



German Council for Social
and Economic Data (RatSWD)

www.ratswd.de

RatSWD

Working Paper Series

Working Paper

No. 116

Intergenerational Relationships

Bernhard Nauck and Anja Steinbach

July 2009

Working Paper Series of the Council for Social and Economic Data (RatSWD)

The *RatSWD Working Papers* series was launched at the end of 2007. Since 2009, the series has been publishing exclusively conceptual and historical works dealing with the organization of the German statistical infrastructure and research infrastructure in the social, behavioral, and economic sciences. Papers that have appeared in the series deal primarily with the organization of Germany's official statistical system, government agency research, and academic research infrastructure, as well as directly with the work of the RatSWD. Papers addressing the aforementioned topics in other countries as well as supranational aspects are particularly welcome.

RatSWD Working Papers are non-exclusive, which means that there is nothing to prevent you from publishing your work in another venue as well: all papers can and should also appear in professionally, institutionally, and locally specialized journals. The *RatSWD Working Papers* are not available in bookstores but can be ordered online through the RatSWD.

In order to make the series more accessible to readers not fluent in German, the English section of the *RatSWD Working Papers* website presents only those papers published in English, while the German section lists the complete contents of all issues in the series in chronological order.

Starting in 2009, some of the empirical research papers that originally appeared in the *RatSWD Working Papers* series will be published in the series *RatSWD Research Notes*.

The views expressed in the *RatSWD Working Papers* are exclusively the opinions of their authors and not those of the RatSWD.

The RatSWD Working Paper Series is edited by:

Chair of the RatSWD (2007/ 2008 Heike Solga; 2009 Gert G. Wagner)

Managing Director of the RatSWD (Denis Huschka)

Intergenerational Relationships

Bernhard Nauck and Anja Steinbach

Chemnitz University of Technology

(bernhard.nauck[at]phil.tu-chemnitz.de; anja.steinbach[at]phil.tu-chemnitz.de)

Abstract

Intergenerational relationships within family and kinship have become a salient issue in scientific research. Major reasons were intense demographic changes in the 20th century, such as the increased life expectancy in combination with decreased fertility, and its implications for major institutions of the social welfare state. This has resulted in the realization of several larger studies, which may serve for the analysis of the situation of old aged people, such as the German Socio-economic Panel, the Generations and Gender Survey, the Family Survey, the German Aging Survey, the Survey on Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe, and the Panel Analysis of Intimate Relationships and Family Dynamics. However, an overarching theoretical and research perspective on intergenerational relationships from their creation (fertility) over parenting to the most long-lasting relationship between adults of different generations is still missing. In order to overcome this deficiency, the paper recommends for future data structures to obtain information on intergenerational relationships (1) simultaneously and complete, (2) in a life-span perspective, (3) from a panel design, and (4) a multi-actor design. Studies should (5) account for cultural variability of intergenerational relationships and (6) for institutional settings in cross-national comparisons.

Keywords: Intergenerational Relationships, Intergenerational Solidarity, Life Course, Demographic Change, Ageing, Panel Studies

1. Introduction

Intergenerational relationships within family and kinship have become a salient issue in the public discourse as well as in scientific research. Major reasons were intense demographic changes in the 20th century, such as the increased life expectancy in combination with decreased fertility, and its implications for major institutions of the social welfare state. In the social sciences, this has resulted – since the end of the 1990s – in the planning and realization of several larger studies of the situation of old aged people in Germany and Europe, including the relationships to family members. It has also resulted in the implementation of instruments regarding parent-child-relationships in already existing or newly initiated longitudinal surveys. Due to the urgent political issues, the initial research on intergenerational relationships in families in the context of demographic changes has focused on the relationships between *aged* parents and their *adult* children, generally around the question of family based caring potentials and intergenerational solidarity in later life stages. Accordingly, data collection was concentrated on the relationships between children and their (very) old parents. This research domain was thus located at the interface between family research and aging research. Being labeled as *research on intergenerational relationships*, it is at present well distinguished from *research on parent-child-relationships* as a classical research domain of parenting within developmental psychology and socialization research. *An overarching theoretical and research perspective on intergenerational relationships from their creation (fertility) over parenting to the most long-lasting relationship between adults of different generations is still missing.*

2. Theoretical Developments and Research Questions

2.1 Theoretical Developments

Most of the literature regarding intergenerational relationships starts with a reflection on the family-in-crisis-hypothesis. To test this hypothesis, but also to give a descriptive picture, various aspects concerning these relations are considered. The most important contributions

are the theory of intergenerational solidarity (Bengtson and Roberts 1991; Bengtson 2001) and the work on ambivalence (Lüscher and Pillemer 1998; Pillemer and Lüscher 2004). In these contributions many different aspects of contact and supportive behavior within the family and between generations are discussed. Heavily based on social exchange theory, intergenerational relationships are understood as any form of exchange between generations. Six exchange dimensions are distinguished, namely structural, associative, affective, consensual, normative and functional solidarity.

The *structural dimension* refers to the opportunity structure which determines the specific realization of family interactions. Typical measurements are geographical distance and residential proximity; but availability of kin, parents, children and siblings, as well as their age, sex, marital status, health status and working arrangements are also seen as important factors of structural solidarity. The *associative dimension* refers to the amount and kind of intergenerational contact, either face-to-face or by phone, e-mail or any other means. Therefore, frequency and intensity of contact can be distinguished. The *affective dimension* comprises emotional closeness as well as conflict as measures of the quality of the relationship between children and their parents. The *consensual dimension* measures the amount of agreement in values and beliefs – whatever the specific content of these convictions may be. The *normative dimension* refers to the extent of commitment to filial and parental obligations by the respective members of intergenerational relationships. The *functional dimension* measures all kinds of financial, instrumental and emotional support, exchanged between parents and children.

However, the various types of interaction between generations are not always positive. Intergenerational relations can – and typically do – comprise both positive and negative components, and thus are to some extent *ambivalent*. This is due to the social character of intergenerational relationships, being in most cases unavoidable and unescapable, rather “diffuse” in their exchange and thus “packaged”. It is an open debate whether ambivalence should be measured directly, for example by asking about the amount of simultaneously positive and negative, and thus ambivalent, emotions or whether ambivalence should be

concluded indirectly from the extent of simultaneous emotional closeness and conflict between generations.

