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Why Intergenerational Ambivalence?

- Credit to the conference place
- much is known about intergenerational solidarity, about emotional closeness, even in cross-cultural comparison
- much less is known about the intersection of affection and conflict

- allows for the combination of a „psychological“ study of affective bonds and a „sociological“ study of action choices under constraints, such as kinship systems, normative obligations and available resources
- „exit“ and „voice“ as important choices in intimate relationships, besides „loyalty“ and „neglect“
Intergenerational Ambivalence

Theoretical aim
- extend the explanation of intergenerational ambivalence to culturally and economically diverse societies
- relate intergenerational ambivalence of women to institutional settings of the kinship system

Empirical aim
- replication of the solidarity-conflict-model from the younger generation‘s perspective
- application of a meaningful typology of intergenerational relationships
- analysis of affect and conflict in a three-level-framework of societal, individual and relational conditions
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Research questions

- Is the intergenerational solidarity and ambivalence paradigm valid under economically, culturally and institutionally diverse conditions?
  - Are similar patterns of amicable, ambivalent, disharmonious and detached relationships valid for matrilineal, patrilineal and bilineal kinship systems?

- Are affection and conflict in intergenerational relationships structured by institutional settings, or just a matter of opportunities and individual choices?
  - Is intergenerational ambivalence related to the (lack of) welfare state provisions?
  - Does a matrilineal and patrilineal kinship system result in different patterns of affection and conflict of women towards (biological) mothers and fathers than a bilineal kinship system?
Research Program

Value of Children in Six Cultures
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Design of the Study

In every participating country about

- **300 young mothers** whose oldest child is between two and five years of age
- **300 older mothers** with at least one adolescent child between 14 and 17 years
- these 300 adolescents
- in 100 of these cases the maternal grandmother

As a result, 100 families compose a *three-generation sample* and 300 a *mother-child-dyad* (linked data).

The total sample consists of about 1,000 respondents per country.
### Economic differences between societies

#### Gross National Income per Capita 2005 in USD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>GNI per Capita (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>1230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>1.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>1.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>3.390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>4.460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>4.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>4.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>7.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>9.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>18.580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>34.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>34.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>43.560</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chart above illustrates the gross national income per capita in USD for various countries in the year 2005, highlighting the significant economic disparities among societies.
Development differences between societies

Human Development Index 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Index 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>61.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>73.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>72.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>77.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>73.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>80.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>77.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>87.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>86.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>95.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>93.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>95.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Welfare Hypothesis

Affluence and corporate welfare states provide alternatives to functional solidarity within intergenerational relationships. Relationships “survive”, if based on emotional closeness.

Disharmonious intergenerational relationships are „opted out“ in affluent societies and in corporate welfare states, whereas ambivalent relationships increase with normative obligations.
Lineage Hypothesis

Neolocality and patrilineal descent *reduce functional solidarity* in intergenerational relationships of women.

Matrilocality and unilineal descent result in *structural solidarity* and increase ambivalent intergenerational relationships.
Design of the analysis

- based on **17 areas** (Level 3)
- based on the data from young and older mothers (**9.303 respondents**) (Level 2)
- Respondents were asked about their relationship to their mother and father (**13.166 relationships**) (Level 1)
  - **7.668** existing **relationships to mothers**
  - **5.498** existing **relationships to fathers**
Measurements of intergenerational relationships

Conflict
- respondents rated 3 items (from (1) „never" to (5) „always")

Affection
- respondents rated 3 items (from (1) „never" to (5) „always")

Items were chosen from sub-scales of the Network of Relationships Inventory (NRI), developed by Furmann & Buhrmester (1985)

Factor analysis revealed 73 % explained variance for a 2 factor solution (r = -.02)
# Latent Class Analysis

