	Visits	visit			Visits	visit			Visits	visit		
Origin		child	child	Total	N	child	child	Total	N	child	child	Total	N
Europea	n	86	14	100%	334	76	24	100%	59	84	16	100%	393
Middle-	Eastern	66	34	100%	99	61	39	100%	114	63	37	100%	213
Total		8 ŀ	19	100%	433	66	34	100%	173	76	24	100%	606

1

Phase Three

Type of Household	Мо	nogenera	ational		Multigenerationa	Total					
Cultural Origin	Household	Visits child	Doesn'i visit child	t Total	N	Doesn't Visits visit child ^a)child ^a Total	N	Visits child	Doesn't visit child	Total	N
European		77	33	100%	148		21	77	33	100%	160
Middle-Easte	rn	52	48	100%	56		36	57	43	100%	96
Total		.70	30	100%	204		57	70	30	100%	256
			Υ = -0.9 p < 0.0	51 01		no relationship			γ = -0.4 p < 0.0	1	

a) Percentage not computed because N too small.

1 .

Table 4.5:	Parental visits to children's home, by	Y
	type of household and income level (%)

Phase Two

	Type of Household			Monogenerational				Multigenerational					
Income Level	Household	Visits child	Doesn' visit child	t Total	N	Visits child	Doesn't visit child	Total	N	Visits child	Doesn't visit child	Total	N
Low Income		68	32	100%	120	59	41	100%	100	64	36	100%	220
Higher Income		87	23	100%	291	78	22	100%	68	85	15	100%	359
Total		81	19	100%	411	67	33	100%	168	77	23	100%	579
			γ = -0. p < 0.	52 001			$\gamma = -0.42$ p < 0.02	2			γ = 0.53 p < 0.00	1	

1

17

. .

Phase Three

- 30 -

	Type of	Monogenerational				Multigenerational				Total			
Income Level	nousenoid	Visits child	Doesn't visit child	Total	N	Visits child	Doesn'i visit child	Total	N	Visits child	Doesn't visit child	Total	 N
Low income		60	40	100%	90	а	а	100	45	57	43	100%	135
Higher Income		85	15	100%	96	а	а	100	14	85	15	100%	112
Total		73	17	100%	186	61	39	100%	59	70	30	100%	247
		-	y = -5.5 p < 0.00	01]	γ =-0.8 p < 0.00	91		J	r =-0.6 p < 0.00]	l	-

a - Percentages not computed because N too small.

		Phase T	WO			Phase Thr	ee	
Cultural Origin	Visits child	Doesn't visit child	Total	N	Visits child	Doesn't visit child	Total	N
European			, to j;					
Low income	75	25	100%	150	64	36	100%	53
Higher Income	91	9	100%	219	85	15	1005	58
Total	84	16	100%	369	77	23	100%	151
		γ = -0.5 p < 0.0	01			γ =-0.5 p < 0.01		
		•		·		•		
Middle-Eastern								
Low income	68	32	100%	238	51	49	100%	82
ligher income	82	18	100%	38	86	14	100%	14
lotal .	69	31	100%	276	57	43	100%	96
		not sig	nificant			γ =-0.6 p < 0.01		

Table 4.6: Parental visits to children's home, by cultural origin and level of income (\$)

\$

- 31 -

point where a statistical presentation would be meaningless.

Once again, examining Table 4.3 and 4.4 and bearing in mind the above discussion of the association between cultural origin, income and parental visits to children's homes, we can return to the question posed previously: what explanation is there for the finding (Table 4.2) that more aged parents living in monogenerational households visit their children than do those aged who share their children's household? Table 4.4 shows that monogenerational households were predominately inhabited by the aged who stem from Europe (about 80% of all those of European origin lived in monogenerational household at Phase Two), while the aged of Middle-Eastern origin constituted the majority of inhabitants of multigenerational households. Europeans, especially where they belong to higher income groups, tend to visit with their children. Thus it is not the household situation that defines visiting patterns but rather the cultural attributes of the people who live in them.

4.4 Longitudinal analysis (monogenerational households)

A longitudinal analysis of parental visits with their children shows a considerable rate of change in habitual visiting patterns (Table 4.7). Just over half of those who, at Phase Two used to visit their children often, cut back on their visits by Phase Three. On the other hand, nearly half of those who never visited their children at Phase Two, did visit them at Phase Three. Fourty four percent of those who survived to Phase Three had not changed their visiting patterns,

- 32 -

whereas 19% had changed positively and 37% negatively.*

		8.	Phas	e Two	
3		Visits often	Visits seldom	Never visits	Total
Phase Three					
Visits often	1.	48	31	20	38
Visits seldom		32	37	28	29
Never visits		19	31	53	29
Total		100%	100%	1.00%	100%
N		108	67	40	215

Table 4.7: Parental visits to children at Phase Two, by parental visits to children at Phase Three (%)

Changed visiting patterns are associated both with self-evaluation of health and with cultural origin (Table 4.8). Parents of European origin and respondents who rated their health as "good"¹ displayed more stable visiting patterns over time than those who rated their health as less than good and those who were reared in a traditional society. Fourty-one percent of those who rated their health as less than good at Phase Three had changed their visiting habits negatively, probably because of increasing difficulties in mobility.

Positive change: an increase in habitual visiting frequency. Negative change: a decline in visiting frequency.

¹ Those variables are interrelated.

.- 33 -

					-
Cultural origin	No change	Changed positi vely	Changed negatively	Total	N
European	50	15	35	100%	139
Middle-Eastern	33	26	40	100%	72
Total	44	19	37	100%	211
Self-evaluation of health					
Good	63	15	23	100%	40
Fair	39	20	41	100%	119
Poor	43	16	41	100%	49
Fotal	44	18	38	100%	208

Table 4.8: Distribution of aged parents living in monogenerational households at Phase Three and their changes in visiting patterns, by cultural group and self-evaluation of health

4.5 Children's visits to parents

Any assumption concerning the differences between the two types of households must encompass children's visits to their parents' home. In as much as the various needs of aged parents living with children are generally covered by the bousehold in which they live (instrumental as well as emotional support), there is less immediate need for their other children to see them. We expected therefore to find that contact initiated by children - visits to the parental home - would occur more frequently in monogenerational households. The data does not bear this out (except at Phase One), as shown by Table 4.9.
preceding t as a percen	he interview, tage of total	by type of hous responses.	week sehold
l	Phase One	Phase Two	Phase Three
Monogenerational household	81	79	83
Multigenerational household	60	74	81

Table 4.9: Parents who stated that at least one child (or grandchild) had visited th

Differences were also expected between married and widowed parents living alone, because of the probability of greater needs (for services as well as general support) of the widowed. Again, the findings apparently reject this hypothesis (Table 4.10). The higher proportion of married persons who received visits from their children may well reflect the effect of living together and of both being interviewed on the same day. If the answers were identical (and this was the case for most married couples) then there were two valid answers for one visit. Thus the hypothesis cannot be confirmed or rejected, but rather more refined analysis is called for.

One further hypothesis rejected by the data concerns the effect of income level. Because of the importance of income as a predictor of the frequency of conta:t with children (see Tables 4.5 and 4.6) the same variable was again examined for its impact on this other aspect of intergenerational contact; however, no relationship was found.

Self-evaluation of health, on the other hand, seems to be related to children's visits. Table 4.10 indicates that in monogenerational households the percentage of parents visited by their children was

higher among those whose health ratings were low than among those who rated their health as good. This may be because of the greater need of these aged parents on the one hand, and the greater concern exhibited by the their children, on the other.

Table 4.10: Children who visited their parents during the week preceding the interview, by type of household, household, cultural origin, age and selfevaluation of health (% of total responses)

		Drigin	A	ge	Self- of he	evaluation alth
	Europ	ean Eas	tern 70-7	9 80+	Good	Fair-Poor
Phase One						
Monogenerational houseold						
Single parent	56	75	56	65		
Couple	5.8	70	50	03	4/	62
Multigenerational household	50	70	62	68	56	64
Unmarried + children	47	65	59	61	42	50
Married + children	52	74	66	52	67	50 62
Phase Two						02
Monogenerational household	77	84	66	74	65	. 7
Multigenerational household.	57	87	73	74	83	0/ 7)
Phase Three					05	/1
lonogenerational household	71	75	80	88	64	76
urtigenerational household(P	ercenta	ge not	computed	becau	se N to	00 small).

Table 4.9 indicates a possible effect of age on children's visits to their parents, that is, the proportion of parents visited during the week preceding the interview increases considerably over time. The data in Table 4.10, although not statistically significant, supports this finding.

Cultural origin has statistical significance only regarding children's visits to parents living in multigenerational households. Further, the same tendency appears in monogenerational households. This finding is partly explained by the greater propensity of aged persons of European origin to live with an only child. Also, parents of Middle-Eastern origin tend to have at least one child living very close by, though not in the same household (Table 4.12). This last phenomenon may explain the slight difference by cultural origin as shown in Table 4.11.

	Mon	ogene	ra	tional	hou	usehol	d	М	ultige	nera	itional h	ouscho	ld
	Visi by c	ted hild	No by	t Visit child	ed	Total	N	Vi: by	sited child	Not by	Visited child	Total	N
Phase Two													
European Middle-	77	1	23	•		100%	338		57		43	100%	90
Eastern	84		16			100%	128		86		14	100%	121
Total	79		21			100%	466		72		28	100%	218
		γ p	* >	0.21 0.05						γ P	.66 ≤ 0.00	1	
Phase Thre	ee												
European Middle-	71		29			100%	140		x		x	100%	27
Eastern	75	2	25			100%	55		x		x	100%	27
Total	73	2	27			100%	195		80		20	100%	54
		T	10	relati	ons	hip		_		γ p	= 0.72 < 0.001		

Table 4.11: Children's visits to parents by cultural origin and type of household (%)

x = percentage not computed because N too small.