Theoretical discussions around intergenerational relationships were long time (and to some extent still are) limited to the question, whether these dimensions are adequate (Szydlik 2000) or complete (Bengtson et al. 2002; Lüscher and Pillemer 1998). More recent discussions have become increasingly critical and point to the theoretical deficits of the well established paradigms (Dallinger 2002; Hammarström 2005; Katz et al. 2005; Grünendahl and Martin 2005), but serious attempts of theoretical explanations of the emergence of and the change within and between the respective dimensions of intergenerational relationships are still very seldom (Merz et al. 2007; Steinbach and Kopp 2008a). In conclusion one may state that apart from the heuristic model of Szydlik (2000), which includes the associative, affective, and functional dimensions and relates them to opportunity, need, family and cultural-contextual structures, no elaborated theory of intergenerational relationships exists.

2.2 *Research Questions*

Empirically, several different analyzing strategies can be distinguished with regard to the respective aspects of intergenerational relationships (Steinbach and Kopp 2008a).

2.2.1 Intergenerational Solidarity

Within this research domain, a first group of studies focuses on the internal structure of the dimensions of intergenerational solidarity (Atkinson et al. 1986; Roberts and Bengtson 1990; Rossi and Rossi 1990). A second group of studies tries to combine these different dimensions of intergenerational relations, aiming at the construction of family typologies (Bengtson 2001; Giarrusso et al. 2004; 2005; Katz et al. 2005; Van Gaalen and Dykstra 2006; Silverstein et al. 1994; Steinbach 2008). A third group of studies deals with the different perspectives, which parents and children have on their relationship. This research has resulted in the so called ‘intergenerational stake hypotheses’ (Bengtson and Kuypers 1971) and has initiated several subsequent replications until recently (Aquilino 1999; Giarrusso et al. 1995; Trommsdorff and

Schwarz 2007). A fourth and largest group of studies can be characterized by their varied attempts at identifying independent sociostructural, intrafamilial or intergenerational factors that determine intergenerational relationships. Determinants of the degree of emotional closeness, the frequency of contact and the level of exchange are of particular interest (Attias-Donfut 2000; Hank 2007; Kaufman and Uhlenberg 1998; Klaus 2009; Kohli et al. 2005; Lawton et al. 1994; Parrott and Bengtson 1999; Roberts and Bengtson 1990; Rossi and Rossi 1990; Spitze and Logan 1991; Steinbach and Kopp 2008b; Szydlik 1995; 2000). But also, for example, conflict (Szydlik 2008), ambivalence (Pillemer and Suito 2002), and inheritance (Kohli 2004; Lauterbach and Lüscher 1996; Nauck 2009b; Szydlik 1999; 2004; Szydlik and Schupp 2004) are important empirical research subjects. The results of all these studies are in sharp contrast to the popular perception of weakening ties between generations in “postmodern” families. Instead, intergenerational relationships become – despite the changing demographic structure – increasingly important for family members and are obviously one of the major mechanisms of social integration in functionally differentiated societies.

2.2.2 Gender

One structural variable has played an important role over the years and thus will be paid attention at this point, namely gender. Empirical results show consistently that the respective combination of gender across generations structures the relationship considerably, i.e. there is a rank order in the closeness of the relationship from mother-daughter- to mother-son, father-daughter- and father-son-relationship (Kaufman and Uhlenberg 1998; Nauck 2009a; Rossi 1993; Szydlik 1995). Women – especially from the older generation – function as ‘kinkeeper’ (Atkinson et al. 1986; Rossi and Rossi 1990), maintaining the relationships and providing support. Moreover, women are prone to find themselves in a “sandwich”-situation with simultaneous care activities for both the older and the younger generation within the family. However, this phenomenon becomes seldom because of increased healthy aging and extended age differences between generations (Kohli and Künemund 2005a; Künemund 2006).

2.2.3 Life Course

In recent years, research on intergenerational relationships has also adopted a life course perspective. Although cross-sectional data are predominantly used, the interesting research question has been, whether early life stages have an important impact on the intergenerational relationships in later life. It was investigated in this perspective, how parents' early transfers to their young adult children affect the children's propensity in middle age to provide social support to their aging parents (Silverstein et al. 2002) and how life course transitions experienced by each generation affect the quality of relationship between adult children and their parents (Kaufman and Uhlenberg 1998). Especially separation and divorce of parents as an obstacle of later life intergenerational relationships has become an important research issue (Aquilino 2005; Kalmijn 2008; Lin 2008); moreover, the relationship between attachment patterns in early childhood and the exchange of support in later life stages has been risen as an important research issue (Cicirelli 1993; Merz et al. 2008; Schwarz and Trommsdorff 2005).

2.2.4 Cross-national Comparisons

The establishment of cross-nationally and cross-culturally comparative data sets has made it possible to investigate intergenerational relationships in a comparative perspective. Such research programs, predominantly based on cross-sectional data, exist especially for East Asian societies (Hermalin 2002), for Europe (Albertini et al. 2007; Brandt and Szydlik 2008; Haberkern and Szydlik 2008; Hank 2007; Katz et al. 2005), and to some extent for comparisons across continents (Nauck 2009a; 2009b; Nauck and Suckow 2006; Nauck and Yi 2007; Trommsdorff and Nauck 2005). The predominant perspective in cross-national research is the interrelationship between the social-political regime on the one hand and the structure of intergenerational exchange relationships on the other, i.e. the question, whether social-political measures and incentives may deteriorate intergenerational support and solidarity (crowding out) or whether they enable and enhance them (crowding in) (Künemund 2008). Empirical research provides some evidence that economic transfer and care provisions by the welfare state do not edge out intergenerational support – both seem to complement each other

(Armi et al. 2008; Attias-Donfut 2000; Brandt and Szydlik 2008; Künemund and Vogel 2006). Moreover, empirical evidence is provided that social-political regimes and individual involvement in intergenerational support interact strongly (Haber Kern and Szydlik 2008).

