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Goals

• Concept of intergenerational solidarity
• Identifying different dyadic structures of solidarity based on relevant components
• Cultural differences of solidarity patterns (Poland – USA)
• Effects of solidarity on well-being and cross-cultural similarities and differences
• Explorative study
Intergenerational Solidarity

Early conceptualization

- Associational
- Affectional
- Consensual solidarity
  (Black & Bengtson, 1974)

Single higher-order construct of three interrelated dimensions (Bengtson & Roberts, 1991)
Empirical studies (e.g., Atkinson, Kivett and Campbell, 1986; Bengtson & Schrader, 1982) led to the following conclusions:

- These three components do not represent one dimension
- Solidarity is not a simple linear composite of association, affect, and consensus
- However, these three components are theoretically interrelated
Changes in the components followed (Bengtson, 1991):
- Replacement of *consensus* with *normative solidarity*;
- Relationship between *normative, affection* and *association* were assumed to be relevant

This model was also not supported by empirical studies
A closer look at the five components

**Affectional solidarity** – the degree of positive sentiments present in the relationship (trust, fairness, affection, warmth)

**Associational solidarity** – frequency of contact (frequency of intergenerational interaction, formal and ritualistic contacts and informal contacts)

**Functional solidarity** – financial and instrumental support
A closer look at the five components

**Consensual solidarity** degree of consensus or conflict in beliefs or orientations, external to the family and as well to perceived subjective consensus.

**Normative solidarity** – level of shared norms of familism held by family members (value similarity)
Ambivalence

Alternative concept contrasting the solidarity model: Ambivalence (Luescher & Pillemer, 1998)
Solidarity must be complemented with other concepts, especially conflict (Bengtson, Rosenthal, & Burton, 1996)

Consensus covers partly conflict but was seen as conflict about themes external to family
Typology
Not linear – but theoretically related

“Develop typologies that represent ambivalent family types those that are inconsistent on dimensions of solidarity and trace the transitions over time” (Bengtson, Giarrusso, Mabry, & Silverstein, 2002, p. 575)

First idea for a person-centered view and complementary perspective with ambivalence
Studies using a regression approach led to inconsistent and partly confusing results.

Example with well-being
RELATIONS BETWEEN
SOLIDARITY DIMENSIONS AND
LIFE SATISFACTION
Functional solidarity and well-being

- Positive effect but can also be negative if too much and unbalanced
- Mutual support – positive (Ferraro & Su, 1999; Kim & Kim, 2003)
- Receiving support – negative (Oeztop, Sener, Gueven, & Dogan, 2009 Pyke & Bengtson, 96; Silverstein et al., 96)
- No effect on well-being (Umberson, 1992; Ingersoll-Dayton, Morgan, & Antonucci, 1997; Merz et al., 2009)
- Support is psychologically beneficial at moderate levels but harmful at high levels (Silverstein, Chen, & Haller, 1996)
Affectional solidarity and well-being

Most powerful predictor
(Merz et al., 2009; Katz, Lowenstein, Phillips, & Daatland, 2005)
Applies for this study as well!

Other components (normative solidarity, associational solidarity) did not explain any variance in well-being

Theoretically not related? - Maybe
Idea for person-centered view was taken up by Silverstein, Gans, Lowenstein, Giarrusso, and Bengtson (2010). Emotional relationships can be positive and negative. **Affection and conflict** were used to look for clusters in 6 nations.
Latent class analysis
Four clusters
Amicable: high in affection low in conflict
Detached: low in both
Disharmonious: high in conflict low in affect
Ambivalent: high in both
New perspective:
Person-centered view does not only apply for affectual solidarity and conflict but also to the other components.

Approach: All five components may create different types of dyadic solidarity
Affectual – Associational – Functional – Consensual - Normative
Values and structural conditions in Poland and USA

• **Similarities**
  Strong family-orientation
  Religiosity (Sabatier et al., 2011)

• **Differences**
  Emotional interdependence
  Interdependent self-construal
  Less mobility
Explorative study

Types can be hardly predicted based on theoretical concept

Examples:

- High in all components?
- Average levels in all components?
Research Questions

• How many types of solidarity can be differentiated?
• Does the occurrence of solidarity types differ between Polish and US-American dyads?
• Do the solidarity types depend on structural conditions?
• Do the solidarity types predict well-being?
# Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>USA</th>
<th></th>
<th>Poland</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>43.0 (5.34)</td>
<td>68.1 (7.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>religion</td>
<td>catholic</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>protestant</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>64%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>home</th>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Same village/town</th>
<th>Other part of country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square (4) = 5.31, ns.
Solidarity Components