(13,166 relationships with 2 parents in 17 areas)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of classes</th>
<th>LL</th>
<th>BIC</th>
<th>AIC</th>
<th>Entropy</th>
<th>L²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 class</td>
<td>-53308.74</td>
<td>106674.40</td>
<td>106629.48</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>19176.19</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 classes</td>
<td>-48397.01</td>
<td>96917.36</td>
<td>96820.02</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>9352.72</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 classes</td>
<td>-45404.69</td>
<td>90999.13</td>
<td>90449.38</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>3368.08</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 classes</td>
<td>-43775.88</td>
<td>87807.93</td>
<td>87605.76</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>110.47</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 classes</td>
<td>-43751.55</td>
<td>87825.67</td>
<td>87571.10</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>61.80</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 classes</td>
<td>-43742.21</td>
<td>87873.41</td>
<td>87566.42</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>43.13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 7 classes    | -43728.70  | 87912.81   | 87553.41   | .66     | 16.11    | 15  | n.s.
| 8 classes    | -43724.56  | 87970.95   | 87559.13   | .65     | 7.83     | 8   | n.s. |
## Latent Class Probabilities

(13.166 relationships with 2 parents in 17 areas)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship type</th>
<th>ambivalent</th>
<th>amicable</th>
<th>disharmonious</th>
<th>detached</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>appraisal</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approval</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>admiration</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagreement</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arguing</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>being upset</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total prevalence</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Intergenerational relationships across all areas
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Intergenerational Relationships in Palestine

The graph shows the distribution of intergenerational relationships for mothers and fathers in Palestine. The relationships are categorized as ambivalent, amicable, disharmonious, and detached. The data indicates a significant proportion of ambivalent relationships, especially for fathers, with smaller percentages of amicable and disharmonious relationships, and the least proportion of detached relationships for both mothers and fathers.
Intergenerational Relationships in Indonesia

- **Mother**
  - Ambivalent: 20%
  - Amicable: 40%
  - Disharmonious: 40%
  - Detached: 10%

- **Father**
  - Ambivalent: 20%
  - Amicable: 40%
  - Disharmonious: 30%
  - Detached: 10%
Intergenerational Relationships in China
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Intergenerational Relationships in Jamaica

![Chart showing intergenerational relationships in Jamaica for both mothers and fathers. The chart uses colors to represent different types of relationships: ambivalent, amicable, disharmonious, and detached. The proportions are distributed across the chart for each gender.]
Intergenerational Relationships in Russia
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Ambivalent</th>
<th>Amicable</th>
<th>Disharmonious</th>
<th>Detached</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Intergenerational Relationships in Turkey
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Intergenerational Relationships in Poland

![Bar chart showing the distribution of relationship types among mothers and fathers in Poland. The chart indicates the percentage of each relationship type for both genders.]

Key:  
- Red: Ambivalent  
- Yellow: Amicable  
- Green: Disharmonious  
- Blue: Detached

The chart shows the distribution of relationship types among mothers and fathers in Poland.
Intergenerational Relationships in Estonia
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Intergenerational Relationships in Israel
Intergenerational Relationships in France

![Bar chart showing types of relationships between generations in France.](chart-image)

- **Mother**
  - Ambivalent: 30%
  - Amicable: 10%
  - Disharmonious: 50%
  - Detached: 20%

- **Father**
  - Ambivalent: 20%
  - Amicable: 20%
  - Disharmonious: 30%
  - Detached: 30%
Intergenerational Relationships in Germany

The chart displays the distribution of intergenerational relationship types for mothers and fathers. The types are categorized as:
- Ambivalent
- Amicable
- Disharmonious
- Detached

For mothers, the distribution is: 50% Ambivalent, 30% Amicable, 20% Disharmonious, and 0% Detached.