2.2.5 Social and Demographic Change

Major demographic trends in the 20th century had a strong impact on the analysis of intergenerational relationships. One emerging research domain is the analysis of intergenerational relationships beyond the parent-child-dyad, namely grandparent-grandchildren-relationships (Hank and Buber 2009; Harper 2005; Hoff 2007; King and Elder 1995; 1997; Mueller and Elder 2003). Increased life-expectancy in welfare societies has not only resulted in increased common life time of parents and children, but also in the increased existence of families with three and even four generations (Hoff 2006; Lauterbach 1995; Lauterbach and Klein 2004). This phenomenon altogether with the decline of horizontal kinship relationships because of reduced fertility was coined as the ‚beanpole-family‘ (Bengtson et al. 1990) and described as the multi-local extended family structure (Bertram 2003; Lauterbach 2004). This development has stimulated the questions, to what extent relationships between generations are interwoven (Friedman et al. 2008) and to what extent grandparent-grandchildren-relationships are comparable to parent-child-relationships (Hoff 2007).

Another major demographic trend is the increased number of immigrants and their aging (Dietzel-Papakyriakou 1993; Nauck 2007). Empirical research has been dedicated to the question, whether intergenerational relationships differ between migrant and native families, between immigrant families of different origin and within different receiving contexts and how these relationships are maintained across national borders (Attias-Donfut and Wolff 2008; Baykara-Krumme 2008a; 2008b; Komter and Schans 2008; Nauck 2001; Nauck and Kohlmann 1998).

3. Status Quo: Data Bases and Access

Meanwhile, several data sets exist which can be used for the analysis of intergenerational relationships. For Germany, these are on the one hand the large-scale data sets like the *German Socio-Economic Panel Study* (GSOEP), the *Generations and Gender Survey* (GGS) and the *Family Survey*, which encompass large age brackets. On the other hand, data-sets from aging research are available, such as the study *Old Age and Autonomy: The Role of Service Systems and Intergenerational Solidarity* (OASIS), the *German Ageing Survey* (DEAS) or the *Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe* (SHARE), which mostly concentrate on the population from the 40th year onwards. Additionally, the data-set of the *Panel Analysis of Intimate Relationships and Family Dynamics* (PAIRFAM) will be available soon, which will provide data on the intergenerational relationships of younger respondents (between 15 and 50) with their respective parents. GGS, OASIS and SHARE are cross-national comparative research programs and allow for analyzing the German situation in an international perspective. Other important international studies of intergenerational relations, but without a German sample, are the *Netherlands Kinship Panel Study* (NKPS) (Dykstra 1999; Dykstra et al. 2006) and two studies from the United States: the *Longitudinal Study of Generations* (LSOG) (Mangen et al. 1988; Giarrusso and Zucker 2004) and the *American National Survey of Families and Households* (NSFH) (Sweet and Bumpass 2002). A systematic comparison of the existing data sets on an international level is provided in the appendix; the following brief description concentrates on German data sets and those with German participation.

German Socio-Economic Panel Study (GSOEP). The GSOEP of the German Institute for Economic Research (DIW), which since 1984 collects detailed annual data to measure the stability and change of living conditions in Germany (Frick 2007), has extended its scope since the early 1990ies to some instruments on intergenerational relationships, such as residential distance and emotional closeness to biological parents and to the closest living son or daughter (if the respondent has more than one) (1991, 1996, 2001, 2006). Since 1984, the

amount of financial transfers between generations is captured (exception: 1992 and 1994), including intergenerational donations, inheritance and bequest.

Generations and Gender Survey (GGS). The GGS is the German version of an international research program in 16 countries. It is merged into the 'Generations and Gender Program' (GGP) of the 'United Nations Economic Commission of Europe' (UNECE) (Ruckdeschel et al., 2006). The first two waves were completed in 2005 and 2008. The GGS contains questions regarding residential distance, frequency of contact and emotional closeness to parents and children, filial obligations, and day care of grandchildren. Financial, instrumental and emotional support is captured with a network generator, within which family members can be named.

Family Survey. The Family Survey of the German Youth Institute (Bien and Marbach 2008) includes a three-wave-panel as a subsample but with a lag of six years between the waves (1988, 1994, 2000). Emotional closeness and exchange of financial support is captured with a network generator, within which family and kinship members can be named. For all named individuals, information on relationship quality, residential distance and frequency of contact are available.

Old Age and Autonomy: The Role of Service Systems and Intergenerational Solidarity (OASIS). OASIS is conducted in five countries, including Germany (Tesch-Römer et al. 2000; Lowenstein and Ogg 2003). Data collection took place in 2000 in urban regions only. The disproportional stratified sample starts at the 25 years old and overrepresents individuals of 75+. Intergenerational relationships are measured on the dimensions residential distance, frequency of contact (to parents and all children), emotional closeness, conflict and ambivalence, consensus (degree of similarity on opinions and values) (parents and focus child) and the agreement to filial obligations. Mutual support is captured with financial, emotional, and instrumental help within the last 12 months. Moreover, grandparent-grandchildren-relationships are covered with regard to residential distance, frequency of contact, and support.

German Ageing Survey (DEAS). The German Ageing Survey of the German Centre of Gerontology is a study of the living situation of people 40 and above in Germany. Three waves were completed in 1996, 2002 and 2008 (Kohli and Künemund 2005b; Tesch-Römer et al. 2002; 2006). For all children and for all individuals, with whom the respondent predominantly grew up, and for up to 8 additional network members, the following dimensions of intergenerational relations are captured: residential distance, frequency of contact and emotional closeness. Exchange of support is part of a network generator, within which up to 5 persons may be named, with whom the respondent exchanges financial, instrumental and emotional support. Day care of grandchildren is also captured, as well as inheritance and bequest.

Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe (SHARE). SHARE is an international longitudinal research program and comprises 15 countries in Europe (Bösch-Supan and Jürges 2005; Bösch-Supan et al. 2005), with three panel waves in 2004/5, 2006/7, and 2008/9. The first wave captured target persons of 50 years and older, and their household partners. Intergenerational relationships are covered by the dimensions residential distance, frequency of contact and emotional closeness to parents and all children, living outside the respondents household. Received help was captured by questions, from whom material and financial transfers within the last 12 months, and caring, if necessary, was received. Up to three individuals can be named. Day care of grandchildren is also captured.