- 37 -

	Phase O	ne ^{a)}	Phase T	wo	Phase T	hree
	European	Middle- Eastern	European	Middle Eastern	European	Middle- Eastern
Practically next door	7	17	10 .	24	3	16
Within easy walking distance	23	31	26	51	24	25
Up to one hour travel	53	48	43	23	48	48
More than one hour travel	14	4	20	2	20	11
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	ч —		382	107	156	87

Table 4.12: Proximty of at least one child to parents living in monogenerational households, by cultural origin

a) The data concerning Phase One shows the same tendency.

4.6 Isolation from children

The findings so far have indicated a high rate of intergenerational contact. More than 70% of all persons (at all three phases) visited their children or were visited by them; only a very small proportion claimed never to see a child. The evidence suggests that only a small proportion of the aged are actually isolated from their children. Cross-tabulation of these two measures of intergenerational contact confirms this finding and shows that this proportion decreased with advancing years, from 19% of the entire population (both households) at Phase Two to 12% at Phase Three. These percentages of aged parents who seem "disengaged" from their children appear quite high, but are actually smaller. It shoud be borne in mind that our measure of "engagement" was "seen or visited during the week preceding the interview". It would hardly be fair to assume that persons who maintain bi-weekly contact with their children are isolated, especially if the visit requires lengthy travel.

The proportion of aged persons who had children in Israel not living with them and did not see them during the month prior to the interview was quite small: 5% of those living in monogenerational households and 9% of those living in multigenerational households (at Phase Two and Three). The Phase Two interview looked into the reasons for these infrequent contacts via open questions. About half of the parents' answers put the blame, so to speak, on the children. The reasons mentioned were: they are busy at work, have to care for small children, or just "do not visit". Only about 2% mentioned bad relations with their children or sons/daughters-in-law, although some of the above-mentioned answers probably indicate that relations are un-satisfactory. The other half of the reasosn mentioned for infrequent contact with the children depended on the older generation. Two such reasons were frequently mentioned: physical limitations and lack of money for travel expenses. Three respondents stated that they had no wish to see their children. These findigns indicate that isolation from children is rare and then only partly due to bad relations between the generations.

Contact with children can also be maintained by telephone. The Phase One interview did not introduce the subject, inasmuch as only a few people had close access to a telephone at that time. The increase in

- 39 -

the standard of living in Israel, as expressed by the expansion of the telephone service, brought telephones to the households of many aged persons. By Phase Two 36% of all those interviewed had telephones; and a Phase Three this proportion had increased to 69%. Assuming that many of the children, too, had meanwhile obtained telephones, the interview asked about the frequency of telephone contact with children. Cross-tabulation of the two types of contact (Table 4.13) - by telephone and meetings with children - shows that 11% of aged parents living in monogenerational households at Phase Two had neither met with nor talked to a child during the week preceding the interview.² The corresponding proportion for Phase Three was 7%. This finding again shows that the proportion of parents isolated from their children is small.

The data indicate that contact by telephone is not confined to those who actually have a phone. Some mentioned using the telephone of neighbours, and at Phase Two there were more parents who mentioned talking to their children by phone than there were persons among them who had private phones.

4.7 Intensity of intergenerational contact

Mutual visitng and contact by phone along with personal visits at close juncture are indications of intensive contact. The data show a high rate of mutual visiting (Table 4.14) as well as a high rate of the second mode of contact (Table 4.13).

It should be borne in mind that many of those who do not employ this type of contact had not telephone.

- 40 -

Table 4.13: Contact both by telephone during the week preceding the interview and by meeting a child during the same time span (% of total responses from monogenerational households).

	Phas	se One		
	Talked by phone	Did not talk by phone	Pha Talked by phone	se Two Did not talk by phone
Saw a child	41	41	57	29
fotal	7	11	7	7
1	48	52 100 %	64	30 1002
		477		206

The proportion of persons who both saw a child and talked to one during a given period was quite high and increased with the growing number of telephones at the respondents' disposal. Thus Table 4.13 shows that telephones are a means of intensificiation of contact with children and that, on the other hand, the increase in the number of telephones at the disposal of the aged (and their children) does not reduce isolation. The differences between the two phases, as shown in Table 4.13, possibly indicate that increased contact by telephone sometimes replaces face-to-face contact.

	Mc hc	onoger ouseho	nerat	tional	Multige househo	ner:	ntional
	Visi	it to ent	No to	visit parent	Visit to parent	No	visit
Phase Two				<u>parone</u>	- par one		parone
Visit to children	69		10		55	20	
No visit to children	16		5		12	13	
Total	85		15	100%	67	33	100%
N				530			191
Phase Three							
Visit to children	67		22		61	29	
No visit to children	7		4			8	
Total	74		26	100%	64	37	100%
N				175			38

Table 4.14: Parents' visits to children, by children's visits to parents (%)

Table 4.14 points out a high rate of mutual visitation, indicating the prevalence of intensive contact between the generations. It also shows differences between the types of households and differences between stages of the project. In multigenerational households there is less visiting by children to parents and there are more isolated aged than in the monogenerational household. This confirms our assumption that the assurance of the parent's security in a sibling's home decreases the immediate concern for his wellbeing, as expressed by frequent visits. The higher proportion of isolated aged probably expresses the feeling of security in the multigenerational household, but we should not overlook the fact that Table 4.14 includes the aged who live with an only son or daughter. The differences between the phases are more preplexing: in both types of household parents' visits to children has increased considerably, especially among those who were not visited by a child during the week preceding the interview. Thus, it seems that by Phase Three parents became more active in maintaining contact with children. This fact supports the theories maintaining that with the loss of peers and of various social roles, family relations gain in importance. The preplexing factor is the manifestation of this shift in relationships at such a late age.

Longitudinal analysis of visiting patterns shows that 90% of those who had been visited at Phase Two by a child or a grandchild during the week preceding the interview had had such visits at Phase Three. On the other hand, visits of friends and neighbors decreased considerably: only 38% of those who were visited by neighbors at Phase Two, and only 21% who were visited by friends, mentioned such visits at Phase Three. These findings indicate, again, the growing importance of family ties with the increase in age.

Cross-tabulation of the two variables of Table 4.15 - parents' visits to children's home and children's visits to parents' - yields yet another index of intensity of intergenerational contact, henceforth to be called 'mutual visiting pattern'. This variable is composed of four categories (see Table 4.15):

- a) contact maintained by mutual visiting (parents visit children and vice versa),
- b) contact maintained by parents visiting children,

- 43 -

c) contact maintained by children visiting parents,

d) no contact by visiting.

The first and last of these categories clearly relate to the intensity of the contact, the former positively, and the latter in the negative sense. As we already know that age relates negatively to parents' visits at their children's homes, ³ we expected that with age and with selfevaluation of health, categories a) and b) - mutual visiting and parents' visits only - will decrease. This hypothesis was confirmed by the data⁴. (See Table 4.15).

The more important data shown by Table 4.15 concern the compensatory nature of children's visits to parents: with the decline in the health of the parents (and growing older) children's visits increased, at both pahses. This compensatory effect is especially salient at Phase Three when the population as a whole has grown older by approximately eight years. Obviously this finding, too, points towards the strong familial support and the firm and meaningful relations with offsprings.

On the other hand, Table 4.15 indicates a tendency of increasing isolation with age and with bad health. The proportion of parents who have little or no contact with their children increases considerably at both Phases Two and Three with age and with low self-evaluation of health. Although the overall proportion of isolated older people is 5

³ See page 31

- 44 -

Because of the small number of persons in multigenerational households, especially at Phase Three, this analysis was carried out in monogenerational households only.

		Phase Two)						Phase Thr	ee		
Mutual visits	Parents visits only	Children visits only	No visits	TOTAL	N	M V	utual isits	Parents visits only	Children visits only	No visits	TOTAL	, N
74	22	2	2	100%	100		77	10	8	5	1002	39
67	20	9	4	100%	240		72	4	22	3	100%	96
49	14	21	15	100%	126		43	9	40	9	100%	35
63	19	11	7	100%	475		67	6	22	5	1007	170
						Age						
66	21	9	5	100%	268	78-82	71	8	19	2	100%	106
61	20	12	7	100%	141	83+	63	3	27	7	1002	67
57	13	15	15	100%	72							
63	19	11	7	100%	481		68	6	22	4	100%	193
	Mutual visits 74 67 49 63 66 61 57 63	Mutual visits Parents visits only 74 22 67 20 49 14 63 19 66 21 61 20 57 13 63 19	Mutual Parents Children visits visits visits 74 22 2 67 20 9 49 14 21 63 19 11 66 21 9 61 20 12 57 13 15 63 19 11	Mutual Parents Children No visits visits visits visits visits 74 22 2 2 67 20 9 4 49 14 21 15 63 19 11 7 66 21 9 5 61 20 12 7 57 13 15 15 63 19 11 7	Mutual Parents visits visits visits visits visits only No TOTAL TOTAL 74 22 2 100% 67 20 9 4 100% 49 14 21 15 100% 63 19 11 7 100% 66 21 9 5 100% 63 19 11 7 100% 63 19 12 7 100% 63 19 11 7 100% 63 19 11 7 100%	Mutual Parents Children No TOTAL N visits visits visits visits visits visits visits 74 22 2 2 100% 100 67 20 9 4 100% 240 49 14 21 15 100% 126 63 19 11 7 100% 475 66 21 9 5 100% 268 61 20 12 7 100% 141 57 13 15 15 100% 72 63 19 11 7 100% 481	Mutual Parents Children No TOTAL N Mutual No visits visits	Mutual Parents visits visits visits only only No visits visits only TOTAL N visits visits Mutual visits visits 74 22 2 2 100% 100 77 67 20 9 4 100% 240 72 49 14 21 15 100% 126 43 63 19 11 7 100% 475 67 66 21 9 5 100% 268 78-82 71 61 20 12 7 100% 141 83+ 63 57 13 15 15 100% 72 72 63 19 11 7 100% 481 68	Mutual Parents visits visits visits only Children No visits visits visits visits visits only TOTAL N Mutual Parents visits visits only 74 22 2 2 100% 100 77 10 67 20 9 4 100% 240 72 4 49 14 21 15 100% 126 43 9 63 19 11 7 100% 475 67 6 Age . 66 21 9 5 100% 268 78-82 71 8 61 20 12 7 100% 72 4 3 3 57 13 15 15 100% 72 268 78-82 71 8 63 19 11 7 100% 72 4 3 3 63 19 11 7 100% 481 68 6	Mutual Parents visits only Children No visits only TOTAL N visits visits only Mutual Parents visits only Children visits only No visits only TotAL N visits visits only Mutual Parents visits only Children visits visits only 74 22 2 2 100% 100 77 10 8 67 20 9 4 100% 240 72 4 22 49 14 21 15 100% 126 43 9 40 63 19 11 7 100% 475 67 6 22 66 21 9 5 100% 268 78-82 71 8 19 61 20 12 7 100% 141 83+ 63 3 27 57 13 15 15 100% 72 2 2 2 63 19 11 7 100% 481 68 6 22	Mutual Parents Children No TOTAL N Mutual Parents Children No visits vi	Mutual Parents Children No TOTAL N Mutual Parents Children No TOTAL 74 22 2 2 100% 100 77 10 8 5 100% 67 20 9 4 100% 240 72 4 22 3 100% 49 14 21 15 100% 126 43 9 40 9 100% 63 19 11 7 100% 475 67 6 22 5 100% 61 20 12 7 100% 141 83+ 63 3 27 7 100% 57 13 15 15 100% 72

