Family Obligations and Support Behaviour:

A United States – Netherlands Comparison

Pearl A. Dykstra, Ph.D.

The Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute

The Hague, The Netherlands

Teresa M. Cooney, Ph.D.*

University of Missouri

Columbia, Missouri – U.S. A.

*This research was initiated in 2007 when Teresa M. Cooney was a visiting scholar at The Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute, funded by the University of Missouri's Faculty Development Leave Program.

Introduction

The goal of this paper is to examine family obligations, family support behaviour, and the links between them in two countries with dramatically different social welfare policy regimes. Though a number of studies draw on comparative European data to address related issues (Albertini, Kohli, & Vogel, 2007; Attias-Donfut, Ogg, & Wolff, 2005; Daatland & Lowenstein, 2005; Ogg & Renault, 2006), limited recent work contrasts European and American families (see Grundy & Henretta, 2006). We thus capitalize on comparable data from two fairly recent national surveys to contrast patterns of family support behaviour, family obligations, and their connection for a subsample of middle-generation adults in the United States (U.S.) and the Netherlands who have both adult offspring and aged parents. We compare the Dutch and American samples regarding their espoused obligations to support adult offspring and aged parents and their actual support behaviour, the association between obligations and support, predictors of support to each generation, and finally the link between support-giving to parents and to adult offspring.

Basically, there are two ways of doing comparative research of this type. The first is to treat findings from different countries as repeated confirmations of a theoretical model because there are reasons to assume that the model holds across countries. The second is to start with the assumption of cultural specificity and to focus on ways in which policies or other macro-level

indicators influence elements of a particular theoretical model. This paper follows the latter approach as we explicitly develop hypotheses regarding expected differences between the U.S. and the Netherlands in terms of family obligation, family support, and their connection to one another. Our rationale rests largely on the dramatic differences that exist in the social welfare systems of the two countries.

Using Esping-Anderson's (1999) classification of social welfare systems, the United States is considered a "liberal" welfare regime, much like that of Great Britain. Such systems offer relatively limited public support for citizens, with assistance generally being means-tested and targeted toward bad risks (e.g., welfare assistance to single parents and Medicare for older adults). Although government benefits are modest in the U.S. and provide only a minimal safety net for American citizens, families are not left to be the sole provider of support for the poor and others in need.

In contrast, countries like Spain and Italy, which are classified as "familialistic" in Esping-Anderson's scheme, are positioned at that end of the welfare state continuum characterized by a lack of public policies and very low levels of public assistance. Consequently, in familialistic countries persons in need must rely heavily on family support. In their extreme form familialistic cultures are characterised by strong kinship bonds evidenced by high rates of

parent-adult child co-residence, contact, and greater proximity, which facilitate the exchange of intergenerational support.

At the opposite end of the continuum are individualistic nations that possess extensive welfare state provisions for assisting those in need. Family contacts and co-residence are somewhat lower in individualistic than in familialistic countries, and family members depend less on one another for assistance in the former (Reher, 1998; Esping-Anderson, 1993). Universal welfare systems in several Scandinavian countries are categorized as individualistic or social democratic using Esping-Anderson's scheme. The Netherlands leans more toward the individualistic end of the continuum; though it has fewer social programs than individualistic countries like Sweden and Norway, it offers greater income support and health coverage for its citizens than the U.S.. Esping-Anderson (1999) argues that public support in the Netherlands is distributed unevenly across the life course, with policies and programs primarily aimed at supporting young families and older adults. Attias-Donfut and Arber (2000) claim, however, that state-provided benefits in the Netherlands most help persons ages 30-60 by reducing dependence on family for housing and financial help.

Given these sharp cross-national differences in social welfare policy for the Netherlands and the U.S., we propose five questions for comparative study of Dutch and American adults and their families: (1)Do American and Dutch adults differ in their expressed views regarding

responsibilities to ageing parents and adult offspring? (2) Do American and Dutch adults differ in the actual support they provide these family members? (3) Does the connection between espoused family obligations and support behaviour differ for adults in the two countries? (4) Do structural factors differentially impact the likelihood that adults will give support to adult offspring and aged parents in these two countries? (5) Is the connection between support provision to aged parents and adult offspring different in the U.S. and the Netherlands? Below we review empirical evidence and theoretical formulations that shape our hypotheses regarding each of these five questions.

Literature review

Family obligations and cultural context

Family obligations are generalized expectations regarding family members' responsibilities for each other, which provide guidelines for family behaviour (Finch & Mason, 1990). A number of authors contend that the views individuals possess regarding support to family members reflect the care systems (ie., welfare regimes) of their countries (Herlofson, 2004; Reher, 1997). In referring specifically to filial obligations, Finley et al. (1988) noted that they

are "a product of the social and structural world in which a person lives" (p. 77). Our first research question tests this issue by asking: do adults in the U.S. and the Netherlands differ in their espoused obligations to support family members?

A recent investigation by Kalmijn and Saraceno (2008) presented strong empirical evidence for the connection between care regimes and family obligations using European data. These researchers compared the views of adults from countries considered to be more familialistic (Greece, Spain, Germany, Austria, Italy) with those from countries labeled individualistic (France, The Netherlands, Sweden, Norway, Denmark) based on both institutional support provisions (e.g., welfare systems) and the strength of kinship ties. Their results support the notion that people in familialistic countries possess stronger family obligations than those in individualistic countries. Their study, however, had some limitations. One shortcoming was that the norms Kalmijn and Saraceno measured applied only to older adult family members; a more comprehensive test of cultural differences in family obligations would use a measure of norms that addresses obligations to both older and young generations in the family, as the current study does. Additionally, their comparison was limited to European nations, like much of the recent comparative work on family support patterns and obligations. Our U.S.-Netherlands study thus expands on such research.

