

Types of Relations between Adult Children and Elderly Parents in Taiwan: Mechanisms Accounting for Various Relational Types¹

Chin-chun Yi*

Ju-ping Lin**

INTRODUCTION

In recent decades, Taiwan has experienced steadily declining fertility and increased longevity expectation. As a result of the changing population structure, the elderly dependency ratio is expected to advance from 13.8% in 2006 to 30.3% in 2026 and to 67% in 2051. With a cultural heritage of strong filial piety, support of elderly parents has become a highly significant issue in the face of a drastically aging population.

From the perspective of the traditional Chinese family, a three-generational household or the co-residence of adult children with elderly parents is considered the ideal realization of filial piety. Although cultural norms toward elderly support remain intact in Taiwan (Yi and Chang, 2008), the actual co-residence between adult children and elderly parents has gradually declined to approximately 1/3 of households (Yi and Chang, 1996; Tseng, et al., 2006) while single elders as well as elderly conjugal households have increased (Yang and Tseng, 2000). The interplay of the dominant filial norm and the emerging nuclearization of both young and old generations is expected to produce complicated intergenerational relations. An attempt is thus made to examine the increasing majority of those adults who are not co-residing with elderly parents and to investigate how they approximate the Confucian ideal in a non-co-resident framework. This subject is of particular importance in the Chinese cultural context, which continues to value elderly support with co-residence receiving uncontroversial social recognition at the abstract level.

In the Chinese setting, the most salient aspect of intergenerational relations is perhaps support provided to one's elders. Elderly support in the typical Chinese definition emphasizes the uni-dimensional dependency of elderly parents on adult children. Thus, the support of elderly parents is usually considered as static and dependent relations, with adult children fulfilling the expected filial behavior. Consequently, the emotional and reciprocal aspects, as well as resource exchanges between generations tend to be overlooked (Lin, 2000). Since

¹ The first draft was presented at the RC06-ISA conference on "Aging: Families and Households in Global Perspective" sponsored by Lasell College and the Fuss Center for Research on Aging and Intergenerational Studies, Boston, USA, from May 19-23, 2008. We thank the reviewer's comments for the revised draft.

* Research Fellow, Institute of Sociology, Academia Sinica, 128 Academia Road, Sec. 2, Nangang, Taipei City, Taiwan.

** Associate Professor, Department of Human Development and Family Studies, National Taiwan Normal University, 162, Heping East Road, Sec. 1, Taipei 10610, Taiwan.

intergenerational relations in actuality involve various aspects of exchange, this paper will explore the intergenerational relations by incorporating the essential dimensions proposed by the solidarity model (Bengtson and Schrader, 1982; Roberts et al., 1991), and will investigate contacts, physical and emotional supports, as well as norms held between elderly parents and their adult children in Taiwan. This line of exploration is yet to be developed in East Asia, findings will allow us to present an overall profile of the family processes emerging in a society undergoing rapid social change. Types of intergenerational relations derived and mechanisms accounting for the variation will provide useful information regarding the family outcome of the interplay between traditional norms and resource restrictions in a contemporary non-Western setting.

THE INTERGENERATIONAL RELATIONS IN TAIWANESE FAMILIES

One basic motive for studying intergenerational relations in Taiwan results from the academic interests in understanding future changes in family structure. In general, co-residence with elderly parents is the key to distinguish between family structure into nuclear family versus complex family (such as the stem family and joint family). Hence, in order to capture possible changes in the family structure, current practice as well as attitudes toward elderly support have been investigated. Specifically, elderly support is investigated in terms of the living arrangement and the economic support between generations (Chen, 2006; Yeh, 1997; Yi and Chen, 1998). Intergenerational relations pertaining to the support or exchange attitudes and behaviors have thus become focal subjects in analyzing the development of family structure in Taiwan.

There are two major clusters of research on intergenerational relations in Taiwan. One approach compares *exchanges between generations*. Comparable with the West, direction as well as amount of monetary, physical labor and emotional exchanges between adult children (G2) and elderly parents (G1) are investigated. However, the general pattern reveals a different picture. Adult children are found to give more money and assistance to elderly parents than that received from parents, regardless of whether samples are rural or island-wide (Chen, 2006; Lin, 1998; Lin and Yi, 2007). Specific factors accounting for the variation in intergenerational exchanges are explored. Perhaps the most significant finding is that a higher amount of help received from elderly parents often results in more provision of help from adult children to parents.

Based on the altruistic model proposed by Becker (1974), Lee, et al., (1994) contend that the family is an altruistic and corporate unit, hence intergenerational support is the outcome of sharing mutual benefits across generations and the continuity of an intergenerational contract. Their study points out that an altruism/corporate group model best portrays the financial support from adult children to parents in Taiwanese families (*ibid.*). Nevertheless, if one considers all emotional, physical and financial support involved in the intergenerational relations, the single most significant factor explaining the support provided to elderly parents is the assistance received from parents (Lin and Yi, 2007). Those who receive more from parents are much more likely to offer support to parents. In other words, the principle of reciprocity between generations is the major reason for adult children providing support to elderly parents.

Another salient mechanism operating in the intergenerational exchanges is the actual parental need. Greater parental need has been found to enhance active exchanges between generations. Using the recent 2006 Taiwan Social Change Survey, Lin and Yi are able to show that intergenerational exchanges between adult children and elderly parents vary depending on the age status of parents, in that children's support becomes increasingly important as parents age (2007). But overall, the emotional support between generations is still the most reported category, and when all children are included (regardless of gender and marital status), the direction of emotional support is more likely to be from adult children to parents (Lin and Yi, 2007). It is evident that active intergenerational exchanges occur between two closely linked generations.

The other cluster of intergenerational studies focuses on the effect of filial *norms*. The normative factor is of particular importance in the East Asian region due to its historical and cultural heritage. Among different cultural and family norms, filial piety assumes the utmost position. Yeh proposes the dual model of filial piety, and documents that reciprocal rather than authoritative filial piety produces more pronounced effects in explaining intergenerational support (2004, 2007). In addition, the effects of norms may vary according to the *gender* of children and the *content* of specific support. It is found that cultural norms affect a son's (not daughter's) intergenerational support, in that the stronger perception of filial duty from sons is likely to result in more economic support, but not emotional support (Lin and Yi, 2007). In other words, norms tend to produce pronounced intergenerational effects among male children, especially in terms of providing material support. While daughters are more likely to exchange emotional support with parents, sons who are culturally expected to take the major responsibility in supporting elderly parents are likely to do so with material provisions. Consistent with other findings of Taiwanese families, gender differences in intergenerational exchanges are affected by the dominant patriarchal norms, and thus reveal a clear lineage differential (Yi and Lu, 1999; Yi et al., 2006).