Table 4.15: Mutual visitings patterns of persons living in monogenerational households, by age and by solfevaluation of health (%)

45

1

is small, it should worry planners of services because it increases with age. Part of the cause for this increasing isolation may be related to the increasing age and possible infirmity of the children. Another factor may be lower morale among the very old and the infirm aged, which may well be expressed by claiming not to be visited by their children.

Mutual visiting is affected both by income and by cultural origin, Knowing that these two variables are interrelated, we held the level of income constant and found that the effect of cultural origin is unclear (Table 4.16), partly because there were very few interviewees of Middle-Eastern origin in the higher income category. However, a careful examination of Table 4.16 indicates that income probably has a stronger influence on this index of intergenerational contact than cultural origin. Table 4.17 shows that income is strongly related to mutual visiting patterns at both Phases while the effect of cultural origin on this variable is effective only at Phase Three.

Table 4.17 shows three differences between the two cultural groups:

a) Children's visits to parents are more frequent among those of Middle-Eastern origin, probably because more of them have at least one child living at a short distance⁵; this pattern increased considerably during the period between the two project phases. This indicates that the compensatory nature of mutual visiting patterns mentioned above is a more effective mechanism of intergenerational relations among those of non-European origin.

5 See Table 4.12.

- 46 -

Table 4.16:	Mutual visiting pattern of elderly living in
	monogenerational households, by income level and cultural origin (%)

•			Phase	Тwo					Phas	e Three				-
		Mutual visits	Parents visits only	Children visits only	No visits	Total	N	Mutual visits	Parents visits only	Children visits only	No	Total	N	
1	Low income											Total		1
- 47	European origin	52	21	11	10	100%	108	71	9	12	9	100%	34	
	origin	53	19	15	13	100%	126	41	5	46	7	100%	41	
	High income			5										
	European origin Middle-Eastern	74	16	7	7	100%	202	82	3	14	1	100%	73	
	origin	(12)*					17	(8)*					9	

Absolute number. Percentage not computed because N too small.

.. ..

*

		Phas	se Two	n fel ander eigen eigen einen eine eine eine einen				Pha	Three			
	Mutual visits	Parents visits only	Children visits only	n No visit:	s Total	N	Mutual	Parents visits	s Children visits	n No		
Income								Unity	Uniy	Visits	Total	N
1. Low 2. Low-middle	47 56	22 23	15 12	16 9	100% 100%	93 141	55	7	31	7	100%	75
 High-middle High 	69 80	19 12	7 ··· 7	4	100% 100%	121 98	80	2	13	1	100%	82
Total	63	19	11	7	100%	453	70	4	22	4	100%	157
Cultural origin												
European Middle-Eastern Total	66 56 63	20 18 19	9 15 11	5 11 7	100% 100% 100%	333 148 481	76 49 68	7 6 7	14 40 21	3	100% 100%	120
	Mutual	visits	Other pa	tterns	Total	N	14.4		<u> </u>		100%	173
Income							Mutual	VISITS	Other Pa	tterns	Total	N
Low income High income Total	53 74 63	γ = -	47 36 37 0.45		100% 100% 100%	234 219 453	55 83 69	Y =-	45 17 31		100% 100% 100%	75 82 157
Cultural origin		p <	0.01					p <	0.01			
European Middle-Eastern Total	66 56 63	v = 0	34 44 37		100% 100% 100%	333 148 481	76 49 68		24 51 32		100% 100% 100%	120 53 173
		p < 0	.05					γ = p <	0.54 0.001		1000	1.18

Table 4.17: Mutual visiting pattern of persons living in monogenerational households, by income level and by cultural origin (%)

- 48

I

Whether this increase is due to cultural norms or to easier accessibility to parents, we do not know.

b) Mutual visits increased among those of European origin and decreased among those of Middle-Eastern origin, though in both groups there is an increase in children's visits to their parents.

These two findings enable us to hypothesize that the development of intergenerationl relations may well differ between these two cultural groups: those of European origin tend to shift with time and age mainly towards the mutual-visiting-pattern, while those of Oriental origin shift towards the children-visiting-parents-pattern. It seems somewhat improbable to attribute these differences of the development of intergenerational relations solely to differences in distance from children.

c) The proportion of isolated aged among those of Middle-Eastern origin is higher than among those of European origin.

- 49 -

5: PATTERNS OF HELP AND ASSISTANCE BETWEEN THE GENERATIONS

Discussion of this subject calls for a distinction between aged living alone (monogeneration households) and those living with a child. Generally speaking, the latter are cared for and their needs covered, in normal times as well as in times of crisis, though which of the various members of the household is the one on whom the aged parent is most dependent when in need, we do not know (and have not endeavoured to investigate in this project). The problem of the aged who live apart from children, and especially those who have none, is quite different, and often more severe, because they lack the built-in support system of those who share their households with children.

Four subtypes of this household are discernable with regard to the problems of intergenerational support. These subtypes are defined by whether or not they have children and by marital status.

	Married	Not married
Has children	а	Ъ
Does not have children*	с	d

The married couple is usually better off than the single or widowed aged person, because mostly one can help the other in many wire

* This category includes in Israel all those who have no children living in Israel.

- 50 -

if one of them is incapacitated. The most vulnerable type, in this respect, is the single childless person who, by definition, has to rely for every support he needs on nonhousehold and non-family support, a type of support which is usually not extended unless specifically asked for.* In the following analysis of intergenerational patterns of support childless aged are excluded; but before beginning this analysis I leel I ought to draw the attention once more to the plight of the very old childless aged.

A. Children's assistance to parents

1.

Assistance extended by the younger to the older generation depends mainly on three factors: the specific needs to be mat, the instrumental resources (financial and manpower) of both generations and the type of relationship between the generations, or, to be more specific, thenature of the expressive component of this relationship. This last mentioned factor may be culturally patterned, and this is why we introduced this variable into the analysis. Because of the explorative nature of this project at its beginning, the data on needs are not as diversified as they ought to be, though we did introduce some changes at stage two. Also, it must be borne in mind that we did not collect information concerning the economic situation of the children or concerning the manpower at their disposal. In other words, one crucial element for the understanding

- 51 -

^{*} In the multigeneration household support is usually extended when need is perceived by other household members. Also, the household chores are carried out whether or not the aged parent is able to perform them.

of the pattern of intergenerational assistance is missing entirely. We do have information on the economic situation of the older generation, on the manpower in the household in which they live, as well as some information on the expressive component of the relationship.

Before the presentation and discussion of the data the following facts have to be pointed out: Men's income in both groups of origin is higher than the income of women; those of Western origin have a higher income than those of Oriental origin; and those living apart from children have a higher one than those living with children, most of whom are women. This was so at phase one, and is still true at phase three, in spite of the fact that, because of changes in the National Insurance Law (Old Age Allowance) there are no more older persons who have no income at all.

1. Children's customary assistance to parents

1 :

The central question asked concerning children's assistance to parents, was: do your children customarily assist you? and if so, what do they usually do for you? The answers to the first part of the question show an increase, at each phase, of respondents who are helped by children, thus indicating a possible relationship between assistance by children and age, as the whole surviving population has grown older at each stage. On the other hand, no relationship was found between assistance at each stage and age of respondents. This finding may indicate that the increase

- 52 -

of assisted persons at each phase is due to sample attrition or to other factors not related to age. As we shall see later on, age of parents constitutes a factor when specific needs occur.

ir.	Phase One	Phase Two	Phase Three	
	X	x	x	
Monogenerational household	39	45	59	
Multigenerational household	No data	22	64	

Table 5.1 Proportion of persons assisted customarily by children, by type of household, as a percentage of total responses

No relationship was found between this general measure of children's assistance and the following variables: income, cultural origin and level of education. We had expected to find that health status would be related to children's assistance. This hypothesis was not rejected (Table 5.2 and 5.3) though it was found valid in monogenerational households only. This finding too is not unexpected, and sustains our hypothesis concerning the differential attitude of children to parents according to the type of household in which they live.

Table 5.2 shows that parents whose health image is low tend more to claim children's assistance than parents whose health image is high. This may be due to actual health problems, but is at least partly due to low mora

* Self evaluation of health is a subjective health indice and is only related to feeling of loneliness and to low education.

٠.