Panel Analysis of Intimate Relationships and Family Dynamics (PAIRFAM). PAIRFAM is a comprehensive research program about partnership and family development in Germany (Huinink and Feldhaus 2008). It is based on a cohort design, comprising three cohorts of 15-17 , 25-27, and 35-37 years old target persons, in combination with a multi-actor design, including the respective partner, both parents, and children of 8 years and older. Data collection of the first wave takes place in 2008/9, 13 further waves are planned. In the first wave, short versions of instruments on intergenerational relationships are applied (residential distance, frequency of contact and emotional closeness). From the second wave onwards, comprehensive instruments on residential distance, frequency of contact, emotional

closeness, conflict, ambivalence, agreement to filial obligations and material/financial, instrumental and emotional transfers will be used, targeting the relationship to both biological parents and, in case, to step parents. The multi-actor design implies that from the second wave onwards, (step-)parents will provide information on their perspective on the intergenerational relationship towards the target person and its respective partner, and that the partner will provide information on his/her relationship to his/her parents-in-law.

Although surveys including topics of intergenerational relationships have grown considerably during the last decade, there are still obvious data deficits – especially for Germany:

- As the data on intergenerational relationships are in most cases limited to the measurement of selective dimensions of intergenerational solidarity, their internal structure and mutual influences can not be tested.
- Most studies originate in the field of social gerontology with a focus on the elderly, their family support and its relation to institutional caretaking.
- Most studies are highly selective in the choice of the studied intergenerational relationships, i.e. only the relationship to the emotionally and spatially closest child or parent is surveyed, resulting in a positive bias in the scientific description of intergenerational relationships.

For a better understanding of intergenerational relationships in present time society, a life course perspective, covering the development of intergenerational relationships across the entire life span and under varying family settings, including non-biological forms of parent-child-relations, is needed. Only then, valid measurements of intergenerational solidarity, conflict and separation in its various dimensions is obtained and allows then also to infer informed estimates about future developments of intergenerational solidarity potentials and social integration.

4. Future Developments and Recommendations

The diagnosis of these deficits allow for some recommendations for necessary data structures in future research.

- Data on intergenerational relationships should be *obtained simultaneously and complete*, i.e. all dimensions of the well-established model of intergenerational solidarity and its extensions into conflict have to be measured. Only this allows for the investigation of the scientifically and practically important interrelationship between the various dimensions of intergenerational relations.
- Data on intergenerational relationships should be targeted to a *life span perspective*. Intergenerational solidarity in later life stages depends on intergenerational experiences in sensitive life stages, trajectories and alternate options and obligations during the previous life course, and is thus path dependent. The interdependence of generations during the entire life span is one of the most important desiderata in this research domain.
- The study of intergenerational relationships needs *panel designs*. Only panel designs allow for the analysis of the creation and the development of intergenerational relationships in specific stages of the life course. They should be complemented by retrospective information on critical life events, related to intergenerational relationships, in the past biography of the respondents and his/her family members.
- Methodological research is urgently needed with regard to the *measurement intervals* for intergenerational relationships. Since previous research has concentrated on the most stable and most harmonious relationships in later life, this research provides no knowledge for adequate measurement in the case of instable, disruptive or conflictous parent-child-relationships.
- The study of intergenerational relationships should include a *multi-actor-design*, to include the perceptions, evaluations, needs, resources of both sides in an intergenerational relationship, which is, by nature, asymmetric and thus prone to differences between members. Moreover, each individual is (and can statistically be modeled) as an action

context of the other. Comprehensive analyses of multi-level panel data on intergenerational relationships will be a major research agenda in this realm.

- The study of intergenerational relationships should account for *cultural variability and diversification*. Increasing numbers of individuals with a migration background result in an increased variability of values related to filial and parental obligations, of arrangements in intergenerational support and of wealth flows between generations. This requests not only to include specific measurements for migrant- and minority-situations, but also cross-culturally informed adaptations, which still have to be developed and tested.
- The emergence of multi-local, multi-generational family structures asks for special provisions in the data collection, and in most cases for a *multi-method-design*. As the study of intergenerational relationships can not be based on a standard representative survey design, where all respondents are accessed with the same data collection method, it will necessarily use a combination of the various obtainable methods, such as mail survey, CATI, CAPI, CASI, PAPI or CAWI. However, no systematic results are available yet, which allow for the estimation of the respective advantages and disadvantages in this specific research field.
- For the full understanding of the interplay between institutional settings in the respective social context and the specific structure of intergenerational relationships, *cross-national and cross-cultural comparisons* are needed. To achieve this goal, concepts and measurements have to be standardized and tested for linguistic and functional equivalence. These efforts require a specific infrastructure and extended time for development, both of which are typically disregarded in the funding of comparative research programs. Effective international collaboration needs an additional infrastructure, from which standardization and equivalence testing is coordinated.

The study of intergenerational relationships is an emerging and expanding research domain in the social sciences. It is placed at an interface between the micro-social level of interactionist family sociology, the meso-level of network analysis and human ecology, and the macro-level of societal integration and social inequality. Its developmental feature implies a life span

perspective, which asks for and allows for interdisciplinary cooperation, including a large array of disciplines, including developmental psychology, social gerontology, demography, economy, and sociology.

References:

- Albertini, M./Kohli, M. and Vogel, C. (2007): Intergenerational transfers of time and money in European families: common patterns – different regimes? In: *Journal of European Social Policy* 17, 319 – 334.
- Aquilino, W.S. (1999): Two Views on One Relationship: Comparing Parents' and Young Adults Children's Reports of the Quality of Intergenerational Relations. In: *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 61, 858-870.
- Aquilino, W.S. (2005): Impact of Family Structure on Parental Attitudes toward the Economic Support of Adult Children Over the Transition to Adulthood. In: *Journal of Family Issues* 26, 143-167.
- Armi, F./Guilley, E. and Lalive D'Epinay, Ch.J. (2008): The Interface between Formal and Informal Support in Advanced Old Age: A Ten-Year Study. In: *International Journal of Ageing and Later Life* 3, 5-19.
- Atkinson, M.P./Kivett, V.R. and Campbell, R.T. (1986): Intergenerational Solidarity: An Examination of a Theoretical Model. In: *Journal of Gerontology* 41, 408-416.
- Attias-Donfut, C. (2000): Familialer Austausch und soziale Sicherung. In: Kohli, M. and Szydlik, M. (Eds.): *Generationen in Familie und Gesellschaft*. Opladen, 222-237.
- Attias-Donfut, C. and Wolff, F.-Ch. (2008): Patterns of Intergenerational Transfers Among Immigrants in France: Comparative Perspective. In: Saraceno, Ch. (Ed.): *Families, Ageing and Social Policy. Intergenerational Solidarity in European Welfare States*. Cheltenham/Northampton, MA, 259-284.
- Baykara-Krumme, H. (2008a): *Migrant Families in Germany: Intergenerational Solidarity in Later Life*. Berlin.
- Baykara-Krumme, H. (2008b): *Reliable Bonds? A Comparative Perspective of Intergenerational Support Patterns Among Migrant Families in Germany*. In: Saraceno, Ch. (Ed.): *Families, Ageing and Social Policy. Intergenerational Solidarity in European Welfare States*. Cheltenham/Northampton, MA, 285-311.
- Bengtson, V.L. (2001): Beyond the Nuclear Family: The Increasing Importance of Multigenerational Bonds. In: *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 63, 1-16.
- Bengtson, V.L. and Kuypers, J.A. (1971): Generational Difference and Developmental Stake. In: *Aging and Human Development* 2, 249 – 260.
- Bengtson, V.L. and Roberts, R.E.L. (1991): Intergenerational Solidarity in Aging Families: An Example of Formal Theory Construction. In: *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 53, 856-870.
- Bengtson, V.L./Rosenthal, C. and Burton, L. (1990): Families and Aging: Diversity and Heterogeneity. In: Binstock, R.H. and George, L.K. (Eds.): *Handbook of Aging and the Social Sciences*. 3rd ed. San Diego, Ca, 263-287.
- Bengtson, V.L./Giarrusso, R./Mabry, J.B. and Silverstein, M. (2002): Solidarity, Conflict, and Ambivalence: Complementary or Competing Perspectives on Intergenerational Relationships? In: *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 64, 568-576.
- Bertram, H. (2003): Die multilokale Mehrgenerationenfamilie. Von der neolokalen Gattenfamilie zur multilokalen Mehrgenerationenfamilie. In: Feldhaus, M./Logemann, N. and Schlegel, M. (Eds.): *Blickrichtung Familie - Vielfalt eines Forschungsgegenstandes*. Würzburg, 15 – 32.
- Bien, W. and Marbach, J.H. (Eds.) (2008): *Familiale Beziehungen, Familienalltag und soziale Netzwerke. Ergebnisse der drei Wellen des Familiensurvey*. Wiesbaden.
- Bösch-Supan, A. and Jürges, H. (Eds.) (2005): *The Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe (SHARE). Methodology*. Mannheim: Mannheim Research Institute for the Economics of Ageing (MEA).
- Bösch-Supan, A./Brugiavini, A./Jürges, H./Mackenbach, J./Siegrist, J. and Weber, G. (Eds.) (2005): *Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe. First Results from the Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe (SHARE)*. Mannheim: Mannheim Research Institute for the Economics of Ageing (MEA).
- Brandt, M. and Szydlik, M. (2008): Soziale Dienste und Hilfe zwischen Generationen in Europa. In: *Zeitschrift für Soziologie* 37, 301-320.
- Cicirelli, V.G. (1993): Attachment and Obligation as Daughters' Motives for Caregiving Behavior and Subsequent Effect on Subjective Burden. In: *Psychology and Aging* 8, 144-155.
- Dallinger, U. (2002): Das 'Problem der Generationen': Theorieentwicklung zu intergenerationellen Beziehungen. In: Dallinger, U. and Schroeter, K.R. (Eds.): *Theoretische Beiträge zur Alterssoziologie*. Opladen, 203-234.
- Dietzel-Papakyriakou, M. (1993): Altern in der Migration. Die Arbeitsmigranten vor dem Dilemma: zurückkehren oder bleiben? Stuttgart.
- Dykstra, P.A. (1999): *Netherlands Kinship Panel Study. A Multi-Actor, Multi-Method Panel Survey on Solidarity in Family Relationships*. The Hague.
- Dykstra, P.A./Kalmijn, M./Knijn, T.C.M./Komter, A.E./Liefbroer, A.C. and Mulder, C.H. (Eds.) (2006): *Family Solidarity in the Netherlands*. Amsterdam.
- Ette, A./Hullen G./Leven, I. and Ruckdeschel, K. (2007): *Generations and Gender Survey. Dokumentation der Befragung von türkischen Migranten in Deutschland. Materialien zur Bevölkerungswissenschaft, Heft 121b*.