Previous studies document the significant influence of normative solidarity in intergenerational relations. For example, Lin studied elderly parents in the farm family and investigated their intergenerational relations with the most intimate adult child. In her series of reports (1996, 1998, 2000), it was identified that higher normative solidarity tended to produce more exchanges between generations, in that elderly farmers were more likely to give and to receive support from children. It seems that normative values have a strong effect on elderly parents, in that those with stronger perception of filial norms are more likely to actively engage in both receiving support from and giving support to children. On the other hand, for adult children, receiving physical help from elderly parents enhances the financial return, and thus more intense intergenerational relations can be observed. But the specific effects of normative values held by adult children are not as clear as for the elderly. In fact, with regard to support behaviors, gendered division of labor in the patriarchal family is repeatedly documented. Sons often provide financial and physical support to elderly parents, while daughters offer emotional support—except daughters with resources, who tend to give money to parents regardless of marital status (Lin and Yi, 2007). Therefore, it will be interesting to delineate the potential impact of normative values in various family processes.

In addition to the above concerns of exchanges between generations and effects of filial norms, a unique outcome of the patriarchal norm in Taiwan is *co-residence* among three generations. It has been proposed that co-residence and economic support are two major components of elderly support in Chinese families (Yi and Chang, 2008). Although the normative attitude of elderly support remains quite intact, the behavioral aspect has revealed a compromised picture. The steadily declining co-residence between elderly parents and adult children is contended to be an inevitable trend because healthy elders prefer not to co-reside with married sons, but to be neighbors; while elders in need of care favor the co-residence arrangement (Tseng, et al., 2006). Also, sons with resources are shown to be more likely to provide financial support to elderly parents than to co-residing with them (Lee et al. 1994). For adult children, the decision to co-residence is often due to the feasibility of receiving physical assistance from elderly parents (Tseng et al., 2006; Yi et al., 2006), which as stated above, may lead to more economic support from the children as well. In other words, co-residence with elderly parents needs to take into account both patriarchal norms and individual resources.

In brief, Taiwanese documents pertaining to the gender differential and varying exchanges between generations reflect the impact of drastic social change on the traditional norm. It has been reported that the dominant filial norm of elderly support is relaxed or compromised due to specific constraints. Hence, this paper intends to study intergenerational relations with an assumption that it is an outcome of the interplay between patriarchal norm and individual resources.

TYPES OF INTERGENERATIONAL RELATIONS

Bengtson and Schrader (1982) proposed a model of intergenerational family solidarity which is construct of a multi-dimensional scale and is composed of six elements, namely the intergenerational structure, association, affect, consensus, function, and norms (Bengtson and Schrader, 1982;). This paradigm of solidarity has been widely utilized to guide studies on intergenerational relationships over the past few decades (Bengtson and Roberts, 1991; Roberts et al., 1991; McChesney and Bengtson, 1988; Roberts and Bengtson, 1990). Although the recent development of family diversification has resulted in greater complexity in intergenerational relations, the utility of the solidarity model has been repeatedly confirmed (Katz et al., 2005; Wenger, 1989). This study therefore adopts the framework suggested by the solidarity model and will explore its validity in an East Asian context. It is presumed that intergenerational relations can be characterized by types in order to describe the existing diversity.

One significant argument from the solidarity model is that the solidarity or cohesion between family generations is not the cumulative outcome of various aspects, but constructed types from different dimensions (Silverstein and Bengtson 1997). In other words, dimensions of intergenerational solidarity are not simply additive in nature, and thus do not form a unitary construct. Intergenerational relations can be examined by analyzing individual aspects or by exploring the mutual influence of various dimensions before an attempt is made to consolidate all different components of intergenerational relations. By doing so, the concept of relational types appears to be a potent construct depicting the multiplicity of intergenerational relations.

With regard to relational types, there seems to be more theoretical discussion than empirical evidence. Hogan and his colleagues used the latent class analysis to investigate the structure of intergenerational exchanges (1993). By distinguishing the receiving and the giving of assistance, care, advice and money between generations, high versus low exchange patterns can be derived. It was shown that over half of American families fall into the category of "low exchanges" and only 11% were defined as the "high exchanges" category (*ibid.*). In addition to the focus on a single solidarity dimension, Silverstein and Bengtson investigated multiple dimensions of functional, emotional, consensual, associational and structural solidarity, and found five intergenerational types of relations among American families (1997). They point out that the intergenerational bonds between adult children and mothers are stronger than those with fathers, with the "tight-knit" type and "detached" type being the major category for sons and daughters respectively (*ibid.*). In that study, it was found that parental divorce has a detrimental effect on intergenerational relations, and more so on father-children relations.

From previous relevant reports, it seems that latent class analysis is a feasible tool to generate various types of relations when different solidarity indices are utilized (Galen and Dykstra 2006; Hogan, et al., 1993; Park et al., 2005; Silverstein and Bengtson 1997). To recap, in the study by Hogan et al., (1993) discussed above, four basic categories (low exchanges, high exchanges, children give more, children receive more) are used to study intergenerational relations. Although the above method provides simple and clear results, the fact that over half of American families belong to the low exchange type implies that other salient aspects of intergenerational relations may be overlooked. Hence, Silverstein and Bengtson propose the concept of intergenerational solidarity by including more comprehensive intergenerational aspects (1997). The success of their attempt refutes the thesis of family decline (Popenoe, 1993) on the one hand, and also echoes the earlier concept of "modified extended family" (Litwak, 1960) which indicates that mutual help between generations is likely to occur when the need is present despite the fact that co-residence, support or exchanges between generations may be low. This line of thought coincides with the ambivalence thesis, which contends that contradiction exists between intergenerational interactions (Connidis and McMullin, 2002; Luescher, 2002; Luescher and Pillemer, 1998).