Based on the Kalmijn and Saraceno findings and others' discussions about the link between social welfare systems and family obligations, we propose a *familism hypothesis* for research question one that states that family obligations are stronger in the U.S. than in the Netherlands (Daatland & Herlofson, 2004; Kalmijn & Saraceno, 2008; Reher, 1997). Because of the more limited public welfare system in the U.S. than the Netherlands, we expect Americans to subscribe more strongly than the Dutch to the belief that it is important to provide support to family members in need.

Family support behaviour and cultural influences

Our second research question asks whether American and Dutch adults differ in the actual support they provide to adult offspring and ageing parents. There are competing views as to the connection between family support patterns and the extensiveness of welfare systems. One view popular in the U.S. is that public assistance threatens family members' interest in and willingness to give support to those in need (Attias-Donfut & Arber, 2000). This argument basically contends that a state support system "crowds out" family support, resulting in less support from family members (Cox & Jackson, 1995). Alternatively, a view offered by Attias-Donfut and Wolff (2000) and others is that public welfare systems promote family solidarity. To illustrate, they note that when ageing individuals are assured a state pension, they may be more likely to assist their adult offspring rather than using and saving their resources to cover their

own needs. Some scholars posit that in such cases family members more willingly share responsibilities or choose to perform certain support tasks that they feel especially capable of doing well (Kunemund & Rein, 1999; Lowenstein & Daatland, 2006).

Empirical evidence fails to support the crowding-out view, yet the notion that public welfare systems prompt greater family support exchange is not fully supported by the data either. Daatlaand and Lowenstein's (2005) analysis of OASIS data from five European countries considered support for ageing parents in relation to each country's social welfare system. They found that even in countries, like Norway, with high levels of public support, family members still played a substantial role in care provision, though "the family is dominant when services are not available" (p. 181), as was the case in Spain. Therefore, "generous welfare state services have not crowded-out the family, but may have reduced dependence on the family" (p. 181). Similarly, no clear welfare-regime differences were found in Kalmijn and Saraceno's (2008) study when ten familialistic and individualistic European countries were compared on actual support-giving to aged parents. Finally, Grundy and Henretta (2006) reported mixed findings in examining family support to both adult offspring and aged parents in the U.S. and Great Britain. They found that Americans were less likely than the British to provide help to ageing parents, but were slightly more likely to assist their adult offspring than were their British counterparts.

Based on theorizing and empirical data, it is thus unclear whether adults in a more individualistic country like the Netherlands will be more or less supportive of family members than those in a more familialistic country like the U.S.. We therefore consider other important macro-level factors, such as population density, as potentially critical influences. For question two we pose a *geographic proximity* hypothesis that contends that Dutch adults will be more likely to engage in family support behaviour than American adults. Because the Netherlands is a dramatically smaller country than the U.S. and its population density is much greater, we expect more family support in the Netherlands than in the U.S. as those who are less geographically dispersed have greater opportunity to provide support (Bengtson, 2001; Hank, 2007; Litwak & Kulis, 1987).

The connection between family obligations and support behaviour

Though family obligations and family support behaviour are considered distinct, an important question is to what extent individuals' espoused family obligations predict their family support behaviour. Research question three addresses whether responsiveness to stated family obligations differs between adults in the U.S. and the Netherlands. Only a few studies have considered the obligations-support connection, and then only in reference to respondents from a single country. Lee and his colleagues (1994) failed to demonstrate an association between obligations and support behaviours using an American sample aged 65 and older. They

found no connection between the support ageing parents received from their adult offspring and their views of filial responsibility. However, a more appropriate test of the question of the obligation – support link would correlate levels of support received by the ageing parents with the adult offspring's espoused level of filial obligation.

Yet more recent American study and a Dutch study used this latter approach and found a significant connection between individuals' stated obligations and support behaviour. Analyzing data from a sample of adults ages 55-89 and their adult offspring, Klein Ikkink, van Tilburg, and Knipscheer (1999) found that Dutch adults' expressed obligations to parents were positively related to levels of support they provided to their parents. Longitudinal analyses of U.S. data conducted by Silverstein, Gans, and Yang (2006) also found that adults espousing stronger filial norms gave significantly more support to their parents, but only in the case of their mothers, not their fathers. Because these two studies used different measures and analytic models, and were conducted at different points in time (5-8 years separated data collections) they provide a weaker post-hoc comparison of the U.S. and the Netherlands, in terms of the obligations-support connection, than the current study. Further, neither study addressed support behaviour targeted at adult children in the family. Thus, whether family obligations are a better predictor of a broader set of family support behaviours in the Netherlands than the U.S., with its dramatically different welfare system, remains to be addressed.

Competing hypotheses are therefore formulated in approaching research question three. One possibility is that the link between obligation and support behaviour is stronger in the U.S. than in the Netherlands. Because of the country's more limited public support system, U.S. families are considered the first line of defense when needs arise. Consequently, it may be more critical for Americans than the Dutch to act upon beliefs about family support because of the more negative consequences that would occur if one did not follow through on obligation norms in the U.S.. Furthermore, because fewer alternatives to family support exist in the U. S. than in the Netherlands, it would be more psychologically uncomfortable for Americans to possess particular views about family support and not behave in accordance with them. We label this hypothesis the *cognitive dissonance hypothesis.* Alternatively, the connection between obligations and support behaviour may be weaker in the U.S. than in the Netherlands. This view, labeled the *no choice hypothesis,* is based on the reasoning that no matter what the circumstances are, given the limited public support system in the U.S., Americans have no choice but to assist family members in need. Thus, as result of fewer alternative options to family support in the U.S. than in the Netherlands, the connection between support behaviour and family obligations is weaker in the U.S..