.;

3

.,

:0 1

0

1

It is therefore not surprising that we did find a strong and statistically significant relationship between children's assistance to parents and parents feeling of dependence on children (see Table 6.5). At both phases two and three,* those who were helped by children (in monogeneration households) claimed to feel dependent on children (= 0.65, P 0.01)

Table 5.2 Relationship between children's customary assistance to parents in monogenerational households, and self-evaluation of health (%)

		Phase One			P	hase Two	Phase Three				
Children's assistance Self-evaluation of health	Children assist	Children do not assist	T	N	Children assist	Children do not assist	T	N	Children assist	Child do r assi	lren not Lst
Good	35	65	100	200	35	35	100	112	45	55	100
Fair	39	61	100	447							
Poor	45	55	100	314	51	49	100	386	63	37	100
A11	40	60	100	961	47	53	100	498	59	41	100
		Non sign	ifica	int		Y = 0.3	L			Y	0.34
						P 4 0.0	L			PL	0.05

* At Phase One no questions about feelings of dependence were asked.

- 54 -

Table 5.	3 Ch	ildren custo	omary ass	ista	ince	to	parents
	by	functional	capacity	of	par	ente	3 (%)

		P	hase One			P	hase Two	Phase Three					
_	capacity	Children assist	Children do not assist	n T	N	Children assist	Children do not assist	Т	N	Children assist	Children do not assist	Т	N
	Ambulatory	39	61	100	868	48	52	100	440	61	39	100	177
	Homebound and bedfast	52	48	100	108	61	39	100	38	50	50	100	26
	A11	40	60	100	976	49	51	100	478	60	40	100	203
			К Р	- 0.20 2 0.01	5 I		У - Р (0.2	5		No rel	ation	nshi;

Table 5.3 shows the relationship between a more objective indice of health status and children's assistance. The functionally impaired persons tend more than the ambulatory ones to receive assistance of children. At stage 3 only this tendency is reversed, a fact which may put a question mark on the above statement. At the beginning of this chapter we argued that married persons living apart from children are better off than the unmarried, because one spouse usually can support and assist the other. Our data sustain this hypothesis generally (Table 5.4): less married persons tend to receive help from children than nonmarried ones, though this relationship is significant at Phase One only.

Table 5.4 Distribution of aged in monogenerational households according to whether or not they customarily receive assistance from children - by marital status (%)

Receive assistance]	Phase	One		P	hase	Two		Phase	Three	
from children	Yes	No	Total	N	Yes	No	Total N	Yes	No	Total	N
Marital status											
Married	36	64	100	584	42	58	100 340	58	42	100	113
Not married*	52	48	100	194	51	49	100.165	62	38	100	91
Total	39	61	100	778	47	53	100 505	60	40	100	204
			8 - - Р 4	- 0.21 - 0.05	no	t sig	nificant	nc	ot sig	gnifica	nt

* This category includes 39 men and 154 women at stage 1. Because of the small number of men no separate analysis was carried out.

It seems apt to conclude this presentation of findings concerning children's customary support of parents by looking at the problem from its opposit angle: Why do children not help their parents? At all three phases there were respondents who said that they needed help, some of them explaining that the children could not help and a few stating that children would not help. The following Table (5.5) shows that in this respect there exists a significant difference between the two cultural groups at all three phases of the project, and in both types of household: most aged of European origin, probably because of their higher income, claim to need no help from children, while the opposit is true for those of Mideastern origin. Significantly, most of the aged of Mideastern origin claim that children cannot help, which may well be true for most of them, since we know that families of this ethnic group tend to have many children and a low income. Thus, though need for help is expressed, these needs are not met by children. The actually unmet needs are probably not so many. When, at Phase Two, those who were not helped by children were asked if they had unfulfilled needs, only 20% in each household type answered affirmatively.

We had not expected to find that the two households would not differ in this respect. We had thought that in the multigenerational household this demand on children's help (children not living with the parent) would be low, and certainly lower than in monogenerational households. This turned out to be a wrong assumption which I find hard to explain, though it may be related to the fact that feeling of dependence on children occurs more frequently in multigenerational households (see Table 6.1).

- 57 -

1

. 1

Moreover, crosstabulation of "Do your children help you customarily" with "Why do they not help you" shows that many of those who are not helped by children at Phase One did not need help. At Phase Two and Three this proportion in monogenerational households was 66%. The proportion in multigenerational households was 29% at Phase Two. At Phase Three percentages were not computed because N was too small. These data do not indicate an increase of parents who need no help from children, but they certainly do show that most of those living in monogenerational households and do not receive help from children do not need such help.

:0

.'

Not being helped by children is dependent on income of parents in both cultural groups (Table 5.6). Those whose needs are not satisfied tend to belong to the lowest income category. Thus, those most in need because of their low income tend not to be supported by their children. This seems to be a very harsh statement, contradicting in a way our findings (and our emphaiss) on the frequent contact with, and non-isolation from, children. I therefore connect this finding with another* - and hypothesize that the low moral of those whose income is very low, is also expressed in this statement of need for help.

Before turning to a detailed discussion of specific needs, attention should be drawn to the importance of level of formal education, underlying, so I believe, most of the above discussion. Level of education and level of income are interrelated, and most of the dependent variables discussed so far are also related to level of education. The specific weight of each of these variables cannot be stated without multi variate analysis.

* Low income (and low level of education) is significant related to feeling of loneliness and to low self-evaluation of help.

- 58 -

	Managanarational	Phase	one	Phase	two	Phase	three	
	households	Europ. origin	Mid- East origin	Europ. origin	Mid- East origin	Europ. origin	Mid- East origin	
	Children's help not needed	61	11	79	28	80	44	
	Children cannot help	35	81	17	62	1	47	:
	Children would not help	3	8	4	9	} 20	13	
	A11	100	100	100	100	100	100	
	N	384	84	189	53	53	32	
	Multigenerational households							
•	Children's help not needed	60	13	49	11		r.	J
	Children cannot help	36	83	31	46			;
	Children would not help	4	4	20	43			
	A11	100	100	100	100			
	N	55	54	49	87	20**	36	

Table 5.5:	Distribution of respondents who do not receive help
	from children, by reasons for not receiving help and
	by group of origin* (%)

* The differences between the cultural groups are all statistically significant.

	Pha	se One	Phase	Two	Phase Three
Monogeneration households	ў - Р	0.86	ሄ - የ	0.81 0.01	$\begin{cases} -0.67 \\ P & 0.01 \end{cases}$
Multigeneration households	γ - Ρ	0.65	8 - P	0.56 0.01	γ = .0.80 P 0.001

** Percentages not computed because N too small.

2. Specific Needs of Parents and Children's Support

1:

a. Help extended in times of acute physical need

This area was investigated at Phase One only. The question asked was: When you were last ill in bed, who (mainly) helped you with the following tasks: preparation of meals, shopping, and housework. Analysis of answers to this question (monogenerational households only - Table 5.7) show that the main source of help of married persons is the spouse while unmarried persons living alone are assisted mainly by their children and their families. Childless respondents were unfortunately included in this analysis, which explains, at least partly, the proportion of persons who claimed to have had no help,* but does not explain the big difference between the married and unmarried who did not have help when ill in bed. It seems, therefore, that the lack of source of help from within the household creates in certain situations a vacuum which is not filled by family or by services. This may happen when children do not live near and the old person is either too ill or too poor, to apply for payed help.

At phases two and three those living in monogenerational households were asked who performed those household chores which they themselves could not manage any more. Again, the family is the most important source of support. 61% of all those who needed help with housework at Phase Two and 56% at Phase Three were helped by children.

About 20% of the original sample (Phase One) had no living childran or no children living in Israel.

- 61 -

Level of	Phase 1 (both householdes)			Phase 2 (m	conogenerational h	ousehold)	*
income	Children's help not needed	Children's help needed	A11	N	Children's help not needed	Children's help needed	All N	-
European Or Low	rigin 24	76	100	116	55	45	100 49	
High	71	29	100	275	88	12	100 127	
A11	60	40	100	371	79	21	100 176	
	Y =82	P 0.001			8 =72	P 0.001		
<u>Mid</u> Easte <u>origin</u>	ern							r K
Low	8	91	100	155	29	71	100 66	
High	65	35	100	43	66	33	100 9	
A11	21	79	100	198	32	68	100	
	y =90	P 0.001			¥ =-0.67	P 0.01		

Table 5.6: Distribution of respondents who do not receive help from children, by level of income and cultural origin (%)

* Phase 2, Multigeneration household: income effects those of European origin only.

Phase III

- 09 -

Because of small N there was no point to control for cultural origin. Income is related to need in monogeneration household.

Low	47	53	100 38
High	62	38	100 84
A11	57	43	100 122
	Y =29	P 0.05	

5.7 Aged living in monogenerational households at Phase One. Sources of help when ill in bed, by specific household tasks, as a percentage of the total population,

1

		None	Spouse	Children living apart	Other relatives living apart*	Payed help	Other	N		
а.	Help_with preparation of_meals									
	Unmarried a living alone	27	-	42	31	7	2	229	.1	
	Married living alone	5	80	13	8	3	-	701	, ,э	
Ъ.	Help with shopping		,							
	Unmarried living alone	22	-	43	35	8	1	229	3: ,	
	living alone	2	81	11	10	3	-	701	((
	housework Unmarried								1	
	living alone Married	27	-	39	24	17	1	229		
	living alone	5	76.	12	7	8	-	701		

* This category includes: grandchildren, siblings, spouses of siblings, and children in-law.

- 62 -

12

b. Financial assistance

Knowing that the income of the aged was (and is) low*, we expected to find many aged who are supported by their children. This expectation was not confirmed by the data (Table 5.8). Less than 10% of those living in monogeneration households, at all three stages, are supported regularly. The proportion of those who receive occasional financial support is higher, but it is difficult to estimate the impact of this type of aid on parents' income, because "Occasional" may mean big or small amounts, often or seldom extended. In order to gain a somewhat better insight into the type and amount of this mode of support, we introduced at stages two and three the following question: Did any of your children not living with you help you during the last 5 years with a one-time big amount of money. or bought you an expensive gift (including durable goods)? The answers show that the flow of this type of financial help too is not a strong one: 15% of those living apart from children at Phase Two, and 19% at Phase Three had received such help. The equivalent figures for multigenerational households are 12% and zero. T.V. sets, telephones and washing machines are the most mentioned items on this list.