The East Asian region is experiencing a rapid aging process. Traditional filial norms are often confronted with the impact of modernization, resulting in structural changes in the family and in intergenerational interactions. Research focusing on the intergenerational relational types is just emerging. In a recent Korean study, Park and his colleagues employ residential distance, intergenerational exchanges and norms to analyze relational types between middle-aged children and their elderly parents (2005). Three relational types are found for parents and five types for children. Among the common three traditional, reciprocal and weak types across generations, higher educated daughters and employed parents tend to exhibit reciprocal exchanges between generations (*ibid.*). Self-reliance of elderly parents appears to contribute to the reciprocal relational type. However, this study fails to provide its latent concept in advance, nor are the chosen indicators given meaningful explanations. Hence, different relational types derived are actually the dichotomized outcome of a single indicator, e.g., reciprocal versus traditional types are defined by the direction of exchanges; normative versus circumstantial types are defined by high versus low norms. Further investigation using a comprehensive index to construct relational types seems imperative in order to capture the diversity of intergenerational relations in Taiwan and in East Asia.

In short, types of intergenerational relations allow us to derive an overall configuration of the family dynamic between generations. Since this subject has not been systematically examined in Asia, especially not using a more comprehensive composite index to derive relational types, the present study will first investigate the intergenerational relational types in the Taiwanese family by inclusion of various solidarity aspects. Secondly, the following analyses will focus on the rapidly emerging non-co-resident group and will explore various reasons leading to different relational types revealed. The target of analysis will be the adult children and their parents. Various mechanisms pertaining to the resources and needs of both generations which affect the relational types will be analyzed in order to delineate possible patterns in the intergenerational interactions.

Bearing this argument in mind, this study will investigate the following question:

1. With the continuing nuclearization process in Taiwan, what are types of intergenerational relations between adult children and parents? Does co-residence or the lack thereof make a significant difference in intergenerational relations?
2. What are possible effects of intergenerational resources on and needs of intergenerational relations derived?

We will use multiple elements proposed by the solidarity model to construct relational types so as to enable us to gather a comprehensive picture of the on-going intergenerational relations in Taiwan. Furthermore, by studying the non-co-residing adult children, possible future development of intergenerational relations in Taiwan and in East Asia may be suggested. Lastly, structural, family-related demographic factors as well as resources and demands of both generations are hypothesized to generate important effects on patterns of intergenerational interaction.

METHODS

Data and Sample

Data are taken from the 2006 Taiwan Social Change Survey, phase five, wave two. The Family Module consists of an island-wide sample of 2102 adults aged 20 years old and above who were randomly chosen using a multi-stage stratified sampling method, and interviewed. Since the subject of this study is intergenerational relations, only samples with at least one parent alive will be analyzed. After deleting samples with no parents alive, the final sample includes 1452 respondents. Among them, 696 intergenerational relations co-reside with parents and 756 live separately from parents.

Variables

Measures of Intergenerational Relations

- a) Frequency of face-to-face contact with parents

"Less Contact" is defined as once a month, several times a year, and zero to one time per year;

"More Contact" includes once a week, several times a week, almost everyday, and everyday.

b) Intergenerational Support

(1) Children give money to parents

"Give Less" are those who answer either not at all or rarely over the last year;

"Give More" is composed of those who report sometimes, often and very often.

(2) Children provide household assistance to parents

"Provide Less" denotes either not at all or rarely over the last year;

"Provide More" means the assistance takes place sometimes, often or very often.

(3) Parents give money to children

Similar responses are included in the dichotomized categories as above (no.2). In order to distinguish from parent's variables, this variable takes the adult children's perspective. Hence, two categories, "Receive Less" and "Receive More," are constructed.

(4) Parents provide household assistance to children

The same logic applied to this variable and results in "Provide Less" and "Provide More" categories.

c) Intergenerational emotions

This variable is constructed from questions about the frequency of respondents listening to parents' ideas and sharing emotions and vice versa. Those who indicate emotional exchanges occur sometimes, often, or very often for both parties are labeled "emotional reciprocity" in contrast with "non-emotional reciprocity."

d) Intergenerational norms

A question was raised with an intention to test the respondent's perceived intergenerational norms: "Which of the following is the most important family relation—relation with parents, conjugal relations, or relations with children?" Those who answer relation with parents as the most important are considered to have strong normative perceptions and are thus labeled as the "high norm" group. In contrast, the "low norm" group is composed of the other two answers.

Factors Accounting for the Relational Types

a) Demographic Factors

(1) Gender and Marital status

Since patriarchy is the dominant cultural norm, adult sons and adult daughters imply different resources available. Hence, four categories are generated from the availability of having a spouse as well as having sons or daughters. Among our sample, 54.4% fall into the category of "daughter and spouse," followed by "son

and spouse" (30.4%), then "daughter/ no spouse" (8.5%) and "son/ no spouse" (6.7%). Having a son and spouse will serve as the reference group in the analysis.

(2) Age

The mean age of the sample is 37.92 years. Three age categories are constructed: "age 30 and below" constitutes 8.1%, "age 31-49" is the majority (65.2%), and the 26.7% of "age 50 and above" will be the reference group.

b) Structural Opportunity

(1) Number of Siblings

This denotes the present number of siblings the respondent has; the mean is 2.98.

(2) Geographic Distance from parent's home

Six categories are provided ranging from "next door, same building or same alley" to "within 15 minutes' walking distance," "within 30 minutes' driving distance," "30 minutes to 1 hour's driving distance," "1-3 hours' driving distance" and "driving distance of 3 hours or above." A score of 1 to 6 is given, with a higher score meaning longer distance. Almost half of our sample (45.9%) live within 30 minutes' driving distance from parents, while 17.2% need to drive more than 3 hours.

c) Parental Need

(1) Parent's Marital Status

Two categories are generated: married and cohabiting are combined into "Have Spouse" (56.1%); widowed and divorced are together labeled "No Spouse" (43.9%). "0" is given to no spouse and "1" to have spouse.