Predictors of family support in individualist and familialistic cultures

Our fourth question addresses the determinants of support behaviour in the U.S. and the Netherlands and asks: In what country are structural factors better predictors of support behaviour for parents and children? The structural factors we consider are grouped into two sets: *demand* factors, which represent the needs of the potential receiver, and *constraint* factors, which include the forces that may limit support-provision by the middle-generation respondent. The demand factors of the receiving generation are considered critical because they influence the opportunity family members have to act on their beliefs about supporting family members in need (Klein Ikkink et al., 1999; Silverstein & Bengtson, 1997; Silverstein, Gans, & Yang, 2006). At the same time, however, middle-generation adults may differentially respond to parental or offspring need and act upon normative obligations because of personal and situational constraints. Though studies consistently reveal that demand factors are stronger influences on family support-giving than constraint factors (Klein Ikkink et al., 1999; Kalmijn & Saraceno, 2008)—at least in regard to help given to ageing parents, we will compare the influence of these factors for middle-generation adults in the U.S. and the Netherlands.

Among the demand factors we consider for ageing parents are the parent's age, sex, health, residential status and geographic distance from respondent. With increased age, parents typically receive more support from offspring, especially household assistance and care (Eggebeen & Hogan, 1990; Klein Ikkink et al., 1999), perhaps because of increased functional

impairment that generally accompanies ageing. Support-giving also tends to be greater for mothers than fathers (Kaufman & Uhlenberg, 1998; Klein Ikkink et al., 1999; Rossi & Rossi, 1990; Silverstein & Bengtson, 1997), which may reflect adults' repayment to their mothers for their greater childcare investment made earlier in the lifespan. This sex difference, however, is less consistent in studies with European than U.S. families (Kalmijn & Saraceno, 2008). Poor health or ADL limitations also is a critical demand factor, as evidence consistently supports the link between poor health and greater receipt of support from offspring (Eggebeen & Hogan, 1990; Kalmijn & Saraceno, 2008; Klein Ikkink et al., 1999; Silverstein et al., 2006). Additionally, several studies indicate a greater likelihood of support provision for parents who are not married (Silverstein et al., 2006) or who live alone (Kalmijn & Saraceno, 2008; Klein Ikkink et al., 1999). Finally, though not really an indicator of need, we consider geographic distance between respondent and ageing parent in this set of factors. Hank (2007) argues that proximity is one factor that "constitute[s] the basic opportunity structure for intergenerational interaction" (p. 158), which includes assistance, thus not surprisingly research shows that with greater distance less support to parents occurs (Checkovich & Stern, 2002; Klein Ikkink et al., 1999; Rossi & Rossi, 1990; Suitor & Pillemer, 2006). We also put distance from respondent in our models first—along with recipient need factors because adults may decide to reside closer to parents or offspring who are in greater need so that support can occur.

Factors likely to be associated with adult offspring's level of demand for parental support include distance from parents, age, sex, education level, marital/partner status, and employment status. Similar to findings regarding support to ageing parents, research shows that adult offspring who live nearby their parents are more likely to receive assistance than others living further away (Cooney & Uhlenberg, 1992). Child's sex is another important predictor, but primarily in U.S. studies with data indicating that daughters are more likely to receive support from parents than are sons (Cooney & Uhlenberg, 1992; Eggebeen & Hogan, 1990; Suitor, Sechrist, & Pillemer, 2007). Suitor and Pillemer (2006) point out that compared to adult sons, daughters show greater allegiance to the family of orientation (in terms of contact, etc), especially if marriage occurs. This may bring them favor when it comes to parental support. Parental support varies by age as well, with the likelihood of support declining significantly as offspring mature and become increasingly independent (Cooney & Uhlenberg, 1992; Eggebeen & Hogan, 1990; Rossi & Rossi, 1990). The reduced reliance on parental support that comes with increasing age may be partly linked to adult offspring's employment, educational achievement and marital status. Adults working full-time may require less financial and housing assistance from family. Similarly, married offspring tend to receive less support from parents than non-married children (Cooney & Uhlenberg, 1992; Eggebeen & Hogan, 1990; Suitor Pillemer, & Sechrist, 2007), perhaps due to higher income or the fact that they have a partner to turn to for

assistance. Finally, for adults to achieve advanced levels of education parental support is usually required, thus education and likelihood of parental support are expected to be positively related (Eggebeen & Hogan, 1990; Henretta et al., 2002).

Several structural factors are likely to affect the ability of middle-generation adults to provide support to either ageing parents or adult offspring. The constraining factors we consider are respondent's education level, income, age, sex, partner status, and health. Both education level and income contribute to socioeconomic status. These factors are significant predictors of support to adult offspring in both the U.S. (Cooney & Uhlenberg, 1992) and Great Britain (Henretta et al., 2002) and to parents in the U.S. (Eggebeen & Hogan, 1990). Higher income adults have more resources to share with family members and they may have greater job flexibility, which facilitates non-monetary assistance. Henretta and colleagues also argue that class-based notions about the value of supporting adult offspring may be captured by education level. Further, they point out that more educated persons tend to have offspring who pursue higher levels of education, which requires greater parental support. Regarding respondent age, a negative association is expected with support-provision to adult offspring, consistent with the finding of a negative association between the age of offspring and likelihood of parental support noted above. However, older respondents may be more likely to support ageing parents, as increased respondent age is likely to reflect increased parental age and need. Multiple studies

reveal this finding (Klein Ikkink et al., 1998; Silverstein et al., 2006), though some data also show an inverse relationship (Eggebeen & Hogan, 1990). Just as sex differences were noted in who receives family support, they are also evident in terms of who provides support to aging parents and adult offspring. In line with gender-socialization of care roles, women appear more responsive to supporting ageing parents (Kalmijn & Saraceno, 2008), especially mothers (Silverstein et al., 2006; Suitor, Sechrist, & Pillemer, 2007), and in providing assistance to adult offspring (Rossi & Rossi, 1990; Silverstein et al., 1995?).