- Frick, J.R. (2006): A General Introduction to the German Socio-Economic Panel Study (SOEP). http://www.diw.de/documents/dokumentenarchiv/17/43529/soep_overview.pdf.
- Friedman, D./Hechter, M. and Kreager, D. (2008): A Theory of the Value of Grandchildren. In: *Rationality and Society* 20 (1), 31-63.
- Giarrusso, R. and Zucker, D. (2004): The USC Longitudinal Study of Generations. Time-1 Thru Time-7 Codebook. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research.
- Giarrusso, R./Stallings, M. and Bengtson, V.L. (1995): The "Intergenerational Stake" Hypothesis Revisited: Parent-Child Differences in Perception of Relationships 20 Years Later. In: Bengtson, V.L./Schaie, K.W. and Burton, L.M. (Eds.): *Adult Intergenerational Relations. Effects of Societal Change*. New York, NY, 227-263.
- Giarrusso, R./Feng, D. and Bengtson, V.L. (2004): The Intergenerational-Stake Phenomenon Over 20 Years. In: *Annual Review of Gerontology and Geriatrics* 24, 55-76.
- Giarrusso, R./Silverstein, M./Gans, D. and Bengtson, V.L. (2005): Ageing Parents and Adult Children: New Perspectives on Intergenerational Relationships. In: Johnson, M.L./Bengtson, V.L./Coleman, P.G./Kirkwood, Th.B.L. (Eds.): *Cambridge Handbook of Age and Ageing*. London, 413-421.
- Grünendahl, M. and Martin, M. (2005): Intergenerative Solidarität und praktische Implikationen. In: Otto, U. and Bauer, P. (Eds.): *Mit Netzwerken professionell zusammenarbeiten. Band 1: Soziale Netzwerke in Lebenslauf- und Lebenslagenperspektiven*. Tübingen, 239-265.
- Haberkern, K. and Szydlik, M. (2008): Pflege der Eltern - Ein europäischer Vergleich. In: *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 60, 78-101.
- Hank, K. (2007): Proximity and Contacts Between Older Parents and Their Children: A European Comparison. In: *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 69, 157-173.
- Hank, K. and Buber, I. (2009): Grandparents Caring for Their Grandchildren. Findings From the 2004 Survey of Health, Ageing, and Retirement in Europe. In: *Journal of Family Issues* (Forthcoming).
- Hammarström, G. (2005): The Construct of Intergenerational Solidarity in a Lineage Perspective: A Discussion on Underlying Theoretical Assumptions. In: *Journal of Aging Studies* 19, 33-51.
- Harper, S. (2005): Grandparenthood. In: Johnson, M.L. (Ed.): *The Cambridge Handbook of Age and Ageing*. London, 422-428.
- Hermalin, A. (2002): The Well-Being of the Elderly in Asia. A Four-Country Comparative Study. Ann Arbor.
- Hoff, A. (2006): Intergenerationale Familienbeziehungen im Wandel. In: Tesch-Römer, C./Engstler, H. and Wurm, S. (Eds.): *Altwerden in Deutschland. Sozialer Wandel und individuelle Entwicklung in der zweiten Lebenshälfte*. Wiesbaden, 231-287.
- Hoff, A. (2007): Patterns of Intergenerational Support in Grandparent-Grandchild and Parent-Child Relationships in Germany. In: *Ageing and Society* 27, 643-665.
- Huinink, J. and Feldhaus, M. (2008): Beziehungs- und Familienentwicklung – eine konzeptionelle Einführung in ein Forschungsprogramm. In: Feldhaus, M. and Huinink, J. (Eds.): *Neuere Entwicklungen in der Beziehungs- und Familienforschung. Vorstudien zum Beziehungs- und Familienentwicklungspanel (PAIRFAM)*. Würzburg, 13-44.
- Kalmijn, M. (2008): The Effects of Separation and Divorce on Parent-Child Relationships in Ten European Countries. In: Saraceno, Ch. (Ed.): *Families, Ageing and Social Policy. Intergenerational Solidarity in European Welfare States*. Cheltenham/Northampton, MA, 170-193.
- Katz, R./Lowenstein, A./Phillips, J. and Daatland, S.O. (2005): Theorizing Intergenerational Family Relations. Solidarity, Conflict, and Ambivalence in Cross-National Contexts. In: Bengtson, V.L./Acocock, A.C./Allen, K.R./Dilworth-Anderson, P. and Klein, D.M. (Eds.): *Sourcebook of Family Theory and Research*. Thousand Oaks, 393-407.
- Kaufman, G. and Uhlenberg, P. (1998): Effects of Life Course Transitions on the Quality of Relationships Between Adult Children and Their Parents. In: *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 60, 924-938.
- King, V. and Elder, G.H. (1995): American Children View Their Grandparents: Linked Lives Across Three Rural Generations. In: *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 57, 165 – 178.
- King, V. and Elder, G.H. (1997): The Legacy of Grandparenting: Childhood Experiences with Grandparents and Current Involvement with Grandchildren. In: *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 59, 848 – 859.
- Klaus, D. (2009): Why Do Adult Children Support Their Parents? In: *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* (Forthcoming).
- Kohli, M. (2004): Intergenerational Transfers and Inheritance: A Comparative View. In: Silverstein, M. and Schaie, K.W. (Eds.): *Intergenerational Relations Across Time and Place. Annual Review of Gerontology and Geriatrics* 24, 266-289.
- Kohli, M. and Künemund, H. (2005a): The Midlife Generation in the Family: Patterns of Exchange and Support. In: Willis, S.L. and Martin, M. (Eds.): *Middle Adulthood: A Lifespan Perspective*. Thousand Oaks/London/New Delhi, 35-61.
- Kohli, M. and Künemund, H. (Eds.) (2005b): *Die zweite Lebenshälfte. Gesellschaftliche Lage und Partizipation im Spiegel des Alters-Survey. 2., erweiterte Auflage*. Wiesbaden.
- Kohli, M./Künemund, H. and Lüdicke, J. (2005): Family Structure, Proximity and Contact. In: Bösch-Supan, A./Brugiavini, A./Jürges, H./Mackenbach, J./Siegrist, J. and Weber, G. (Eds.): *Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe. First Results*