For fathers, the distribution is: 40% Ambivalent, 30% Amicable, 25% Disharmonious, and 5% Detached.
Relationship with Fathers across Areas
## Design of the 3-Level-Analysis

### Level 1: interaction level of intergenerational relationships
- Parent’s age
- Sex of parent (reference: father)
- Proximity of parent
- Contact to parent
- Functional exchange

### Level 2: individual characteristics
- Rural background
- Educational level
- Female workforce inclusion
- Household welfare level
- Number of children
- Age of respondent
- Perception of an instrumental value of children
- Perception of a stimulation & affect value of children
- Perception of normative family obligations

### Level 3: societal level
- Human Development Index
- Matrifocal kinship system
Proximity with Fathers and Mothers

The diagram illustrates the proximity of fathers and mothers in various countries. The countries are listed on the x-axis, and the y-axis likely represents the proximity score. Each country has two bars: blue for fathers and red for mothers, indicating the relative proximity of each parent in that country.

Countries mentioned include Ghana, India North, India South, Palestine, Indonesia, China, Jamaica, Russia, Turkey, South Africa, Poland, Estonia, Israel, France, Germany, and USA. The proximity scores are visually compared across these countries to identify patterns or trends in paternal and maternal proximity.
Relationship characteristics predicting class membership
Multinomial regression (reference: detached) controlled for level 2 variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ambivalent</th>
<th>amicable</th>
<th>disharmonious</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent’s age</td>
<td>.99*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.99**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>2.28***</td>
<td>1.69***</td>
<td>1.57***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity</td>
<td>.93*</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>1.11***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>1.26***</td>
<td>1.30***</td>
<td>1.10***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual help</td>
<td>1.13***</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>1.08***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Individual characteristics predicting class membership

Multinomial regression (reference: detached) controlled for level 3 variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ambivalent</th>
<th>amicable</th>
<th>disharmonious</th>
<th>ambivalent</th>
<th>amicable</th>
<th>disharmonious</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural background</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.05*</td>
<td>.89***</td>
<td>.93**</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1.07*</td>
<td>1.19***</td>
<td>1.21***</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.18***</td>
<td>1.11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce inclus.</td>
<td>1.03*</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.05***</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family welfare</td>
<td>1.13***</td>
<td>1.09***</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.10***</td>
<td>1.08***</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended househ.</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.99***</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.02***</td>
<td>.99*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of children</td>
<td>1.05*</td>
<td>1.12***</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.91***</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort VOC</td>
<td>1.18***</td>
<td>1.23***</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.11**</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulation VOC</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.15**</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.14**</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative oblig.</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>2.27***</td>
<td>.73***</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.79***</td>
<td>.72***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matrifokal kinship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Areas predicting class membership
Multinominal regression (reference: detached; USA) controlled for level 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Ambivalent</th>
<th>Amicable</th>
<th>Disharmonious</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>.10***</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.03***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>5.20***</td>
<td>6.13***</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>15.48***</td>
<td>9.53***</td>
<td>1.92***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>2.21***</td>
<td>4.14***</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>2.86***</td>
<td>.35***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>2.35***</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>.50***</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>3.46***</td>
<td>.46***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>2.39***</td>
<td>8.46***</td>
<td>.63*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>1.72***</td>
<td>2.20***</td>
<td>1.71**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>2.58***</td>
<td>3.82***</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.55**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research questions revisited

- Is the intergenerational solidarity and ambivalence paradigm valid under economically, culturally and institutionally diverse conditions?

**YES, definitively!**

the measurement model holds

- Are affection and conflict in intergenerational relationships structured by institutional settings (or just a matter of opportunities, individual choices and internalized norms)?

**Yes, very much so!**

area effects remain strong, when individual characteristics are controlled for
Research questions revisited

- Are similar patterns of amicable, ambivalend, disharmonious and detached relationships valid for matrilineal, patrilineal and bilineal kinship systems?

Yes, they vary in a systematic way, as they structure „exit“ (detachment) and „voice“ (ambivalence) in intergenerational relationships!

- Is intergenerational ambivalence related to the (lack of) welfare state provisions and to a culture of individualism?

No, not so much!
Intergenerational ambivalence is not bound to “Western“ individualism, but depends on how „exit“ and „voice“ are institutionally structured in relation to emotional and functional interdependence.
Thank you for your patience!

Criticism and suggestions are welcome to

bernhard.nauck@soziologie.tu-chemnitz.de