Additionally, variables pertaining to family size are included in each set of models. In predicting support to adult offspring, the size of the middle generation's family of procreation (number of children) is considered. Having more children generally limits the likelihood of being able to provide any one child support due to heightened pressure on parental resources (Cooney & Uhlenberg, 1992; Eggebeen & Hogan, 1990; Henretta et al., 2002; Rossi & Rossi, 1990). Size of the respondent's family of origin (number of living siblings) is included in models of support to parents to reflect alternative sources of assistance to ageing parents that may reduce pressure on the respondent to provide help. Though one Dutch study found no such effect (Klein Ikkink et al., 1998) another study using a multinational sample offers support for this association (Kalmijn & Saraceno, 2008).

Referring to what we label an *individualization hypothesis,* we expect that structural factors, especially those related to family member's needs, are poorer predictors of support in the Netherlands than in the U.S. given that support provision is more individualized in the Netherlands. That is, because of the more extensive social welfare system in the Netherlands, Dutch people can more easily choose whether to step in and assist those family members with high levels of need than their American counterparts. Prior support for this hypothesis comes from Kalmijn and Saraceno's (2008) ten-nation European study where they found demand factors or needs to be markedly more important to provision of help to ageing parents in familialistic than individualistic countries.

Patterns of support to aged parents and adult offspring within families

For adults in the middle or "sandwich" generation of families, providing support to one generation—either the one above (parents) or below (offspring)—can have implications for support-provision to the other generation. Research question five follows the work of Grundy and Henretta (2006) by examining how middle-generation adults in the U.S. and the Netherlands distribute help between aging parents and adult offspring. In their work using data for middle-generation women in the U.S. and Great Britain, Grundy and Henretta tested two competing hypotheses that we also propose here. Their *hypothesis of competing demands* posed that the likelihood of giving assistance to one generation would be negatively associated with the

likelihood of helping the other because limited resources would require middle-generation adults to make choices in dividing their time and material resources between parents and offspring. Alternatively, their *family solidarity hypothesis* claimed that a positive association existed between the likelihood of assistance to the two generations, as adults vary in their commitment to helping family members in general (ie. their feelings of family solidarity). Adults high on family solidarity would be inclined to help both generations and those possessing low solidarity would be unlikely to help either. Their finding of a positive association between likelihood of helping parents and adult offspring supported the family solidarity hypothesis in both the U.S. and Great Britain. Still, it is questionable whether similar results will be found in our comparison of the Netherlands and the U.S. given the sharper differences in welfare regimes for these two countries compared to the U.S. and Great Britain. Moreover, our analyses will include a broader age range of middle-generation adults than did theirs, as well as both male and female middle-generation adults.

Methods

This study draws on national data sets from the United States and the Netherlands. The U.S. data are from the third wave of the National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH) (Sweet & Bumpass, 2002), conducted from 2001 to 2003 (N = 4600 main respondents). The original NSFH study was completed in the mid-1980s and included an adult main respondent

(aged 19 and older) drawn from approximately 13,000 households in the contiguous United States. Due to budget constraints, the decision was made to limit the third follow-up in 2001 to those original primary respondents who had reached age 45 or older, or those with a target child (identified in an earlier wave) that was now between ages 18 and 33. These selection factors are not problematic, however, given the criteria we use to address our specific research questions (see below). The research team successfully located 71 per cent of the eligible respondents for wave 3. Sampling weights were not developed by the NSFH staff for Wave 3, therefore the analyses herein are based on unweighted data.

The Dutch data are from the first wave of the Netherlands Kinship Panel Study (NKPS), which took place from 2002 - 2004 (N = 8161). The main respondents, who were ages 18-80, were drawn from a random sample of private addresses in the Netherlands. The overall response rate was 45 per cent, which is comparable to other family surveys in the Netherlands (Dykstra et al., 2005), where response rates are generally low and seem to be declining over time (De Leeuw & De Heer, 2001; Stoop, 2005). Adults under age 30, women residing alone and young adults living at home are under-represented in the sample. The primary respondents selected for the sample completed face-to-face interviews and a self-enumerated questionnaire. The latter had a return rate of 92%. Additionally, respondents were asked for contacts for a randomly selected parent and two randomly selected children aged 15 and over. Cooperation

with this request was lower (40% of respondents refused to provide that parent information, and 28.7% refused such information on their children); because of these refusals, there is substantially more missing data in the Dutch dataset as some of the information on aged parents and adult offspring used in the analyses was drawn directly from the reports of these family members.

Both the U.S. and the Netherlands data sets are public release files. These specific studies were selected for this comparative project because they contained a number of similar questions regarding family obligations, support, and characteristics of family members. Additionally, data collections occurred close in time, thus eliminating the possibility that period effects would confound the national comparisons.

Several selection factors were used to identify the analytic samples from these two studies. First, we limited the analytic samples for both countries to adults aged 40-79 to capture middle-aged adults of approximately the same ages in both countries. Because we were interested in support given to non-resident aged parents and adult offspring, we also selected from these subsamples only those respondents with at least one parent and one adult child (age 19 or older) living outside the household. These selection criteria resulted in 1232 cases for the U.S. sample and 732 cases for the Netherlands sample who had complete data regarding

provision of support to both aged parents and to adult children—our dependent variables described below.