- from the Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe (SHARE). Mannheim: Mannheim Research Institute for the Economics of Ageing (MEA), 164-170.
- Komter, A. and Schans, D. (2008): Reciprocity Revisited: Give and Take in Dutch and Immigrant Families. In: *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 39, 279-298.
- Künemund, H. (2006): Changing Welfare States and the „Sandwich Generation“. Increasing Burden for the Next Generation? In: *International Journal of Ageing and Later Life* 1 (2), 11-29.
- Künemund, H. (2008): Intergenerational Relations Within the Family and the State. In: Saraceno, Ch. (Ed.): *Families, Ageing and Social Policy. Intergenerational Solidarity in European Welfare States*. Cheltenham/Northampton, MA, 105-122.
- Künemund, H. and Vogel, C. (2006): Öffentliche und private Transfers und Unterstützungsleistungen im Alter – „crowding out“ oder „crowding in“? In: *Zeitschrift für Familienforschung* 18, 269-289.
- Lauterbach, W. (1995): Die gemeinsame Lebenszeit von Familiengenerationen. In: *Zeitschrift für Soziologie* 24, 22 – 41.
- Lauterbach, W. (2004): Die multilokale Mehrgenerationenfamilie. Zum Wandel der Familienstruktur in der zweiten Lebenshälfte. Würzburg.
- Lauterbach, W. and Klein, Th. (2004): The change of generational relations based on demographic developments: The case of Germany. In: *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 35, 651-663.
- Lauterbach, W. and Lüscher, K. (1996): Erben und die Verbundenheit der Lebensverläufe von Familienmitgliedern. In: *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 48, 66 – 95.
- Lawton, L./Silverstein, M. and Bengtson, V.L. (1994): Affection, Social Contact and Geographic Distance between Adult Children and Their Parents. In: *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 56, 57-68.
- Lin, I-F. (2008): Consequences of Parental Divorce for Adult Children's Support of Their Frail Parents. In: *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 70, 113-128.
- Lowenstein, A. and Ogg, J. (2003): OASIS – Old Age and Autonomy: The Role of Service Systems and Intergenerational Family Solidarity. Final Report. Haifa: Center for Research and Study of Aging.
- Lüscher, K. and Pillemer, K. (1998): Intergenerational Ambivalence: A New Approach to the Study of Parent-Child Relations in Later Life. In: *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 60, 413-425.
- Mangen, D.J./Bengtson, V.L. and Landry, P.H. (Eds.) (1988): *The Measurement of Intergenerational Relations*. Newbury Park/Beverly Hills/London/New Delhi.
- Merz, E.-M./Schuengel, C. and Schulze, H.-J. (2007): Intergenerational Solidarity: An Attachment Perspective. In: *Journal of Aging Studies* 21, 175-186.
- Merz, E.-M./Schuengel, C. and Schulze, H.-J. (2008): Inter-generational Relationships at Different Ages: An Attachment Perspective. In: *Ageing and Society* 28, 717-736.
- Mueller, M.M. and Elder, G.H. (2003): Family Contingencies Across the Generations: Grandparent-Grandchild Relationships in Holistic Perspective. In: *Journal of Marriage and Family* 65, 404 – 417.
- Nauck, B. (2001): Social Capital, Intergenerational Transmission and Intercultural Contact in Immigrant Families. In: *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 32, 465 – 488.
- Nauck, B. (2007): Immigrant Families in Germany. Family change between situational adaptation, acculturation, segregation and remigration. In: *Zeitschrift für Familienforschung* 19, 34 – 54.
- Nauck, B. (2009a): Patterns of Exchange in Kinship Systems in Germany, Russia, and the People's Republic of China. In: *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* (Forthcoming).
- Nauck, B. (2009b): Intergenerational Relationships and Inheritance Expectations. Comparative Results from Seven Societies in Asia and Europe. In: *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 12 (Forthcoming).
- Nauck, B. and Kohlmann, A. (1998): Verwandtschaft als soziales Kapital - Netzwerkbeziehungen in türkischen Migrantenfamilien. In: Wagner, M. and Schütze, Y. (Eds.): *Verwandtschaft. Sozialwissenschaftliche Beiträge zu einem vernachlässigten Thema*. Stuttgart, 203 – 235.
- Nauck, B. and Suckow, J. (2006): Intergenerational Relationships in Cross-Cultural Comparison: How Social Networks Frame Intergenerational Relations Between Mothers and Grandmothers in Japan, Korea, China, Indonesia, Israel, Germany, and Turkey. In: *Journal of Family Issues* 27, 1159 – 1185.
- Nauck, B. and Yi, Ch.-Ch. (Eds.) (2007): *Intergenerational Relationships in Cross-Cultural Perspective: Fertility, Interaction and Support*. Special Issue of *Current Sociology* 55.
- Parrott, T.M. and Bengtson, V.L. (1999): The Effects of Earlier Intergenerational Affection, Normative Expectations, and Family Conflict on Contemporary Exchange of Help and Support. In: *Research on Aging* 21, 73-105.
- Pillemer, K. and Lüscher, K. (Eds.) (2004): *Intergenerational Ambivalences. New Perspectives on Parent-Child Relations in Later Life*. Oxford.
- Pillemer, K. and Sutor, J.J. (2002): Explaining Mothers' Ambivalence Toward Their Adult Children. In: *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 64, 602-613.
- Roberts, R.E.L. and Bengtson, V.L. (1990): Is Intergenerational Solidarity a Unidimensional Construct? A Second Test of a Formal Model. In: *Journal of Gerontology* 45, 12-20.