- 63 -

The average monthly income of the aged male head of family in 1969, was about half of the average monthly income of the nonaged male head of family. The equivalent figures for female head of families are lower by about 50%. Habib J., "Poverty in Israel Before and After Receipt of Public Transfers", <u>The National Insurance Institute</u>, <u>Bureau of Research and Planning</u>, Discussion paper 4, Table 5.15, p. 61.

15

Table 5.8: Percentage of persons receiving different kinds of assistance from children by type of household, as a percentage of the total population

- 64 -

	Phase One	Phase Two	Phase Three	
Monogenerational househo.	1d s			
Financial assistance	* 20	18	27	·i 7
Shopping and errands	0	16	35	
Emotional support	9	18	38	ţ
Household chores	10	10	31	
N	775	512	208	, () ,
Multigeneration household	ds			•
Financial assistance		18	7	;
Shopping and errands	no data	1	19	
Emotional support		14	43	
N		203	58	

* Financial assistance includes occasional and regular financial help. At all three phases of the project only about one third of those mentioning receiving financial help from children claimed that this help was extended on a regular basis. As one would expect, financial support of parents is related to parents income* (in both groups of cultural origin), and is not affected by age.

Table 5.9: Financial support of parents living in monogenerational households during the years preceding the interview, by parents income.

Financial Comment	Р	hase (One		PI	Phase Two				Phase Three			
 Financial Support	Yes	No	A11	N	Yes	No	A11	N	Yes	No	A11	N	
Parents Income		ľ									-		
Low	33	67	100	367	21	79	100	301	27	73	100	42	
Higher	15	85	100	347	9	91	100	272	18	82	100	146	
A11	24	76	100	714	25	85	100	573	22	78	100	188	
		Υ _ Ρ ζ	0.45 0.01			8 - P (• .47 _ 0.00			Non	signif	icant	

* It is probably also related to children's income, but we have no information on this variable.

Shopping and Errands

The proportion of persons living in both households and receiving help from children with shopping and errands increases at each stage (Table 5.8), thus indicating a possible relationship between age and this area of need. On the other hand, no such relationship was found between age and this variable at each stage, a finding which contradicts the above hypothesis. However, longitudinal analysis of this variable in monogenerational households does show an increase of persons who are helped with shopping. On the basis of these three indices it seems safe to state that with the increase in age of the respondents there develops an increase of children's help in this area of need.

No relationship was found between this variable and cultural origin, but we did find that this variable too is affected by income of parents (irrespective of cultural origin): more help of this kind is extended to those whose income is low, probably not because they have more functional difficulties but because:

- a. by doing some of parent's shopping, children also assist them financially;
- b. low income is highly related to low education (our population included a high rate of analphabets). People belonging to this category
 cannot cope with the bureaucracy and are therefore even more dependent
 on children's help.

- 66 -

Emotional Support

The proportion of parents receiving emotional support from children not living with them increases in both households (Table 5.8), but no relationship was found at both phases between emotional support and age at each phase. However, longitudinal analysis of this variable in monogenerational households shows a considerable increase at Phase Three of parents receiving emotional support. More than half of those who receive such support at Phase Three are newcomers to this type of support, whilst the proportion of "Dropouts" between the phases is much smaller. This finding corroborates the one mentioned above and presented at Table 5.8, and both of them indicate that this type of help increases with the increase in age of parents.

Table 5.10: Emotional support of parents living in monogenerational households - longitudinal analysis (absolute numbers)

	1. 	••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••					
	Phase Three						
Phase Two	Receive emotional support	Received other support	Total				
Passived emotional	•						
support	17	13	30				
Received other							
support	19	18	37				
Total	36	31	67				

- 67 -

Emotional support of parents living in monogenerational households is related to parents incomes, possibly intervened by cultural origin. Table 5.11 shows that parent belonging to the higher income levels tend to mention this type of support more than parents whose income is low.

Table 5.11: Emotional support of parents, by parent's income, and by cultural origin (mono-generational households)

 Emotional		Phase Two							- 1				
support	European origin			Mid-	Mid-Eastern origin			Total					
Income	Yes	No	Total	N	Yes	No	Total	N	Yes	No	Total	N	
Low income	13	87	100	111	10	90	100	114	11	89	100	237	
Higher income	24	70	100	229	26	74	100	19	24	76	100	248	
A11	20	80	100	340	12	88	100	145	18	82	100	485	
	γ = - 0.05 P 4 0.05			8 = − 0.54 P ∠ 0.05			8 = - 0.44			44			
							P L 0.01						
						Phas	e Three	2					
Low income		Not	compu	ted		Not	comput	ted	32	68	100	91	
Higher income		Νt	00 ST.A	11		Nt	oo sma	11	42	58	100	97	•
A11									37	63	100	188	
										X P	= - 0. 20.05	22	

- 68 -

Contrary to our expectations, no relationship was found between emotional support and self evaluation of health. We had hypothesized that parents whose functional capacity is impaired (or whose morale is low) would receive more of this kind of help than those who are comparatively well. The rejection of this hypothesis may be partially due to the low morale of those who are functionally impaired and therefore reluctant to mention this type of support of children.

No relationship was found between the above independent variables and emotional support of parents living in multigenerational households, probably because this type of support of parents who live with a sibling is the least contaminated by instrumental considerations.

Longitudinal Analysis

Longitudinal analysis of children's help to parents was carried out for monogenerational households only, because a) the absolute numbers in multigenerational households, especially at Phase Three, are small; and b) the pattern of intergenerational help between parents who live alone and their children, is the more important one.

Table 5.12 shows:

- a. the percentage of those helped by children has increased between stage one and two, and between stages two and three. This finding confirms the one documented by Table 5.8;
- b. one third of those who, at Phase One had not received help from children were supported at stage 2; and this proportion increased between Phases Two and Three to 49%.

- 69 -

c. a considerable decrease between the Phases, of parents who had received help and are not helped at the following Phase. Both these tendencies indicate an increase over time, of persons who receive help from children.

17.

		Phase One		P	Phase Two				
	Childre help parents	en Children do not he parents	n lp Total	Children help parents	Children do not help parents	Total			
Phase Two				Phase Three					
Children help parents	67	36	48	75	49	60			
Children do not help parents	33	64	52	25	51	40			
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100			
N	153	267	420	68	97	165			

Longitudinal analysis of reasons for not being helped by children shows, that nearly half of those who, at Phase One, did not need children's help claimed to need such help at Phase Two (and, in fact, were mostly helped by children); this proportion has shrunk between Phases Two and Three to 142. Thus there is an increase of not needing help with the passage of time and the increase in age, which may be due to the survival effect. On the other hand, Table 5.13 shows an increase of the proportion
of persons who claim at two consecutive phases that they needed help. This finding probably sustains the previous one and may well overrule the possibility of survival effect.

Table 5.13:Reasons for not being helped by children,
longitudinal analysis (monogenerational
households only) (%)

	Pha	se One		Phase	Phase Two				
	Children's help not needed	Children's help needed	Total	Children's help not needed	Children's help needed	Total			
Phase	Two		P	hase Three					
Children's help not needed	52	31	42	86	42	64			
Children' s help needed	48	69	58	14	58	36			
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100			
N	148	134	282	44	43	87			

B. Parents Assistance to Children

The question, "do you customarily help your children?" was asked at Phase Two and Three only. A second question inquired about the different types of help extended to children: At Phase One we asked directly about financial assistance, followed by a question about "Other help", not specifying different areas. We shall therefore first present data of Phase One, and then compare Phases Two and Three.

Non-financial assistance to children at Phase One

24% of parents in monogenerational households, as compared with 36% in multigenerational households, extended such help to children not living with them. In both households this variable was associated with:

- a) cultural origin significantly more of those of European origin extend help to children ($\forall = 0.95$ and $\forall = 53$, P $\angle 0.001$ in both households);
- b) income significantly more of those belonging to the higher income level extend help to children (χ = .74, P 0.001, and χ = .52 P \angle 0.001).

These two variables are interrelated. Income affects both cultural groups (Table 5.14). In both groups those belonging to the high income level tend to help more than those whose income is low.

- 72 -

Table 5.14:	Phase One: Non-financial assistance to children,
	by income and cultural origin (%)

	Europ	ean Origin			Mid-E	astern Orig	in		
	Helps Children	Does not help children	A11	N	Helps Children	Does not help children	All	N	
Monogenerationz Household	<u>1</u>								÷
Low income	10	90	100	185	. 9	91	100	176	
High income	38	62	100	311	20	80	100	35	
All	26	74	100	496	10	90	100	211	X
Multigeneration	al	γ = Р 4	0.70 0.001			8=0 PL0	.45 .05		
Household									
Low income	38	62	100	142	26	74	100	273	
High income	64	30	100	75	48	52	100	42	
A11	47	53	100	217	29	71	100	315	
		γ = 0 p < 0	.48 .001			8 = 0 p∠ 0	.43 .01		

<u>level of education</u> - significantly more of those with a higher level of education extend non-financial help to children ($\chi = .52$, P \angle 0.001 and $\chi = .30$, P \angle 0.001).

Cultural origin affects higher level of education only (those whose formal years of schooling are seven or more years): In this group 52% of those of European origin, as compared with 33% of those of Near-Eastern origin, support children non finanically.

When income was held constant, we found an association between level of education and non financial assistance to children in the higher income categories only ($x^2 = 6.83$ df = 1 P \angle 0.001).

No relationship was found between age and nonfinancial assistance to children. This was a rather unexpected finding because we had thought that with the increase in age such help would decline.

On the basis of the above findings I hypothesize that the combination of high income and high level of education, both of which occur (significantly) more frequently amongst the aged of European origin, are the characteristics of those who extend non financial aid to children.