These two data sets included three items pertaining to family obligations that were worded similarly enough to constitute comparable items for a measure of family obligation: two items referred to helping adult offspring (by providing financial support and by letting adult children live at home if they have financial problems) and one item from each data set addressed having ageing parents who can no longer live on their own live with you. Having more than a single item addressing obligation to ageing parents would be preferable. However, we are confident about this item because the work of Kilmijn and Saraceno (2008) revealed that a similar item on co-residence correlated highly with attitudinal items pertaining to looking after ageing parents (r=.81) and paying for elderly parents' care (r=.70) in a study that included a Dutch sample. (See Appendix A for exact wording of these items on each survey.) These three items asked respondents the extent to which they agreed or disagreed (5-point scale) with the statements on family obligation. The two items referring to adult offspring were weighted by .5 so that views about adult offspring contributed equally to a summed index of family obligation as the one item regarding aged parents. Index scores thus range from 2 to 10, with high scores reflecting stronger obligation to help family members. The Cronbach's alpha coefficients for the U.S. and Dutch scale were .41 and .47, respectively. These are somewhat low reliabilities but

comparable to those of other brief scales of family obligation used in the literature (e.g., Ward, 2001, used a 4-item scale with an alpha = .44). Also, the reliabilities are fairly comparable for the two samples, thereby eliminating confounds due to measurement differences.

Support to parents and adult offspring was examined with three items addressing financial support and instrumental support (e.g. errands, transportation, house and yard help). In the U.S. data, respondents were asked about providing support to each of their surviving parents and each adult child during the past 3 months. In the Netherlands data set, one living parent of a respondent and up to two adult children were the foci of the support questions pertaining to transfers in the past month. To institute comparability in the two data sets we randomly selected (using a random number generator) one living parent (if more than one) and one adult child to be the focus of the analyses. We recognize that the timeframe used for considering support provision was longer in the U.S. than the Netherlands dataset. As much as possible, however, measures were constructed to be comparable. For example, in the U.S. data respondents reported financial help over $200 to either parents or offspring. If over that amount, they were asked a follow-up on the amount of money provided. In the Netherlands dataset, respondents reported any support exceeding 500 Euros. Thus, when coding U.S. data to indicate financial help, we only included those cases where the reported gift or loan was over $500 (in 2002, the Euro was equal to approximately $1.09). Finally, we examine support to ageing

parents and to adult children with dichotomous dummy variables denoting "any support given" to eliminate comparison problems due to different response choices in the two data sets.

Several predictor variables related to respondent constraints and recipient demands discussed in the literature review were also examined in each data set. The respondent constraints were nearly identical in the analyses used to predict support to aged parents and to adult offspring. Included in this set of variables was the respondent's education level, sex (1=female, 0=male), disability status (1= long-term illnesses, physical or mental conditions, 0=none), age, household income (converted into Euros) and relationship status (1=married, cohabiting, remarried, 0=living outside a relationship). In the analyses pertaining to aged parents, a variable indexing number of siblings was also included to capture alternate sources of help that the aged parents may have. In the models predicting support to adult children, the number of children the respondent had was used to indicate the extent of demands faced from other offspring. A few other possible constraint variables were assessed in preliminary analyses, including other types of marital status (e.g., respondent divorced) and respondent's work and retirement statuses. These variables did not contribute significantly to the analyses and were eliminated as analyses progressed.

Demand factors in both sets of models were intended to capture personal and situational characteristics of the recipients that could influence their need for support. In the models

pertaining to support to aged parents we included: parent's age, sex (1=male, 0=female), health (1-5 scale, 5=excellent), and whether the parent lived alone. Relationship quality between the respondent and parent was also assessed because preliminary analyses revealed that in the Dutch data this variable was associated with missing data on the parent, and was also associated with support. Thus, by including it in the models we control for this non-random element of the missingness of the data that we eventually impute (see below). In the models predicting support to adult children we consider the child's age, sex (1=male, 0=female), education level, marital status (1=married, 0=unmarried), and full-time work (1= yes, 0=no) status. Preliminary analyses considered other forms of relationship status (cohabiting or married vs. single, etc) and employment status (e.g., any work vs. not working; part-time, full-time, not working) for offspring but found the selected options to be most predictive of support outcomes. In both models distance from respondent was included, transformed into kilometres in the U.S. data. Data pertaining to distance and income were logged to address negative skew issues in both models, as was the number of children variable in the adult child models.

Missing data were limited in these data sets (8% or less on all variables, and most independent variables had under 2% of cases with missing values), with the exception of four variables. In the Dutch data adult child's employment status (53%) and aged parent's health status (75%) had extensive missing data because this information was drawn from the family

members' questionnaires, rather than from that of the primary respondent. In the U.S. dataset distance from the adult child (8.4%) and household income (39%) were the variables with the most incomplete data, though most variables had less than 1 per cent of data missing. We used the *Ice* program for multiple imputation (Royston, 2005) in STATA to impute values for the missing data. Based on Acock's (2005) discussion of degree of missing data and suggested number of imputations, we generated five imputed data sets for the U.S. dataset and 10 for the Netherlands dataset. The multivariate models presented in the Results section are based on the parameter estimates obtained in the multiple imputation and estimation process. The multivariate models described below were also estimated using listwise deletion and mean imputation. The few differences resulting in the regression estimates using these methods and the multiple imputation approach are discussed in the results.