(2) Parent's Health Status

Respondents are asked to evaluate each parent's health status. A score of 1 to 4 is given to "one parent healthy/one deceased or both healthy," "one unhealthy, one healthy," "one unhealthy, one deceased," "both parents are unhealthy," with higher scores denoting the unhealthiness of parents. The result shows that 59.2% of the sample falls into the first category, followed by 17.7% in the third category, 13% in the second category, then lastly 10.1% in the fourth category.

d) Individual Resources

(1) Work Status

"Formal employment" (63.2%), "informal employment or family business" (14.6%) and "no employment" (22.3%) are distinguished, with formal employment as the reference group.

(2) Monthly Income

A score of 1 to 7 is given, with higher scores meaning higher income. The categories are "no income," "below \$20,000," "\$20,000 to \$40,000," "\$40,000 to \$60,000," "\$60,000 to \$80,000," "\$80,000 to \$100,000," and "above \$100,000." 65.7% report having income of \$40,000 or below, and only 4.2% belong to the highest category.

The Analytic Strategy

From Children's Perspective

Previous studies on intergenerational relations emphasize the elderly perspective more. One recent study has documented that different perceptions do exist between generations (Park, et al., 2005). Since our research interest lies in the possible effect of normative changes on intergenerational relations, focusing on the perspective of *adult children* will allow us to explore the future development of intergenerational exchanges as well as of family structure in Taiwan. Therefore, we will first analyze two groups of adult children, those with and without co-residence, to compare their intergenerational relations in order to discern if significant differences exist between the two.

Focus on the Non-co-residing Children

To support our argument that adult children who co-reside with parents are different from those who do not co-reside, we will first examine the demographic profile. From Table 1, it can be seen that co-residing children tend to be males (64%), younger (59% below age 30), unmarried (77%) as opposed to their counterpart. However, there is no significant difference in terms of urban rural background, ethnicity and occupational categories between the two groups. It appears that unmarried children delayed leaving home, which constitutes an important motivation for co-residence. In other words, non-co-residence may become more significant as children age and establish their families. Therefore, we will focus on the non-co-residing group and investigate the relational types derived. Since not to co-reside with elderly parents may emerge as a major trend in the East Asian region, exploring the intergenerational relations of this group will illuminate our understanding of the future relational types between generations.

Table 1.

The Comparison between Co-resident and Non-co-resident Groups: Demographical Variables

		Co-resident n=696		Non-co-resident n=756		Chi-square(χ^2)
		n	%	n	%	
Gender	male	448	64.4	281	37.2	$\chi^2=30.744$ ***
	female	248	35.6	475	62.8	
Age	below 30	413	59.3	61	8.1	$\chi^2=348.238$ ***
	31-49	217	31.2	493	65.2	
	50 and above	66	9.5	202	26.7	
Marital status	unmarried	536	77.0	115	15.2	$\chi^2=296.304$ ***
	married	160	23.0	641	84.8	

Use Latent Class Analysis

Significant aspects of the solidarity model are incorporated in the construction of intergenerational types. To derive a valid typology, latent class analysis will be employed. Specifically, associational, functional, affectual and normative indicators are selected to form various relational types. As stated above, seven indicators of contact, exchanges, emotional closeness and filial norms are dichotomized to explore the latent structural pattern in the intergenerational interaction. Furthermore, due to the nature of categorical variables, multinomial logistic regression will be applied to examine factors associated with types of intergenerational relations. It is hypothesized that in addition to the differences of co-residence, intergenerational resources and demands will produce significant effects on relational types.

RESULTS**Compare Intergenerational Relations between Co-residence vs. Non-co-residence**

Four categories of intergenerational solidarity indicators are used to compare adult children who co-reside with elderly parents versus those who do not co-reside. From Table 2, it can be seen that 71% of adult children who do not co-reside with parent have face to face contact at least once a week. With regard to other aspects, both groups report high emotional closeness, but significant differences are found in other functional and normative aspects. Let us look at *co-residing* adult children first. They are more likely to give money and household assistance to elderly parents, and are also more likely to receive household assistance from parents. Co-residing children are also more likely to hold higher filial norms as expected. In other words, co-residence contributes to active functional exchanges between generations. On the other hand, adult children who do *not co-reside* with parents tend to engage in typically and culturally expected exchanges. They are more likely to give, but not to receive, in functional exchanges in accordance with the norm. Specifically, while adult children who do not co-reside with parents are shown to give money and household help to parents, they are more likely not to receive financial and physical assistance from parents. Although this is the group which reveals lower filial norms, the direction of intergenerational exchanges actually fulfills the cultural expectation in that elderly parents are the recipient in the process.

There are two competing arguments in the literature. From the perspective of adult children, provision to elderly parents is an expected norm. Consequently, both groups exhibit similar patterns in that G2 is more likely to offer monetary and physical help to G1. But for adult children who do not co-reside with parents, the higher percentage of offering money was contended to be a trade-off of not living together for sons with resources (Lee et al., 1994). They are also much less likely to receive assistance from parents. As for children who are more likely to receive household help from parents due to the geographical convenience, previous studies indicate that children, especially sons, tend to give money as a return (Tseng et al., 2006). Nevertheless, the fact that non-co-residing children, regardless of their age and economic condition, and even if holding lower filial norms, are still more likely to give money to parents, perhaps reflect a compromise between the traditional expectation and personal constraints.

Table 2.

Comparison between Co-resident and Non-Co-resident Groups: Intergenerational solidarity Indicators

	value	Co-resident		Non-co-resident		Chi-square (÷2)
		(n=696)		(n=756)		
		n	%	N	%	
Face to face contact	L			220	29.1	
	H			536	70.9	
Give G1 financial support	L	299	43	276	36.5	6.422*
	H	396	57	480	63.5	
Do household chores for G1	L	157	22.6	361	47.8	100.233***
	H	539	77.6	395	52.2	
Receive financial support from G1	L	383	55.1	645	85.3	160.003***
	H	312	44.9	111	14.7	
Receive household chores from G1	L	130	18.7	565	74.7	454.723***
	H	564	81.3	191	25.3	
Emotional closeness	L	390	41.7	330	43.7	0.583
	H	406	58.3	426	56.3	
Norm	L	236	33.9	426	56.3	73.57***
	H	460	66.1	330	43.7	

Note: * $p < 0.05$ *** $p < 0.001$

Overall, the comparison between co-resident and non co-resident adult children indicates that significant differences exist between the two. It should be noted that the majority of co-residing children express higher endorsement of filial values, in contrast with a lower proportion of those in the non-co-residence group. The filial norm is considered more important by adult children who co-reside with parents. Although co-residence has been a major family experience for Taiwanese adolescents and has been documented to bring about long-term effects on generational relations (Yi et al., 2006), the actual co-residence of three generational households drastically declines during adulthood. Future generations are likely to have separate residences and may reveal different concepts of filial acts. Hence, the following analysis will be confined to the non co-resident group and will explore its relational types as well as mechanisms accounting for the variance.