Financial aid to children at Phase One

20% of the aged living in multigenerational households, and 11% of those living in monogenerational households, extended financial assistance to children (including children sharing their households, a fact which probably explains the higher rate of financial aid in multigenerational households). The two types of households differ, however, with respect to the frequency of financial aid to children. Those living with children tend to extend regular help, probably a regular contribution to the household expenses, whilst those living apart from children tend to give a one-time (big) sum.

Table 5.15 : Phase One: Parents' financial assistance to children by type of household (%)

	,		
	Monogenerational households	Multigenerational households	
Regular financial assistance	3	17	
Irregular financial assistance	1	-	
One time financial assistance	7	3	
No financial assistance	89	80	
A11	100	100	
N	795	557	

Financial aid is associated, again, with: cultural origin, level of formal education and income, all in the same direction as non-financial assistance: higher income, higher level of education and European origin are conducive to extending financial help to children.

PARENTS ASSISTANCE TO CHILDREN - PHASES TWO AND THREE

a. Parents customary help to children

Table 5.16 shows that the proportion of parents customarily helping children declines amongst those living in monogenerational households, from 41% at Phase Two to 27% at Phase three, thus indicating that, possibly, with the increase in age, the "helping capacity" declines. This finding is supported by the association found at Phase Two between age and customarily helping children: the younger age cohorts tend more to assist children than the older ones (x² significant at 0.05 level).

In multigenerational households the trend is reversed: the proportion of helping parents increases from 27% at Phase Two to 53% at Phase three. This increase is due to a sharp increase at Phase Three of people mentioning occasional gifts when asked about types of help to children.* It is somewhat difficult to understand clearly the meaning of this "help", especially so because, as we shall presently see, very few parents give substantial gifts to children. Nevertheless, it seems to be of importance to parents living in multigenerational households, possibly because this is the only way in which they can see themselves as helping children (income of parents living in multigenerational households is considerably lower than income of persons living apart from children). The increase of helping parents at phase three should not lead us to the wrong conclusion concerning relationship between helping capacity and age. In multigenerational households at Phase Three

* The question asked was an open one: do you customarily help your children not living with you, and if so, in what way.

- 76 -

parents' help to children is affected by age: the younger age cohort tends more to help than the older one ($\chi = 0.52$ PL0.05)

Table 5.16:	Phases Two	and Three: Parents	assisting children not	living
	with them.	according to modes	of assistance and type	of
	household,	as a percentage of	the total population	

	Phase Two	Phase Three
Monogenerational households		
Parents assist:		
financially	29	8
care of grandchildren	10	7
occasional gifts	no data	14
household chores	3	-
Parents do not assist	59	73
N	515	204
Multigenerational households		
Parents assist:		
financially	2	5
care of grandchildren	8	5
occasional gifts	22	39
Parents do not assist	73	47
N	200	59

- 77 -

Parents' help to children is affected by cultural origin, by income, and by level of formal education, all in the same line as presented when discussing parents' help to children at Phase One: higher income, higher educational level and belonging to the group of European origin are conducive to helping children. Table 5.17 presents the association between helping children, income and cultural origin, showing once more that income is possibly a better predictor for the dependent variable than cultural origin.

Self evaluation of health, too, is associated with parents customary help to children (see Table 5.18). As one would expect, less of those who rate their health as poor claim to help children, though helping with gifts need not be affected by poor health, or by a subjective feeling of poor health. Bearing this in mind, it is important to point out that poor self-evaluation of health is related to low income and to low level of education. On the basis of this information and because of the limitations of the statistical analysis employed, it is unclear which of these variables carries most weight, or any weight at all. In order to clarify this point, multi-variate analysis is called for, but could not be carried out because of the time (and budget) limitations of this project.

- 78 -

		Phase Two			6.0	Phase Thr	ee		
	Helps Children	Does not help children	A11	N	Helps Children	Does not help children	A11	N	
Monogenerationa households	11.								
European origin	<u>.</u>	5							
Low income	29	71	100	111	19	81	100	42	
High income	57	43	100	228	40	60	100	85	
A11	52	48	100	339	33	67	100	127	
		y 0,	.53		is a	8 -	-0.47		
		PLO.	.001			РL	0.001		
Mid-Eastern or	igin	-							
Low income	16	84	100	127	Relati	onship in	same di	rection	
High income	50	50	100	20	Number	s too smal	l to pr	esent in	%. N
A11	20	80	100	147					
		8	0.68			¥	0.7	9	
•		PLI	.001			Р	6.01		
Multigeneration households	<u>al</u>								
<u>European_origin</u>									
Low income	18	82	100	45	Not con	mputed bec	ause N	too small	
High income	83	17	100	18	ý k	3			
A11	37	63 ¥ = 0 P 4 0	100 .92	63					
Mid-Eastern or	igin								
low income	15	85	100	110					
All	32	78 X - 0	100	131					

Table 5.	17:	Parents'	help	to	children	by	cultural	origin	and	income	(%)	

- 79 -

	Р	hase Two				Phase Three	e		
	Helps children	Does not help children	A11	N	Helps children	Does not help children	A11	N	
 Monogenerational							×		
households					Good				
Good and fair	48	52	100	378	52	48	100	44	
Poor	18	82	100	131	Fair & 22	78	100	158	
A11	60	40	100	509	29	71	100	202	
		Υ -	-0.60			¥ -	0.59		
		PL	0.001			Pζ	0.001		
Multigenerational households									
Good and fair	36	64	100	. 143	Relatio	onship in t ion	he san	ne	
Poor	5	95	100	56	Number	s too small	to pr	esent N =	in %
A11	35	65	100	199					
		Υ -	-0.81			8 -	-0.56		
		Pζ	0.001			p L	0.05		
									and the start

Table 5.18: Parents' help to children by self evaluation of health

b. Specific modes of parents' support of children

Table 5.16 indicates that, apart from financial support at Phase Two, only small proportions of parents actually do help children not living with them. The proportion of specific modes of parents' help decreases between the two phases of the project, in both households. We had expected to find more persons helping with the care of grandchildren, and had not thought that occasional gifts would claim such importance. Because of the low percentages we analyzed financial support only.

<u>Financial support</u> to children is affected by cultural origin, level of formal education and income. 90% of all those who extended financial support at Phase Two (monogenerational households only), are of European origin; they constitute 40% of all those of European origin and 10% of all those of Mid-Eastern origin; 80% of all those who extend financial help to children belong to the higher level of formal education. Thus, the general picture of factors conducive to aid to children repeats itself (see Table 5.17). Financial aid to children is not related to age of parents.

In order to obtain more precise and more reliable information concerning parental aid to children, we introduced at Phase Two questions confining the answers to time limits of one year, such as: Did you extend regular financial assistance to children during the course of last year? Answers to this question confirmed that the flow of parental aid is a thin one.

- 81 -

Parents'	Eur	opean	origin		Mid-	Easter	n orig	ín	
f inancial support	Yes	No	A11	N	Yes	No	A11	N	
Income	1								•
Low	29	71	100	111	16	84	100	127	
High	57	43	100	228	50	50	100	20	
A11	48	52	100	339	20	80	100	147	
		X.	= 0.53			8-	0.68		

Table 5.19: Parents' financial support of children, by income and cultural origin (monogenerational households at Phase Two) (%)

Table 5.20: Regular financial aid to children during the year preceding the interview as a percentage of total responses

	Phase Two	Phase Three	
Monogenerational households	10 N=512	9 N=204	
Multigenerational households	5 N=208	10 N= 58	

Another question concerning financial aid related to expensive gifts or to contributions to household maintenance during the year preceding the interview. This was a closed question specifying items such as: TV sets, telephone, refrigerator, washing machines, given as gifts to children. The data show that parents who live in multigenerational households tend more to give such gifts to the children with whom they live than parents who live in monogenerational "households. The proportions of parents who extend such help is small, and does not exceed 10%. The most mentioned item in both types of households was: a big sum of money. The next on the list was helping children living apart from parents to buy an apartment - 8% of all parents in monogenerational households. Because of the meagre results of these questions at Phase Two, they were not repeated at Phase Three.

Summing up the chapter on parental support of children, the following points should be emphasized:

- a. The flow of aid in this direction is a rather thin one; even when the parents were, as yet, comparatively young, it was a thin flow.
- b. Parents aid to children, when not broken into specific modes of aid, is related to age of parents: younger parents tend more to help than the older ones. When modes of assistance were isolated, we found that financial support of children is not affected by age of parents.

- 83 -

c. Parents' assistance to children is related to: higher level of income, European origin and higher level of formal education. Detailed analysis has shown that the combination of higher income and higher education, irrespective of cultural origin, are conducive to flow of assistance from the older to the younger generation.

Longitudinal analysis of parents' customary support of children shows a marked stability among those who do not support children. Eighty nine percent of the survivors of those living in monogenerational households at Phase Two did not support children at Phase Three. On the other hand, over half of those who had supported children at Phase Two ceased to do so at Phase Three. This indicates that the flow of support from the older to the younger generation shrinks with the passing of time and possibly with the age of the respondents. This trend appears distinctly in the analysis of mutual aid patterns (see following pages).

The same trend appears in multigenerational households. Because of the small total we prefered not to present figures of this trend.

C. Mutual Aid Patterns

In order to gain some insight into the mutuality of intergenerational support, a new variable was constructed cross-tabulation of "Parents" help to children" with "Children's help to parents". Table 5.20 shows the marginal distribution of this variable at both phases at which these questions were asked.

	Phase Two	Phase Three
No assistance (neither gives nor receives assistance)	32	27
Children's assistance to parents only	27	45
Parents' assistance to children only	21	14
Mutual assistance	20	14
Total	100%	100%
Ν	499	202

Table 5.20:Mutual support patterns in monogenerational
households at Phases Two and Three (%)

Table 5.20 shows that the pattern "Children helping their parents" has gained in volume at Phase Three, at the expense, so to speak, of the opposite direction. In other words, parents' support of children has diminished considerably, a trend expressed also by the decrease of mutual assistance. This finding is corroborated both by longitudinal analysis (Table 5.21) and by cross-tabulation with age (Table 5.22). Table 5.22 shows the decrease with age at each phase of both patterns which include the flow of support from parent to child. It also shows the increase, with age, of the flow of assistance from children to parents. Table 5.21 presents the dynamics over time of these changes: nearly 50% of those aged parents who did neither give nor receive support at Phase Two, do receive children's support at Phase Three; 50% of those who received and gave support at Phase Two, shifted to the one direction support pattern (child to parent) at Phase Three.