Results

We start by providing a brief comparison of the demographic variables pertaining to the two analytic samples (Table 1). The two country samples are quite similar in background. Both groups of respondents are in their early 50s on average, though in the Dutch sample they tend to be about 1 year older (54 vs. 53). Women make up the majority of respondents in both samples, and reports about parents are primarily about mothers, more so in the Netherlands sample (77%) than the U.S. one (68%). Offspring that are considered are more evenly split

along male-female lines, although again the Dutch sample is slightly over-represented by daughters compared to the U.S.. Respondents in these data sets are generally partnered (about three-quarters), have on average 3.5 siblings and about 2 children on average. The U.S. sample has a markedly higher income than the Dutch sample, and approximately one-quarter of both samples report a physical or mental disability that limits their activity. Parents' average age is 78 in the U.S. sample and 82 in the Dutch sample. A substantial difference exists in the percent of ageing parents that live alone, with it being much nearly 50 per cent higher in the Netherlands than the U.S. (77 vs. 58%). Parents' health status and relationship quality are, however, comparable. As expected, ageing parents and adult offspring live much further from the respondent in the U.S. than the Netherlands. Finally, the mean age of the third-generation offspring is about 28 in both samples. More offspring are married in the U.S. than the Netherlands, and working full-time. The U.S. adult offspring also report higher education level, on average, than the Dutch offspring. All of these background variables are controlled for in the final multivariate analyses.

Next we consider research questions one and two, focused on differences in stated family obligations and support provision, respectively, by Dutch and American adults, ages 40 - 79. Table 2 shows that adults in the U.S. espouse much stronger obligations to support ageing parents and adult offspring, consistent with the proposed familialism hypothesis. The average

family obligation score for the U.S. sample (6.77) is approximately one standard deviation higher than the mean score for Dutch respondents (5.42, sd = 1.33). Yet, despite this marked difference in stated obligations to help family members, the likelihood that Dutch respondents report having assisted family members, either instrumentally or financially, in the recent past is dramatically higher than it is for the American respondents. This holds true regardless of whether we consider support to either the younger or older generation, or both. Well over three-quarters of the Dutch respondents report having helped either their ageing parent or the designated adult child recently, compared to just over half of American respondents. In both countries, the likelihood of helping one's aged parent is approximately equal to helping one's launched adult child, however, the Dutch respondents are nearly twice as likely (68%) to report such support giving as are the American respondents (35%). Even more striking is the difference in reported support provision to *both* generations in one's family; half of the respondents in the Netherlands sample report this pattern of recent support, compared to just one-eighth of the U.S. sample. Table 3 presents figures on support provision separated into financial and instrumental assistance to assess whether country differences exist at this level. U.S. respondents are slightly more likely than the Dutch respondents to report provision of financial support to family members, but Dutch respondents far exceed the Americans in likelihood of giving instrumental assistance. Moreover, Americans are more likely to provide monetary help

to their offspring than instrumental support, whereas the opposite is true among the Dutch. In both countries, however, instrumental support to parents is far more likely to be given than financial support, with the latter rarely occurring in either country. Based on major differences in proximity between family members in the two countries, the patterns of support-giving shown in Tables 2 and 3 by Dutch and American respondents were expected.

The geographic proximity hypothesis for support-provision is further explored in Table 4. This table reports the percent of Dutch and American respondents who provide financial, instrumental and any support to adult children and parents, separately, for those who live nearby the specified family member—here defined as within 10 kilometers, which is the median distance between respondents and designated family members in the Dutch sample. Because we argued that the Dutch respondents would be more supportive than the Americans because of their geographic proximity to family members, we chose to compare only closely-residing families in this analysis who resemble the "typical" Dutch family in this regard. Thus, we test this hypothesis by asking whether American families behave like Dutch families if they live as nearby each other as the members in an average Dutch family. The figures presented in Table 4 reflect a similar pattern to those shown in Tables 2 and 3. Except for the likelihood of providing financial support to family members—particularly adult offspring, Dutch respondents are markedly more apt to be engaged in support behaviour than their American counterparts even

when geographic distance is controlled. Compared to American respondents, Dutch respondents are about 50 per cent more likely to be providing any type of help to adult offspring who live nearby, and about 20 per cent more likely to be involved in support behaviour with aged parents who are in close proximity. Chi-square analyses (not shown here) revealed that geographic proximity is a significant predictor of help to offspring in the U.S. but not the Netherlands, whereas it is highly predictive of support to aged parents in both countries. However, as shown in Table 4, controlling for proximity does not fully eliminate the Dutch-American difference in support-giving to family members.

Next, we compared the role of family obligations in predicting provision of support to aged parents and adult children, separately, for respondents in the two countries. Additionally, we examined the influence of recipient (adult child or aged parent) demand factors and respondent constraint factors in predicting support behaviors, comparing results for the United States and the Netherlands. Tables 5a and 5b show the results of the multivariate models estimated for the Dutch and American samples, respectively, in reference to support provision to aged parents.

The estimates presented for Model 1 show sharp differences in the influence of family obligations on the likelihood of any support being provided to an aged parent for respondents in the two countries. Greater espoused family obligation is associated with a significant increase in

the likelihood of giving support to an aged parent in the U.S. but not in the Netherlands. A one point increase on this 10-point scale is associated with a 16 per cent greater likelihood of having provided support to a parent in the last three months for American respondents. This finding supports the cognitive dissonance hypotheses stated with research question 3.

Model II adds respondent-parent proximity to the model; as expected, in both countries the odds of giving support to older parents is significantly reduced with increasing distance. Though significant for both samples, distance is associated with a more pronounced drop in the likelihood of helping aged parents in the U.S. than in the Netherlands.