Types of Intergenerational Relations in the Taiwanese Family

The analysis will proceed with the adult child as the respondent. Since co-residence, a structural variable, serves as the basis to distinguish two groups, relational types will be constructed from associational, functional, affectual and normative indicators. Using frequency of contact, monetary and physical assistance in household chores between generations, perceived emotional closeness and filial norms, the best fitting model is five types of intergenerational relations (see Table 3, $L^2=84.225$, $df=88$, $p=.5942$).

The distribution of various indicators for the five relational types is presented in Table 4. As can be seen, Type 1 is characterized by frequent contact, less functional exchanges, high emotional closeness and low filial norm. Type 2 is high in contact frequency, in giving money to parents, in exchange household assistance, and in emotional closeness, but low in receiving money from parents and in filial norms. Type 3 has higher contact frequency and higher filial norm, but lower emotional closeness, and the functional exchanges are from the expected direction of adult children to parents only. Type 4 shares with Type 3 the traditionally prescribed functional exchanges (i.e., high from G2 to G1, low from G1 to G2), but it differs from others in having less face to face contact with parents, yet feels emotionally close to them. Type 4 also reports lower filial norm. Type 5 reveals higher contact only, while all other aspects are low— exchanges, affection as well as norms.

Table 3.

**Model Fit for the Optimal Number of Classes
in the Latent Class Analysis (N=756)**

Number of Latent Classes	L ²	df	BIC	P value
2	141.768	112	6473.856	.0301
3	112.280	104	6497.392	.2724
4	94.140	96	6532.277	.5346
5	84.225	88	6575.386	.5942

Table 4.

The Latent Class Analysis of Adult Child-Parent Relations (probabilities) (N=756)

Indicators		Type I	Type II	Type III	Type IV	Type V
		n=76	n=128	n=372	n=46	n=134
Face contact	L	0.284	0.191	0.216	1	0.39
	H	0.716	0.809	0.784	0	0.61
Give G1 money	L	0.646	0.179	0.238	0.178	0.588
	H	0.354	0.821	0.762	0.822	0.412
Give G1 help	L	0.502	0.195	0.392	0.167	1
	H	0.498	0.805	0.608	0.833	0
Receive G1 money	L	0.586	0.56	1	0.95	1
	H	0.414	0.44	0	0.05	0
Receive G1 help	L	0.704	0.182	0.84	0.971	0.982
	H	0.296	0.818	0.16	0.029	0.018
Emotionally close	L	0.41	0.027	0.505	0	0.759
	H	0.59	0.973	0.495	1	0.241
Norm	L	0.728	0.503	0.496	0.639	0.585
	H	0.272	0.497	0.504	0.361	0.415

Based on the characteristics listed above, each relational type will be labeled as follows: Sociable, Tight-knit, Normative, Intimate but distant, and Detached (Table 5). According to the relative distribution from the contact, exchanges, affection and norms, the majority fall into the "Normative" type, which constitutes almost half of the sample (49.21%). Adult children who are in the normative type manifest obligatory behaviors in the expected direction: visit parents often; more likely to give money and help parents with household chores, and having relatively higher filial norm but not higher affection toward parents. This is the group which interacts with parents in greater compliance with the normative expectation.

For other relational types, the "Tight-knit" type (16.93%) not only has frequent contact with parents, it also engages in mutual assistance in household chores and is more likely to give money to (not receive it from) parents. Although the Tight-knit type is not more likely to have a higher filial norm, this is the group which reports the highest emotional closeness with parents. The "Sociable" type, which constitutes 10%, shares frequent contact and high affect just like the Tight-knit type, but it differs in having all lower functional exchanges and lower filial norm. In other words, the Sociable type enjoys interacting with parents, but not in performing specific functional exchanges, since filial norm is less likely to become a guideline. The "Detached" type (17.72%) is low in all aspects of indicators except the frequent contact. It appears the only culturally prescribed behavior left for adult children is to at least visit parents in person at least once a week. For the "Intimate but distant" type, in addition to being the smallest group (6%), it is also the only type that does not have frequent contact with parents. However, this group expresses high emotional closeness with parents and it provides monetary and physical labor to parents in accordance with the conventional practice. They also tend to hold lower filial norms.

Table 5.

Types and Definitions of Intergenerational Relations in Taiwan (n=756)

Relational Types	N	%	Definition (from children's perspective)
Sociable	76	10.05	High in face to face contact and emotional closeness, but low in functional exchanges and in norms
Tight-knit	128	16.93	High in all indicators of solidarity except norms
Normative(obligatory)	372	49.21	High in face to face contact and in norms, also high in provision to parents; but low in receiving help from parents and low in emotional closeness
Intimate but Distant	46	6.09	Low in face to face contact, in receiving parents' help, in norms, but high in provision to parents and in emotional closeness
Detached	134	17.12	High in face to face contact only, low in all other aspects

It should be pointed out that the importance of the filial norm does not seem to produce the expected salient effect in the construction of various relational types. Only the Normative type reports slightly higher filial norms. Among our sample, 44% of the non-co-resident children indicate that relation to parents is the most important, but more than half of our sample reports spouse or children having higher priority. The traditional position of filial norms appears to be changing among adult children who do not co-reside with parents.

Factors Accounting For Types of Intergenerational Relations in Taiwan

From the above analysis, five intergenerational types of relations for Taiwanese adult children who do not co-reside with parents are found. Using more comprehensive solidarity indicators, it was shown that associational, functional exchanges between generations, emotional feeling as well as normative values assume different importance in different relational types. Since there are various mechanisms in the individual's life course which may exert significant influence in the intergenerational interactions, it will be interesting to explore their possible effect. Table 6 is the multinomial logistic regression, which considers structural opportunities, personal demographical variables, individual resources and parental demand on relational types. The Tight-knit type is used as the reference group.