Mutual support patterns are related to both cultural origin (Table 5.23) and income (Table 5.24). Those who neither give nor receive support are characterized by low income on the one hand and by stemming from Middle-Eastern origin on the other;* the mutual aid pattern is characterized by higher level of income and by being of European origin. On the basis of our knowledge of the interrelationships between income and cultural origin, I hypothesize that the combination of these two variables predicts the development of patterns of assistance; and that cultural origin alone does have little influence. This hypothesis helps to explain the rather striking finding (Table 5.23) showing that nearly half of those of Middle-Eastern origin (i.e. stemming from a rather traditional society characterized by strong family ties) do not give or receive assistance.

- 86 -

 ^{*} Isolating income from cultural origin was tried but cannot be presented because of the very small number of aged parents of Middle-Eastern origin belonging to the higher level of income.

Origin		Pha	ise Two		Pha			
Pattern of support		European	Middle- Eastern	Total	European	Middle- Eastern	Total	
 No assistance		26	46	32	19	44	27	
Children to parents	only	25	32	27	47	39	45	
Parents to children	only	27	9	- 21	16	8	14	
Mutual assistance		23	13	20	17	10	15 🔤	
Total		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
N		354	145	499	140	62	202	

Table 5.23: Mutual support patterns in monogenerational households, bu cultural origin (%)

Table 5.24: Mutual support patterns in monogenerational households, by level of income (%)

Income	Ph	ase Two		Pha	ase Three		
Pattern of support	Low	High	Total	Low	lifgh	Total	
No assistance	42	24	32	37	19	28	
Children's assistance to parents only	36	18	27	48	40	44	
Parents' assistance to children only	9	32	21	4	21	13	
Mutual assistance	14	26	20	10	20	15	
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
N	230	241	471	91	95	186	
IN	250	241	471	21	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	-00	

6: FEELING OF DEPENDENCE ON CHILDREN

Dependence on children is, as one would expect, related to intergenerational contact and support. This relationship will be discussed presently, but first we would like to present the data on the association of this variable with the demographic independent ones.

6.A. Feelings of dependence on children and demographic variables

- Feeling of dependence on children is not associated with <u>age</u> of parents.
- b. Feeling of dependence on children is not associated with <u>cultural origin</u>.
- c. Feeling of dependence on children in not associated with <u>level of education</u>, with one exception: aged parents of Middle Eastern origin whose level of education is low tend to feel dependent on children.
- Feeling of dependence on children is affected by <u>income</u> at Phase Two only, in both households.
- e. Feeling of dependence on children is associated with <u>sex</u>: more women than men, at both phases and in both households, admit to this feeling.

(See Table 6.1)

These findings indicate that this variable is less affected by societal constraints than those discussed in the previous chapters. On the other hand, it is the first variable, so far, associated meaningfully Table 6.1: Feeling of dependence on children, by sex (%)

F	eelings of	Pl	hase ?	ſwo		Pl	hase '	Three	
d	ependence	Yes	No	All	N	Yes	No	A11	N
Monogenerationa households	1								
Men		33	67	100	283	54	46	100	119
Women		55	50	100	205	61	39	100	81
A11		40	60	100	488	57	43	100	201
			P l	• 0.34 - 0.00	1.	1	non-s	ignifi	cant
Multigeneration households	<u>a1</u>								
Men		49	51	100	113	43	57	100	28
Women		70	30	100	132	78	22	100	55
A11		60	40	100	245	66	34	100	83
			γ.	• 0.42			Y .	- 0.65	

- 89 -

with sex. This, so I believe, is an important finding, because it ties in with other findings (presented in previous reports), all of which point towards the probable lower morale of women, especially of those whose level of formal education is negligible: women, especially those whose level of education is low (most of whom are of Middle Eastern origin), tend to: lower self-evaluation of health; to experience feelings of loneliness and towards passivity in the use of leisure time. In other words, they tend to be passive and to complain about loneliness and low health and thus, presumably, also feel dependent on children.

6.B. Modes of dependence

The interview inquired about modes of dependence of aged parents. Table 6.2 shows the distribution of these modes in both households at both phases. This Table shows that:

- a. The most frequently mentioned mode of dependence at Phase Two, in both households, is the emotional one, expressed in need for moral support.
- b. Moral support has diminished considerably at Phase Three, a finding which I find hard to explain.
- c. Feeling of dependence because of need for personal care is much more abundant in multigenerational households. This may be due to the slightly higher percent of functionally impaired parents living i.. this household. On the other hand, this may be affected by the basic quality of protection (and sometimes over-protection) offered by this type of household.

	Phase Two	Phase Three	
 Monogenerational household			
Economic dependence	12	13	
Emotional dependence	23	14	
Physical dependence (personal care)	2	16	
Physical dependence (household)	3	-	
Physical and economic dependence	-	26	
Ν	488	204	
Multigenerational household			
Economic dependence	9	7	
Emotional dependence	28	14	
Physical dependence (personal care)	25	24	
Physical and economic dependnece	-	30	
N	488	56	

Table 6.2:	Modes of dependence, b	y type of	household	at	each
	phase, as a percentage	of total	responses		

- d. The proportion of feeling of dependence because of need for personal care increased considerably between Phases Two and Three in monogenerational households. This indicates the influence of aging, and indeed, we did find a significant association between age and this mode of dependence at Phase Three ($\chi = 0.35 \ P \perp 0.01$). The lack of increase of this mode of dependence in multigenerational households does not, to my mind, contradict this explanation, because of the protective nature of this type of household.
- e. There is a considerable overlap (at Phase Three) of aged parents who feel both physical and economic dependence on children. Because of technical reasons we did not compute this for Phase Two and thus do not know the extent of this overlap at that stage, though from both Tables 6.1 and 6.2 one may conclude that the proportion was considerably smaller. It seems to me that here, again, the protective nature of this type of household was at play. It is worth mentioning in this connection that many more women than men mentioned both these modes of dependence-
- f. A considerable proportion of aged parents (at Phase Three) feel both physical and economic dependence. Because of technical reasons we did not compute this for Phase Two and therefore do not know the proportion of persons at Phase Two who expressed these two modes of dependency. We cannot say whether this proportion has increased between the two phases; but the fact that just over a quarter of the aged persons at Phase Three, in both households, feel these two modes of dependence may well be indicative of emotional as well as instrumental needs of a great proportion of the very old.

6.C. Feeling of dependence on children and intergenerational contact and support

Dependence on children of parents living in monogenerational households at Phase Three is related to distance from nearest child: more of those who have a child living at easy walking distance than those whose nearest child lives further away feel dependent. The same holds true for physical dependence.

Table 6.3: Feeling of dependence on children, by distance from nearest child (%) in monogenerational households.

Feeling of dependence	Pl	Phase Two					Phase Three			
Distance from nearest child	Yes	No	A11	N	Yes	No	A11	N		
Easy walking distance	42	58	100	219	75	25	100	62		
Further away	38	62	100	268	52	48	100	126		
All	40	60	100	487	60	40	100	189		
		Not re	elated			8.	• 0.44			
						Р	L0.01			

Dependence on children in monogenerational households is also dependent on contact with children. Those who have seen at least one child during the week preceding the interview tend to feel dependent.

	Feeling of	P	hase	Two		I	Phase	Three		
Saw at least one child last week	dependence	Yes	No	A11	N	Yes	No	A11	N	
 Yes	••••••	41	59	100	375	60	40	100	173	
No		30	70	100	93	39	61	100	28	
All		38	62	100	468	57	43	100	201	

Table 6.4: Feeling of dependence on children by frequency of contact with at least one child (%) in monogenerational households)

Having seen at least one child recently may well be related to distance from nearest child, though we have no clear-cut evidence of this relationship. I have therefore chosen to present the effect of both these rather structural variables on feeling of dependence on children. These data possibly indicate once again that easy accessibility (and probably availability, too) promote feelings of dependence.

Children's support of parents living in monogenerational households is associated with parents' feelings of dependence. Supported parents tend to feel dependent (Table 6.5).

		Feeling of		Phase	Two	-	- <u> </u>	Phase	Three	
Children	help parent	dependence s	Yes	No	A11	N	Yes	No	A11	N
	Yes		60	40	100	221	70	30	100	11
	No ৰ		24	76	100	252	37	63	100	8
	A11		41	59	100	473	57	43	100	19

Table 6.5: Feeling of dependence on children, by children's help to parents (monogenerational households)

Examination of each mode of support yielded the same results: supported parents tend to feel dependent.

financial support	Y	- 0.5	P [0.01	Phase Two
	لا	- 0.64	P _ 0.01	Phase Three
shopping and errands	۲	0.53	P 2 0.01	Phase Three
emotional support	४	= 0.41	· / 0.01	Phase Three

Helping children seems is promote . along of two evendence. At both prices significantly more is chose who do not ach a lot free feel dependent : them.* probably because they the converse of the lebe (so that a first

- - * C.OT at Phase for and at Posse in se

1

6.D. Feelings of dependence on children - differences between types of households.

Table 6.1 shows that aged parents living in multigenerational households tend more to feel dependent on children, than those living alone (this difference is statistically significant at Phase Two only). This finding ties in with other data discussed above which indicated that the protection and in-built service system offered by the multigenerational household possibly promotes dependence. Yet another finding points towards the same conclusion: feelings of dependence on children are related to the prefered living arrangements for the aged, in multigenerational households only.* Those who believe that the prefered living arrangements for the elderly is the multigenerational households, tend to feel dependent on their children.