Consistent with the individualization hypothesis posed in question 4, parental demand factors play a less significant role in predicting provision of support to older parents in the Netherlands than the U.S. sample (see Model III). A few parent characteristics, however, operate similarly in the two countries: ageing fathers have half the chance of receiving help from offspring than ageing mothers, and respondents who report higher quality relationships with their parents are more apt to provide support to them than are those reporting poor relationships. No other parental demand factors, however, significantly raise the odds of receiving filial support for Dutch elders. On the other hand, if American parents are in poorer health, older, or living alone—all factors which reflect increased parental need—the chances they will receive assistance from their adult offspring is raised significantly. Note that the odds of

providing assistance to a parent living alone in the Netherlands is also quite high compared to those for parents living with a partner (almost 50 per cent higher), but this odds ratio was only marginally significant ($p = .08$) due to a high standard error.

Assistance to ageing parents also is influenced more significantly by the adult child's situation in the U.S. than in the Netherlands, which is expected based on the individualization hypothesis. Education level was the only personal characteristic of Dutch respondents that significantly predicted support to parents, as higher levels of education predicted a greater likelihood of helping parents. In contrast, though respondents' education level did not impact likelihood of assisting parents in the U.S. sample, partnership and disability status of the respondent, as well as household income did. Adults currently in a relationship were less likely to report having supported a parent recently, as were persons with a disability. In contrast, the likelihood of giving parental support increased significantly along with household income. These findings are all consistent with the argument that increased constraint on the respondent's resources (physical, time or money) in the U.S. sample would predict stronger reductions on support provision to ageing parents.

Finally, in regard to research question 5, a strong positive predictor of whether a respondent helped an aged parent was the respondent's recent history of having helped adult offspring, in both countries. This association, however, was much stronger in the Netherlands

(OR = 2.49) than in the U.S. (OR = 1.34). Thus, evidence for the family solidarity hypothesis is clear in both countries, although individualized family patterns of support behaviour appear more common in the Netherlands than the U.S..

The models estimating the provision of any support to adult offspring in the two countries are presented in Tables 6a and 6b. For both the Dutch and American samples, Model I reveals no significant association between espoused family obligations and support giving to adult offspring. Furthermore, in Model II we see that proximity only matters in terms of helping adult offspring for American respondents. Living a greater distance from offspring in the U.S. significantly reduces the odds of parents assisting them. Thus, the familialism hypothesis generated for research question 1 was only supported with data for support to ageing parents. Furthermore, proximity does not account for differences in support to adult offspring in the Netherlands, though it is more critical to American families.

In terms of adult child demand factors, Model III reveals similar patterns of associations as found earlier with support-giving to ageing parents in both countries, though significance levels vary across countries. In both countries, the older offspring are, the less likely they are to receive parental support. Additionally, in both countries it is more educated offspring who benefit in terms of parental assistance compared to less-educated peers. Full-time work also greatly reduces the likelihood of parental help, but this effect is stronger in the U.S. than the

Netherlands and only significant in the former. Interestingly, married offspring in the U.S. also face reduced chances of parental support, whereas in the Netherlands, they are more likely to receive assistance, though the odds ratio associated with marriage is not significant in the Netherlands sample.

As with support provided to aged parents, respondent constraints matter less for transfers to adult children in the Netherlands than in the U.S. American parents who are female, older, or who have greater income are significantly more likely to assist their adult offspring than are males, younger persons, or those with lower household incomes. Further, parents with more adult offspring are substantially less likely to be providing help to a given child. For Dutch parents, only disability status and family support patterns make a difference in whether an adult child receives any parental help. Surprisingly, those parents reporting a disability actually have a higher likelihood of giving support to an adult child. Finally, Dutch respondents who provide any assistance to their aged parents are significantly more likely to also help their adult offspring—in fact the odds are almost doubled when they provide support to their elderly parents. In contrast, this factor is insignificant for American respondents. Thus, similar to the results regarding support to ageing parents, structural factors appear to be a more salient influence on support behavior in American than Dutch families, consistent with the individualization hypothesis stated in question 4. Furthermore, the family solidarity explanation

for overall patterns of support-giving to generations in the family appears more reasonable than a competing-demands argument. However, support for this hypothesis is more evident in Dutch than American families.

Discussion

This paper considered how families living in dramatically different social welfare regimes—specifically the U.S. and the Netherlands, enact intergenerational support behaviour in relation to their espoused feelings of family obligation. The paper builds on a body of work that has focused largely on European comparisons and comparisons between the U.S. and Great Britain. Five questions were raised and hypotheses were posed for each.

Our first question addressed possible differences in espoused obligations for the U.S. and the Netherlands. Using Esping-Anderson's classification and discussion of social welfare systems, we expected that Americans would espouse stronger family obligations than the Dutch. This hypothesis was based on the fact that the U.S. leans more to the familialistic than individualistic end of the welfare-system continuum; the opposite holds for the Netherlands. Indeed, consistent with past work focused exclusively on European countries (Kalmijn & Saraceno, 2008) we found that Americans reported stronger feelings of obligation to support aging parents and adult offspring than Dutch adults. It makes sense that individuals feel more strongly about providing for family members in need in countries where public assistance

programs are relatively limited, which is the case in the U.S. compared to the Netherlands. Kalmijn and Saraceno's (2008) ten-country European study used a broader measure of obligation toward ageing parents to compare countries with different welfare regimes and found that the Netherlands aligned with northern European countries (e.g., Sweden) in offering low support for such views, whereas Southern European countries like Italy and Spain—considereed familialistic—strongly favored filial norms. Our findings thus contribute to this body of work showing a link between norms and welfare regimes. Plus, they expand evidence supporting this theory by using norms about assistance to adult offspring as well.