Table 6.

The Multinomial Logistic Regression Model of Intergenerational Relations: Exp(B)

	Ref: Tight-knit (n=128)			
	Detached	Normative	Sociable	Intimate but Distant
Structural Opportunity				
Geographic distance	1.385***	1.403***	1.387***	1.396***
Sibling number	1.198	1.239**	1.058	1.322*
Demographics				
(ref. married son)				
Unmarried Sons	2.336	1.213	1.061	1.017
Unmarried daughters	0.544	0.522	0.843	0.430
Married daughters	0.596	0.561*	0.503	1.191
(ref. age 50 and above)				
Age below 30	0.244*	0.169***	0.915	2.980
Age 31-49	0.379*	0.380**	0.646	2.112
Individual Resources				
Income	0.817*	1.088	0.920	0.841
Parental Demand				
(ref. widowed)				
G1 Marriage	0.412**	0.458**	0.755	0.481
G1 Health	1.158	1.105	1.108	1.164

*p<0.05 **p<0.01 ***p<0.001

Findings from Table 5 indicate that with regard to family structure characteristics, closer geographical distance between generations results in a higher probability of the Tight-knit type; those with more siblings are more likely to become the "Normative" and "Intimate but Distant" types ($\text{Exp}(B)=1.239, p<.01$; $\text{Exp}(B)=1.332, p<.05$) rather than the Tight-knit type. From the demographic specific, married sons, in contrast with married daughters, have a higher probability of falling into the Normative type ($\text{Exp}(B)=.561, p<.05$); adult children in younger groups (i.e., age below 30 and age 31-49) have a higher chance to be the Tight-knit type, but as they age, the probability of becoming Detached ($\text{Exp}(B)=.244$ and ($\text{Exp}(B)=.379, p<.05$) and Normative types ($\text{Exp}(B)=.169, p<.001$; $\text{Exp}(B)=.380, p<.01$) increases. In terms of income resources, lower income tends to result in the Detached type ($\text{Exp}(B)=.817, p<.05$). From the parental side, the health status does not produce significant difference, but parents' marital status does: adult children are more likely to have Detached or Normative relations if parents are widowed or divorced ($\text{Exp}(B)=.412, p<.01$; $\text{Exp}(B)=.458, p<.01$).

Looking down the columns of Table 5, it is evident that when compared with the *Tight-knit* type, adult children who are in the Detached types are characterized by greater geographical distance between generations, older age, lower income, and having single parent. The Normative type tends to live at a greater geographical distance, have more siblings, be a married son, be older, and have a single parent. For the Sociable type, only greater geographical distance attains significance in contrast with the Tight-knit type. Similarly, for Intimate but Distant type, to live farther from parents and to have more siblings contribute to intergenerational relations which display less face to face contact, higher affection and single direction provision to parents.

It appears that the structural opportunity, individual demographics and resources, as well as parental needs all have expected differing and salient effects on various relational types. In other words, structural factor represents significant opportunity in the intergenerational relations: while living farther reduces exchanges, having less siblings increases the likelihood of receiving assistance from parents and consequently becomes the Tight-knit type. On the other hand, children's life stage and resources produce important effect on the intergenerational relations in that older children with resources tend to fall into the Normative type in contrast with children lacking resources falling into the Detached type.

DISCUSSION

This paper first delineates the difference of intergenerational relations between co-residence and non-co-residence of adult children and their parents in Taiwan. Taking the children's perspective, the two groups resemble each other in their conformity to traditional filial behaviors: frequent face to face contact, higher functional provision to parents in financial and in physical support, a lower likelihood of receiving money from parents, and higher emotional closeness. Nevertheless, co-residing children express higher endorsement of filial norms and are more likely to receive parental help around the house due to geographical feasibility. The filial behavior between the two groups is shown to attain significant differences, in that non-co-resident children have a higher tendency to provide money to parents and a lower tendency to receive money from parents—an exchange pattern which fits with the cultural expectation. Since separate residence probably represents the future intergenerational

patterns in East Asia, an attempt is made to explore the relational types of the non-co-resident group and to delineate possible mechanisms accounting for the intergenerational relations revealed.

Previous effort in Asia has failed to utilize more comprehensive indicators to generate relational types. Studies in the West have also inadequately investigated the potential influence of the filial norm, which is the dominant social value in East Asia. Hence, inspired by the intergenerational solidarity model proposed by Bengtson and Silverstein, this study utilizes association, functional exchanges, emotional closeness and filial norms to derive types of intergenerational relations in Taiwan. From seven indicators which consider demands and resources of both generations, five relational types are derived. The Tight-knit type of intergenerational relations reveals higher levels of face to face contact, functional exchanges and emotional closeness. The Sociable type differs from it in that the functional provisions to parents are low. The comparison between the Detached and the Sociable is that while the former shares higher contact and lower exchanges, lower emotional level between generations is reported. Between the Normative or obligatory type and the Intimate but Distant type, both relational types engage in the culturally expected behaviors, in that adult children provide parents with money and physical labor, but do not receive these from them. The Normative type, unlike the Intimate but Distant type having lower face to face contact but higher emotional closeness, conforms in meeting parents regularly and in holding a higher filial norm.

There are several significant implications from the analysis:

1. The derived relational types suggest that intergenerational solidarity or cohesion in Taiwan is not a unitary construct from additive elements. Instead, consistent with findings on the American intergenerational relations (Silverstein and Bengtson 1997), relational types need to be constructed by taking into account different aspects of solidarity simultaneously. In other words, the traditional Chinese concept of elderly support (i.e., single direction from children to parents for livelihood) needs to be expanded to include diversified interaction patterns. From the result on non-co-resident adult children in Taiwan, it is essential to consider the multiple indicators of contact, exchanges, and affection between generations in delineating relational types in order to capture the diversified and different types of relations.
2. With regard to mechanisms involved in the construction of relational types, our results point out that in different types of intergenerational relations in Taiwan,
 - (A) The opportunity structure documented in the literature, such as the demographic composition of family and geographical distance (Bengtson and Harootyan 1994; Mangen and McChesney 1988), is verified in the Taiwanese setting. Living close to parents and having fewer siblings lead to more dense and intimate interaction between generations, as the Tight-knit type indicates.
 - (B) For gender differentials, married sons (in comparison with married daughters) who do not co-reside with parents have higher probability of becoming the

Normative type. This implies that males not only tend to endorse the filial norm, they also take the actual responsibility of provision to parents. Married daughters, although not co-residing with own parents as the patrilineal system prescribes, are likely to engage in mutual functional exchanges and also enjoy closer emotional relationships.