Prefered living arrangements	Ph	nase Two)		Ph	ase Thr	ee	
Feelings of dependence on children	To live with a child	Other	Total	N	To live with a child	Other	Total	N
Yes	59	41	100	143	78	22	100	55
No	35	65	100	94	43	57	100	28
Total	50	50	100	237	60	34	100	83
		γ -	0.47			8 =	0.05	
		ΡL	0.01			P L	0.01	

Table 6.6: Prefered living arrangements, by feelings of dependence on children (multigenerational households)(%)

* The question asked was: What are the preferred living arrangements for the aged: living alone, living with child or living in an old-age home?

- 96 -

The proposed hypothesis on the relationship between availability of services, the (over) protective nature of multigenerational households and promotion of feelings of dependence is sustained by the data on changes in household structure (Chapter 3) which show that there was very little movement from mono- to multigenerational households between the three phases of the project. It can, therefore, hardly be argued that those who became frail, or developed feelings of dependence, tended to join their children's households.

Longitudinal analysis of feelings of dependence on children in monogenerational households shows that 50% of those who had had no such feelings at Phase Two, had such feelings at Phase Three. This finding points towards an increase of feeling of dependence on children, as already indicated by Table 6.1. Only just over one third of those who had expressed feelings of dependence at Phase Two did not have such feelings at Phase Three.

Longitudinal analysis of feelings of dependence in multigenerational households shows a greater degree of stability: most of those who did not feel dependent at Phase Two reapeated that statement at Phase Three. But we should remember that the population is small, and only 21 persons survived of those who had not felt dependent at Phase Two.

- 97 -

7: ATTITUDES TOWARDS LIVING ARRANGEMENT

My interest in this subject developed gradually with the progress
of this project over the years because of the following points:
a. Logically, there should exist a relationship between intergenerational relations and this variable. Liming or disliking living with or apart from children is somehow linked with mutual interaction, with the expectations and the realities of intergenerational exchange.
b. My attention to the subject was drawn by findings at Phase One, when I was as yet unaware of the effects of household structure on the aged person's quality of life.

The cross-national study was interested in the subject of housing for the aged and introduced a series of questions on this subject. One of these inquired about the prefered living arrangements for older persons. The answers to this question showed that though the question was not phrased subjectively, they indicated that most respondents believed the prefered living arrangement to be the one they were living in. There was one exception: 59% of couples living with children thought that the prefered living arrangement would be to live in a separate household (compared to 23% of widowed aged living with a child). Over 75% of those then living in monogenerational households prefered this living arrangement. These data show that many married aged parents who live with a child, actually prefer separation of households. This may be due to a demographic factor: many of these couples lived at that time with young, as yet unmarried children. The wish for separation may be related to the

- 98 -

wish to see their children married, but it may also be due to friction caused by the differences in styles of life.

These findings of the First Phase made me want to understand the reasons for preferences on the one hand, and to gain insight into the balance of rewards and sanctions perceived by the residents of different living arrangements.

Because of the lack of any baseline to begin with,¹ we introduced at Phase Two, and later repeated at Phase Three, the following questions: a. are you satisfied with living apart from (or: with) your children? b. what are the advantages and disadvantages of living with (or: apart from) your children?

Remembering the above mentioned data of Phase One, one would expect that most people are satisfied with their living arrangements; and, in fact, only 13% of those living in monogenerational households at Phase Two, and 12% at Phase Three, expressed dissatisfaction. The corresponding proportions for multigenerational households are 15% and 13%, respectively. These small proportions prevented analysis of dissatisfaction.

A positive attitude towards living apart from children does not prevent the perception of the disadvantage of the monogenerational households. At both Phases Two and Three about 50% of those living in this type of household stated that they were aware of disadvantages, whereas only 7% at both Phases stated that there were no advantages.

1 I could not find any literature pertaining to this specific subject.

Modes of advantages and disadvantages

The question asked was an open one, because we wanted to gain a first insight of the factors involved. Detailed content analysis of the answers was carried out, resulting in the clustering of the answers as presented by Tables 7.1 and 7.2.

a. Monogenerational households.

Table 7.1: Advantages and disadavantages of monogenerational households, as a proportion of the total responses (%) a

	Phase Two	Phase Three
Advantages		
Privacy and independence	33	50
Promotion of positive relations with offsprings	38	59
Quietness, peacefulness, lack of noises of small children	23	38
Disadvantages		
Non-availability of help when needed	49	56
Separation from and non-involvement with family	30	17
Loneliness and boredom	42	51
N	489	208

Table 7.1 indicates that the perception of the relationship with offsprings has an impact on the attitude towards the monogenerational household. Separation from children is perceived both as an advantage and a disadvantage, sometimes by the same person. People Feel that living closely together may create problems, and some of them said that separation

1

is positive because of the differences in norms and life styles of the generations; they do not wish to see and know all that is going on, and do not wish to be directly involved in the affairs of the daily routine of their children's families; but on the other hand they miss this engagement. Reading the answers to this question, I felt that what they probably would like is to be involved in their children's lives in small doses; to see them often, but not for long (they need quietness and peacefulness); to maintain intimacy without paying the price of losing one's privacy and peace of mind. In short, to repeat Rosenmayer's phrase, to maintain intimacy at a distance.

The fact that nearly half of the population is aware of the grave disadvantages and nevertheless expresses satisfaction with living in this type of household indicates that this is their prefered way of life. This ties in with the analysis of household development presented in Chapter Two of this project, which showed that the statistically prefered living arrangement is the monogenerational household.

b. Multigenerational households

	Phase Two	Phase Three
Advantages*		
Availability of emotional support	62	48
Economic security, availability of help when sick . (instrumental security)	30	60
Satisfaction with social environment: involvement with family, absence of feeling of loneliness	19	49
N		
Disadvantages		
Noise of children, absence of peacefulness	34	17
Friction between the generations because of differences in life styles	34	-
Feeling of dependence on children, being a burden on children	24	6
Lack of privacy and independence	22	21
Ν		

Table 7.2: Advantages and Disadvantages of the multigenerational household (%)

Percentages computed from the total population who mentioned advantages.

Percentages computed from the total population who mentioned disadvantages.

Table 7.2 shows that the perceived advantages of living in a multigenerational households are all linked with the protective nature of this household; it is advantageous because it offers emotional and instrumental support, as well as social contact. The high proportion of those who mentioned availability of emotional support as an advantage is

25

important because it is an indication of both the incidence of this need and of the fact that it is a commodity actually supplied to those who live in multigenerational households. One wonders why only very few respondents refered to helping children as an advantage, in spite of the fact that at Phase Two nearly 50% of those living in multigenerational households performed household chores regularly. Living with children seems to be perceived as primarily advantageous to the aged parents. This impression is confirmed by content analysis of another question, which showed that 65% of the older generation interviewed, viewed this living arrangement as advantageous to their generation only.*

The positive attitude towards the multigenerational household is affected by marital status of the child with whom one lives: living with a married child is more condusive to perceiving this living arrangement as advantageous, than living with single (mostly young) children (Table 7.3). This may be due to generational differences in life styles and culture: most of these aged (who were all over 70 years old when interviewed at Phase Two) lived with young, as yet unmarried children; in fact, 40% of them lived with at least one child whose age was less than 21 years at that time. This finding ties in with the data of Phase One mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, showing that married aged parents living with children prefer to live in separate households. A high proportion of aged who live with young children are married.

- 103 -

^{*} Fifty percent of the interviewed children at Phase Two stated that this arrangement was clearly advantageous to the parents only.

Table 7.3: Distribution of parents living in multigenerational households at Phase Two, according to whether or not they perceive this arrangement as advantageous, by subtype of multigenerational household (%)

Sub-Type of Multigenerational household	Perception of Advantage	Yes	No	Tot a1	N
Lives with a married child		96	4	100%	117
Lives with a single child		76	24	100%	115
Total		86	16	100%	232
3	$x^2 = 9.6$ df - 1 p < 0.001				

Prefered living arrangements for older persons

As already stated above, this question was introduced at Phase One, and subsequently repeated at Phases Two and Three. At these later phases a more subjective questions followed the non-personal one.

Table 7.4 shows a considerable shift towards monogenerational households as the prefered living arrangement for older persons: most of those who had been living in monogenerational households at Phase One and had not then thought of this arrangement as desirable, had changed their minds when interviewed at Phase Two; and nearly 30% of those living in multigenerational households at Phase One who had thought this to be the prefered living arrangement, had changed their minds towards the monogenerational living arrangement. At Phase Three the same trend is discernible. These data on shifts of attitudes in a given time span, match the data of actual changes of household structure, as presented in Chapter Three, where we did show an increase in monogenerational households and found only a small proportion

.

			i'hase Two							Phase three	·····		
		Phase One	Prefered Mono- generational household	Multi- generational household	01d- age homes	Total	N	Phase Two	Mono- generational household	Multi- generational household	01d- age homes	Total	N
Mono- generati househol	onal d												
Prefered	mono-		85	5	10	100%	543		89	5	6	100%	175
	multi-		77	13	10	100%	39		x	x	x	100%	12
1	old-age	homes	73	2	25	100%	40		x	x	x	100%	24
Total			83	6	11	100%	622		88	6	6	100%	211
multi-													
generatio household	onal 1								Ab	solute number	8		
Prefered	multi-		65	28	7	100%	134		29	12	3		44
	Mono-		31	60	4	100%	95		4	12	1		17
	old-age	homes	X	x	x		20		1	3	1		4
Total			51	42	7	100%	249		34	27	5		65

Table 7.4: Prefered living arrangements for olderpersons - longitudinal analysis (%)

x = Percentage not computed because N too small.

of households which had changed from mono- to multigenerational. When asked subjectively if they would be prepared to change their living arrangements, about 20% of all respondents in both households at both phases answered affirmatively. This variable was found to be highly correlated with satisfaction from present living arrangements: as expected, the less satisfied are prepared to change. Longitudinal analysis of this variable shows that most people had not changed their attitude.they would prefer to remain living as before.