**Affectual**: mean of intimacy and admiration for mother and daughter

**Consensual**: mean of conflict (mother and daughter)

**Associational**: contact frequency (ordinal)

**Functional**: giving support by mother – giving support by daughter

**Normative**: similarities of family values
## Reliability of Solidarity Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Aff</th>
<th>Cons</th>
<th>Assoc</th>
<th>Funct</th>
<th>Norm</th>
<th>Well-Being</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Items</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First Value – USA; second value - Poland
Latent Cluster Analysis (LCA)

- Stable estimation of clusters
- Estimation of number of clusters based on information criteria (AIC, BIC)
- Comparison of cluster solutions
- Mixed scale types (nominal, ordinal, and interval data)
- Testing for similarity of patterns across groups
- Bootstrapping method as reliability indicator
### Correlations Between Solidarity Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Aff</th>
<th>Cons</th>
<th>Assoc</th>
<th>Funct</th>
<th>Norm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aff</td>
<td></td>
<td>.48***</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cons</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.20***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.18***</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Func</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Poland – above diagonal
USA – below diagonal
Country Differences in Solidarity Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>Poland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Func</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Latent Cluster Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>LL</th>
<th>BIC(LL)</th>
<th>Npar</th>
<th>Class.Err.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Cluster</td>
<td>-2725.22</td>
<td>5526.41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Cluster</td>
<td>-2574.83</td>
<td>5288.96</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Cluster</td>
<td>-2533.74</td>
<td>5270.09</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4-Cluster</strong></td>
<td><strong>-2499.40</strong></td>
<td><strong>5264.72</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.22</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Cluster</td>
<td>-2475.00</td>
<td>5279.17</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Cluster</td>
<td>-2455.29</td>
<td>5303.14</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison:

- **Bootstrap**
  - 4 clu vs. 5 clu: -5.76, p-value: .14
  - 3 clu vs. 4 clu: 68.68, p-value: .00
## Patterns of Solidarity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solidarity Component</th>
<th>Harmonious</th>
<th>Amicable</th>
<th>Ambivalent</th>
<th>Distant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cluster Size (%)</td>
<td>46.67</td>
<td>34.04</td>
<td>9.94</td>
<td>9.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affectual (+)</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensual (-)</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional (0)</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associational (+)</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>4.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative (0)</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Red: lowest value  
Green: highest value
Distributions of Solidarity Clusters

Chi-square (3) = 1.53, ns
Proximity and Solidarity Types

Poland: Chi-square (6) = 55.64, p < .001

Poland: Chi-square (6) = 55.64, p < .001
Mother’s Partner Status and Solidarity Types

Poland: Chi-square (3) = 3.61, ns
Daughters’ Wellbeing and Solidarity Types

Country: $F(1, 553) = 2.56, p = .11$
Cluster: $F(3, 553) = 2.14, p = .09$
Country x Cluster: $F(3, 553) = 2.53, p = .06$

Poland
- Harmonious
- Amicable
- Ambivalent
- Distant

US
- Harmonious
- Amicable
- Ambivalent
- Distant

Country: $F(1, 553) = 2.56, p = .11$
Cluster: $F(3, 553) = 2.14, p = .09$
Country x Cluster: $F(3, 553) = 2.53, p = .06$
Mothers’ Well-being and Solidarity Types

Country: $F(1, 553) = 22.85, p = .0001$
Cluster: $F(3, 553) = .80, p = .50$
Country x Cluster: $F(3, 553) = 1.13, p = .34$

Well-Being

- **Poland**
  - harmonious
  - amicable
  - ambivalent
  - distant

- **US**
  - harmonious
  - amicable
  - ambivalent
  - distant
Conclusions

1. Person-centered approach: more adequate methodological approach for concept and related assumptions
2. Clusters represent dyadic structure across five components
3. Main results:
   3a) Four main types of solidarity two types occurred often, two types more rarely (10% each) – pos/neg
Conclusions

Distant/ambivalent not so frequent: Ambivalence not so relevant?

3b) No difference in occurrence rates across the two countries

3c) Cultural differences:
Polish mothers living with daughter and without partner are mostly characterized by distant solidarity,
American mothers more by ambivalent solidarity
Conclusions

3d) Well-Being
US: Daughters of distant solidarity dyads had higher life satisfaction than daughters of ambivalent solidarity dyads. Does the distant pattern have positive qualities?

3e) Poland: Mothers of harmonious and amicable types are more satisfied than mothers of distant/ambivalent types.
Conclusions

Outlook
Confirmation of similar structures with other samples, with other cultures.
Confirmation of predictability of the different types of solidarity.
THANKS!