- (C) The importance of age effects shows that the tendency to become the Detached or the Normative types as children age corresponds with previous studies of American families, which point out that the optimal stage of receiving parental assistance is between age 20-30 and declines after age 35 (Cooney and Uhlenberg, 1992). Intergenerational interaction is indeed a dynamic process over the life course.
 - (D) From the perspective of resources and demands, parents' marital status is shown to have a pronounced effect, in that when parents are widowed or divorced, the intergenerational relations are prone to be the Normative or the Detached type; but if children are older and economically less well off, the Detached type appears to be the most likely outcome. In other words, individual resources do interact with parental demands, which in turn produce significant consequences on types of intergenerational relations.
3. However, the presumed salient effect of the filial norm is unclear in the analysis. The reason why the filial norm does not achieve the expected function in distinguishing various relational types may be due to the question raised and the co-residence variable included. Among Taiwanese adult children who do not co-reside with parents, more than half indicate that parents are not the most important dyadic relation in the family; spouse and children are considered to have higher priority. The question itself is intended to capture the typical conformer to the traditional filial norm, as clearly shown among the co-resident counterpart. However, for the non-co-resident group, filial behaviors such as regular visits rather than filial values are kept rather intact. Hence, further studies using other indicators of filial values (e.g., general attitude of elderly support or the filial piety scale) may shed light on the potential contribution of how normative values operate in the intergenerational relations in Chinese societies and in the East Asian region.

In addition, significant differences between married sons and married daughters as well as the filial expectation affiliated with sibling numbers and birth order (Yi and Pan, 2006; Yu and Su, 2006) are verified. Our study shows that among the non-co-residing group, married daughters, compared with married sons, are more likely to become the "Tight-knit" type. Since separate residence may become an inevitable trend between generations, the above findings offer significant cultural implications. Deviating from the traditional gendered expectation, parents-daughter relations may sustain strongly even after marriage. While married sons conform to the cultural expectation by offering functional provisions to parents and thus becoming the majority Normative type, daughters enjoy close emotional interaction with parents. Looking ahead, since frequent visits are reported among almost all adult children and since sons continue to obey the culturally prescribed role, it is highly probable that

future intergenerational relations in Taiwan will maintain a clear normative picture. On the other hand, the demographic profile of co-resident group with young unmarried sons comprising the majority and the substantial Tight-knit type especially for married daughters, it is likely that besides the Normative type, future intergenerational relations will reveal an important affectual component, not emphasized in the culture before. In other words, we will increasingly observe Taiwanese adult children living apart from parents having frequent visits, functional exchanges and emotional support with parents, not necessarily owing to the normative requirement, but the voluntary choice.

To sum up, our study documents that both the realistic demands from parents and individual resources affect types of generational relations. It also suggests that the relational types derived may be an outcome of the interplay between individual resources and patriarchal norms. In the process of societal changes, the family system often responds to external constraints and opportunities with compromised strategy. For Chinese societies, affection between generations has not been an emphasis in the family. Rather, to act in accordance with the traditional normative behaviors (such as regular face to face contact and functional provision) is considered an obligation for adult children. By doing so, manifest generational conflicts and negative social reactions are likely to be prevented, and basic intergenerational relations and exchanges are preserved. Nevertheless, as young cohorts become middle-aged children, the affluent society will provide more opportunities for separate residence and close family ties. The traditional filial value may depart even faster from the strict conventional rule, as reflected in the current non-co-residing sample. Whether types of intergenerational relations will resemble the Western counterpart so that filial norm retreats to be of nominal function, or whether cultural expectation remains strong so that provision to parents is still considered essential will require further investigation.

REFERENCES

- Becker, G. S. (1974). A Theory of Social Interactions. *Journal of Political Economy*, 82, 1063-1093.
- Bengtson, V. L. and Harootyan, R. A. (1994). *Intergenerational Linkages: Hidden Connections in American Society*. NY: Springer.
- Bengtson, V. L. and Roberts, R.E. L. (1991). Intergenerational Solidarity in Aging Families: An Example of Formal Theory Construction. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 53, 856-870.
- Bengtson, V. L. and Schrader, S. S. (1982). Parent-Child Relations. In D.J. Mangen and W.A. Peterson, (Eds.), *Research Instruments in Social Gerontology* (pp. 115-186). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Chen, C.N. (2006). A Household-Based Convoy and the Reciprocity of Support Exchange between Adult Children and Noncoresiding Parents. *Journal of Family Issues*, 27, 1100-1136.
- Connidis, I. A. and McMullin, J. A. (2002). Sociological Ambivalence and Family Ties: A Critical Perspective. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 64, 558-567.
- Cooney, T. M. and Uhlenberg, P. (1992). Support from Parents over the Life Course: The Adult Child's Perspective. *Social Forces*, 71, 63-84.
- Galen, V. R. I. and Dykstra, P.A. (2006). Solidarity and Conflict between Adult Children and Parents: A Latent Class Analysis. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 68(4), 947-960.