- Rossi, A.S. (1993): Intergenerational Relations: Gender, Norms, and Behavior. In: Bengtson, V.L. and Achenbaum, W.A. (Eds.): *The Changing Contract Across Generations*. New York, 191-211.
- Rossi, A.S. and Rossi, P.H. (1990): *Of Human Bounding. Parent-Child Relations Across the Life Course*. New York.
- Ruckdeschel, K./Ette, A./Hullen G. and Leven, I. (2006): Generations and Gender Survey. Dokumentation der ersten Welle der Hauptbefragung in Deutschland. Materialien zur Bevölkerungswissenschaft, Heft 121a.
- Schwarz, B. and Trommsdorff, G. (2005): The Relation Between Attachment and Intergenerational Support. In: *European Journal of Ageing* 2, 192-199.
- Silverstein, M./Lawton, L. and Bengtson, V.L. (1994): Types of Relations Between Parents and Adult Children. In: Bengtson, V.L. and Harootyan, R.A. (Eds.): *Intergenerational Linkages. Hidden Connections in American Society*. New York, 43-76.
- Silverstein, M./Conroy, St.J./Wang, H./Giarrusso, R. and Bengtson, V.L. (2002): Reciprocity in Parent-Child Relations Over the Adult Life Course. In: *Journal of Gerontology: Social Sciences*: 57B, 3 - 11.
- Spitze, G. and Logan, J.R. (1991): Sibling Structure and Intergenerational Relations. In: *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 53, 871-884.
- Steinbach, A. (2008): Intergenerational Solidarity and Ambivalence: Types of Relationships in German Families. In: *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 39, 115-127.
- Steinbach, A. and Kopp, J. (2008a): Intergenerationale Beziehungen. Theoretische Diskussionen, empirische Befunde und offene Fragen. In: Feldhaus, M. and Huinink, J. (Eds.): *Neuere Entwicklungen in der Beziehungs- und Familienforschung. Vorstudien zum Beziehungs- und Familienentwicklungspanel (PAIRFAM)*. Würzburg, 403-430.
- Steinbach, A. and Kopp, J. (2008b): "When will I see you again?" Intergenerational Contacts in Germany. In: Saraceno, Ch. (Ed.): *Families, Ageing and Social Policy. Intergenerational Solidarity in European Welfare States*. Cheltenham/Northampton, MA, 88-104.
- Sweet, J.A. and Bumpass, L.L. (2002): *The National Survey of Families and Households - Waves 1, 2, and 3: Data Description and Documentation*. Center for Demography and Ecology, University of Wisconsin-Madison (<http://www.ssc.wisc.edu/nsfh/home.htm>).
- Szydlik, M. (1995): Die Enge der Beziehung zwischen erwachsenen Kindern und ihren Eltern - und umgekehrt. In: *Zeitschrift für Soziologie* 24, 75-94.
- Szydlik, M. (1999): Erben in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Zum Verhältnis von familialer Solidarität und sozialer Ungleichheit. In: *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 51, 80 - 104.
- Szydlik, M. (2000): Lebenslange Solidarität? Generationenbeziehungen zwischen erwachsenen Kindern und Eltern. Opladen.
- Szydlik, M. (2004): Inheritance and Inequality: Theoretical Reasoning and Empirical Evidence. In: *European Sociological Review* 20, 31 - 45.
- Szydlik, M. (2008): Intergenerational Solidarity and Conflict. In: *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 34, 97-114.
- Szydlik, M. and Schupp, J. (2004): Wer erbt mehr? Erbschaften, Sozialstruktur und Alterssicherung. In: *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 56, 609 - 629.
- Tesch-Römer, C./Engstler, H. and Wurm, S. (Eds.) (2006): *Altwerden in Deutschland. Sozialer Wandel und individuelle Entwicklung in der zweiten Lebenshälfte*. Wiesbaden.
- Tesch-Römer, C./Kondratowitz, H.-J. von/Motel-Klingebiel, A. and Spangler, D. (2000): *OASIS - Old Age and Autonomy: The Role of Service Systems and Intergenerational Family Solidarity. Erhebungsdesign und Instrumente des deutschen Surveys*. Berlin: Deutsches Zentrum für Altersfragen.
- Tesch-Römer, C./Wurm, S./Hoff, A. and Engstler, H. (2002): *Die zweite Welle des Alterssurveys. Erhebungsdesign und Instrumente*. DZA Diskussionspapiere, Nr. 35. Berlin: Deutsches Zentrum für Altersfragen.
- Trommsdorff, G. and Nauck, B. (Eds.) (2005): *The Value of Children in Cross-cultural Perspective*. Lengerich.
- Trommsdorff, G. and Schwarz, B. (2007): The „Intergenerational Stake Hypothesis“ in Indonesia and Germany: Adult Daughters' and their Mothers' Perception of their Relationship. In: *Current Sociology* 55, 599-620.
- Van Gaalen, R.I. and Dykstra, P.A. (2006): Solidarity and Conflict Between Adult Children and Parents: A Latent Class Analysis. In: *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 68, 947-960.

Appendix: Overview of surveys which include measures of intergenerational relationships

Study	Full Name	Institution	Data Collection	Unit of Observation	Universe	Countries	Migrant Sample	Dimensions of Intergenerational Relations
GSOEP	German Socio-Economic Panel Study	German Institute for Economic Research, Berlin	Since 1984 IGR: 91, 96, 01, 06	Households (n=10.000) Individuals (n=20.000)	18+ Panel	DE	684 Foreigners (1994+)	Distance, Contact, Emotional Closeness, Transfer
Family Survey	German Family Survey	German Youth Institute, Munich	1988/1990 1994 2000	Individuals (n=10.000)	18-55 Mixed Design	DE		Distance, Contact, Emotional Closeness, Satisfaction, Transfer
GGS	Generations and Gender Survey	Federal Institute for Population Research, Wiesbaden	2005 2008 (2011)	Individuals (n=10.000)	18-79 Mixed Design	DE (AU, BE, BG, CZ, EE, FR, GE, HU, IT, JP, LT, NL, NO, RO, RU)	4.000 Turks (in 2006)	Distance, Contact, Satisfaction, Filial Obligations, Transfer
OASIS	Old Age and Autonomy: The Role of Service Systems and Intergenerational Solidarity	The German Centre of Gerontology, Berlin	2000	Individuals (n=1.300)	25+ Cross-sectional	DE (IL, NO, ES, UK)		Distance, Contact, Emotional Closeness, Consensus, Filial Obligations, Transfer
DEAS	German Ageing Survey	The German Centre of Gerontology, Berlin	1996 2002 2008	Individuals (n=5.000)	40+ Mixed Design	DE	586 Foreigners (in 2002, 2008)	Distance, Contact, Emotional Closeness, Transfer
SHARE	Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe	Mannheim Research Institute for the Economics of Ageing, Mannheim	2004/5 2006/7 2008/9	Individuals (n=3.000) Partner	50+ Panel	DE (AT, BE, DK, FR, GR, IT, ES, CH, NL/CZ, IE, PL/SI)		Distance, Contact, Emotional Closeness, Transfer
PAIRFAM	Panel Analysis of Intimate Relationships and Family Dynamics	Universities of Bremen, Chemnitz, Mannheim, Munich	2008/9 + 13 waves	Individuals (n=12.000) Partner, Children, Parents	15/25/35 Panel	DE	300 Turks (in 2008)	Distance, Contact, Emotional Closeness, Conflict, Filial Obligations, Transfer

NKPS	Netherlands Kinship Panel Study	Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute, The Hague; NL	2002/4 2006/7	Individuals (n=10.000) Partner, Children, Parents, Siblings	18-79 Panel	NL	1.400 Migrants (in 2002, 2006)	Distance, Contact, Relationship Quality, Conflict, Filial Obligations, Transfer
LSOG	Longitudinal Study of Generations	University of Southern California, Los Angeles, USA	1971, 1985, 1988, 1991, 1994, 1997	Families (n=300) Members of four Generations (in 2000)	18+ Panel	US		Distance, Contact, Emotional Closeness, Conflict, Consensus, Filial Obligations, Transfer
NSFH	American National Survey of Families and Households	Center for Demography, University of Wisconsin, USA	1987/8, 1992/4; 2001/2	Individuals (n=13.000) Partner, Children	18+ Panel	US	oversample of Blacks/Puerto Ricans/Mexicans	Distance, Contact, Relationship Quality, Transfer