- Hogan, D.P., Eggebeen, D.J. and Clogg, C.C. (1993). The Structure of Intergenerational Exchanges in American Families. *American Journal of Sociology*, 98(6), 1428-1458.
- Katz, R., Lowenstein, A., Phillips, J., and Daatland, S.O (2005). Theorizing Intergenerational Family Relations. Solidarity, Conflict and Ambivalence in Cross-national Contexts. In V.L. Bengtson, A.C. Acock, K.R. Allen, P. Dilworth-Anderson, and D. Klein (Eds.), *Sourcebook of Family Theory and Research* (pp. 393-402). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Lee, Y.J., Parish, W.L. and Willis, R. J. (1994). Sons, Daughters, and Intergenerational Support in Taiwan. *American Journal of Sociology*, 99(4), 1010-1041.
- Lin, J.P. and Yi, C.C. (2007). Norm, Affection or Exchange? Intergenerational support between Adult Children and Elder Parents. Paper presented at the 9th Conference on the Taiwan Social Change Survey, Taipei, Institute of Sociology, Academia Sinica. (In Chinese)
- Lin, J.P. (1996). The Intergenerational Relation between Elderly and Adult Children: The intergenerational Exchanges. *Journal of Taiwan Home Economics*, 25, 77-85. (In Chinese)
- Lin, J.P. (1998). *Intergenerational Solidarity between The Rural Elderly And Their Adult Children-From Elder's Perspective*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, National Taiwan University, Taipei, Taiwan. (In Chinese)
- Lin, J.P. (2000). Intergenerational Solidarity between the Rural Elderly and Their Adult Children. *Journal of Taiwan Home Economics*, 29, 32-58. (In Chinese)
- Litwak, E. (1960). Geographic Mobility and Extended Family Cohesion. *American Sociological Review*, 25(3), 385-394.
- Luescher, K. (2002). Intergenerational Ambivalence: Further Steps in Theory and Research. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 64(3), 585-593.
- Luescher, K. and Pillemer, K. (1998). Intergenerational Ambivalence: A New Approach to the Study of Parent-children Relations in Later Life. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 60, 413-425.
- Mangen, D. J. and McChesney, Y. K. (1988). Intergenerational Cohesion. A Comparison of Linear and Nonlinear Analytical Approaches. In D. J. Mangen, V.L. Bengtson and P.H. Landry, (Eds.), *Measurement of Intergenerational Relations* (pp.208-221). CA: Sage.
- McChesney, K. Y. and Bengtson, V. L. (1988). Solidarity, Integration, and Cohesion in Families: Concepts and Theories. In D.J. Mangen, V.L. Bengtson & P.H. Landry, (Eds.), *Measurement of Intergenerational Relations* (pp. 15-30). CA: Sage.
- Park, K.S., Phua, V., McNally, J. and Sun, R. (2005). Diversity and Structure of Intergenerational Relationships: Elderly Parent-Adult Child Relations in Korea. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Gerontology*, 20(4), 285-305.
- Popenoe, D. (1993) American Family Decline, 1960-1990: A Review and Appraisal. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 55(5), 27-55.
- Roberts, R.E.L. and Bengtson, V.L. (1990). Is Intergenerational Solidarity a Unidimensional Construct? A Second Test of a Formal Model. *Journal of Gerontology: Social Sciences*, 45, 12-20.
- Roberts, R.E.L., Richards, L.N. and Bengtson, V.L. (1991). Intergenerational Solidarity in Families: Untangling the Ties that Bind. *Marriage and Family Review*, 16, 11-46.
- Silverstein, M. and Bengtson, V. L. (1997). Intergenerational Family Solidarity and the Structure of Adult Child-parent Relationships in American Families. *American Journal of Sociology*, 103(2), 429-460.

- Tseng, L.Y., Chang, C.O. & Chen, S.M. (2006). An Analysis on the Living Arrangement Choices of the Elderly: A Discussion on Intergenerational Relationships. *Journal of Housing Studies*, 15(2), 45-64. (In Chinese)
- Wenger, G.C. (1989). Support Networks in Old Age: Constructing a Typology. In: M. Jeffreys, (Ed.), *Growing Old in the 20th Century*. London: Routledge.
- Yang, C.L. and Tseng, Y. (2000). Changes of Household Composition in Taiwan. *Taiwanese Journal of Sociology*, 24, 239-280. (In Chinese)
- Yeh, K.H. (1997). Change in the Taiwan People's Concept of Filial Piety. In L.Y. Chang, Y.H. Lu and F.C. Wang, (Eds.), *Taiwanese Society in 1990s* (pp.171-214). Taipei: Academia Sinica. (In Chinese)
- Yeh, K.H. (2007). Intergenerational Exchange Behaviours in Taiwan: the Filial Piety Perspective. Paper presented at the 9th Conference on the Taiwan Social Change Survey, Taipei, Institute of Sociology, Academia Sinica. (In Chinese)
- Yeh, K.H. and Bedford, O. (2004). Filial Belief and Parent-Child Conflict. *Asia Journal of Social Psychology*, 39(2), 132-144.
- Yi C.C. and Chang, Y.H. (1996). Change of Family Structure and Marital Power in Taiwan. In H.H. Chen, (Ed.), *Families, Human Resources and Social Development* (pp.135-156). Taipei: Department and Graduate Institute of Sociology, National Chengchi University.
- Yi C.C. and Chang, Y.H. (2008). The Continuity and Change of Patrilineal Families: Family Sociological Research in Taiwan, 1960-2000. In G.S. Hsieh, (Ed.). *Blooming Disciplines: The History of Sociological Development in Taiwan*. Taipei: Socio Publishing Co., Ltd.
- Yi C.C. and Lu, Y.S. (1999). Who are My Family Members? Lineage and Marital Status in the Taiwanese Family. *The American Journal of Chinese Studies*, 6(2), 249-278.
- Yi, C.C. and Pan, E.L. (2005). Intergenerational Relations in Taiwan: A Preliminary Analysis on the Lineage Differential. In A. Steinbach, (Ed.), *Fertility Behavior and Intergenerational Relations* (pp.233-257). Wiesbaden, Germany: Verlag Fuer So-Zialwissenschaften Publishing Co.
- Yi, C.C., Pan, E.L., Chang, Y.H. and Chan, C.W. (2006). Grandparents, Parents and Children: The Intergenerational Relations in Taiwan. *Journal of Family Issues*, 27(8), 1042-1067.
- Yi, C.C. and Chen, Y.H. (1998). Present Forms and Future Attitudes of the Elderly Parental Support in Taiwan. *Journal of Population Studies*, 19, 1-32. (In Chinese)
- Yu, W.H. and Su, K.H. (2006). Gender, Sibship Structure, and Educational Inequality in Taiwan: Son Preference Revisited. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 68, 1057-1068.

Copyright of *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* is the property of *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.