Our second question recognizes, however, that norms and behavior may vary within a country. That is, it is not necessarily the case that countries characterised by low obligations also reveal relatively low levels of family support. In fact, given the dramatic differences in population density for the Netherlands and the U.S., we expected that Dutch adults would engage in more support behaviour with ageing parents and adult offspring than American adults. Our expectation was supported by data revealing a strikingly greater likelihood of supporting either the older parent or the adult offspring generation, and both generations, in the Dutch than American sample. Interestingly, Dutch adults were much more likely than Americans to report giving instrumental support to their ageing parents and to their adult offspring, even when we controlled for distance by examining only family members that live

nearby one other (within 10 kilometers). There was less difference between countries in the likelihood of monetary transfers by middle-generation adults in these two samples, and distance appeared less important in this type of exchange. Consistent with other studies, few adults in either sample provided monetary assistance to ageing parents, and in both countries adult children were more often recipients of middle-generation financial support than ageing parents (Wong et al., 1999). Wong and her colleagues argue that adults may more often provide monetary support for adult offspring than parents because of enhanced feelings of financial responsibility for offspring. They note that such feelings may result in part from the legal mandates to financially support minor children. They also suggest that adults may exaggerate the financial support they provide to adult offspring in response to social desirability. It was the case, however, that Americans were slightly more likely to give money to adult offspring than were the Dutch, regardless of distance. Because monetary support is critical for the pursuit of higher education by offspring, and the U.S. has fewer educational support programs than the Netherlands, and the American offspring in this study are more educated than the Dutch offspring, this finding seems reasonable.

More importantly, however, we find that the Dutch are still more actively engaged in intergenerational assistance than are Americans, even when geographic distance differences are considered. Perhaps because of the proximity that characterizes most Dutch families, and has

for generations, turning to family members for help is a more engrained reaction among Dutch than American individuals. In contrast, because many Americans generally live a greater distance from family members, making interaction and support more difficult (Hank, 2007), there may be more openness to and acceptance of alternative supports (e.g., asking friends or neighbors for help) among Americans than the Dutch, even when family members are close by. Indeed, privacy is believed to be highly valued by the Dutch ( ), which may inhibit them from turning to non-family for support. Alternatively, cultural values regarding the priority of the family group versus the individual also differ across countries (Hank, 2007). The lower likelihood of support being given to ageing parents and adult offspring by Americans may reflect a preference on their part to "stand on their own two feet" and "make it on their own," even in the face of personal challenges and need. It may be only when needs become quite excessive that Americans are willing to ask for or accept help from family.

Results showing a high likelihood of intergenerational support to both aging parents and adult offspring in the Netherlands are also important to emphasize in light of warnings that strong social welfare programs dampen family supportiveness (Cox & Jackson, 1995). Our findings actually suggest that more social provisions may actually "pull in" families as supports, as suggested by Attias-Donfut and Arber (2000). Indeed, we see that functional solidarity in Dutch families has not been abandoned in the presence of the relatively generous public

provisions in this individualistic nation.

A major aim of this paper was to examine the connection between family obligations and family support behaviour and to determine if differences in this linkage existed for the U.S. and the Netherlands. We found only partial support for our cognitive dissonance hypothesis that proposed that obligations and behaviour would be more strongly associated in the U.S. than in the Netherlands because of the relative lack of public provisions for individuals and families in the former. We expected that adults who hold strong obligations to support family members would feel more psychologically uncomfortable if they did not follow through on those obligations in a welfare regime like that of the U.S. where few alternatives to family support are offered by the government. Only in the case of Americans' support for ageing parents, however, did we find a significant association between family obligations and helping behaviour. Connections between these factors were not apparent when it came to either Dutch or American adults' relationships with adult offspring or regarding help to ageing parents among the Dutch. We know from decades of research that in the U.S., intergenerational support more often flows from parents to offspring, across most of adulthood. Perhaps because this is the dominant family exchange pattern it is governed less by personal feelings of obligation and more by other factors. In contrast, in the U.S. feelings of obligation toward parents may be a necessary condition in order for adults to assist ageing parents, as argued by Silverstein and colleagues (2006).

Moreover, these authors found that obligations work in tandem with increasing parental need to intensify support behaviours over time, especially in situations involving assistance to mothers. Although we did not conduct our analyses by parent sex, our samples involve mostly ageing mothers, so our findings for the U.S. appear consistent with their results and arguments.

Finding no significant connection between family obligations and support behaviour to either generation in the Dutch sample suggests that factors other than norms shape intergenerational exchanges in Dutch culture. Moreover, when you add to this finding the fact that distance was less influential in the Netherlands than it is in the U.S., as were many of the structural factors we considered as needs and constraints in our multivariate models, it would appear that individual preferences and relationships perhaps contribute more to support patterns in Dutch than American families. Or, given the very strong positive effect that help given to one generation had on the likelihood of help given to the other generation in Dutch families, it may be that family processes like solidarity and togetherness are more influential in that culture compared to American society. Certainly the greater geographic proximity of Dutch than American families may afford them more opportunities to develop, and over time to reinforce, a family culture of togetherness and interdependence that can withstand the pressures of increased distance should family members move further apart. This proximity advantage, combined with the Dutch preference for privacy, may result in individuals who choose to engage

in high levels of support with family members, not only in times of need, but at other times as well in a demonstration of family solidarity.

While our analysis does not directly test the impact of social welfare programs or family processes on support behaviour in the U.S. and the Netherlands, it does offer strong evidence that adults in these two countries hold different beliefs about responsibility to family members and engage in different patterns of intergenerational family assistance. Furthermore, our findings are consistent with current theorizing regarding variations in social welfare regimes and their association to intergenerational support, as well as with empirical findings obtained in several European studies (Attias-Donfut, Ogg, & Wolff, 2005; Daatland & Lowenstein, 2005; Grundy & Henretta, 2006; Kalmijn & Saraceno, 2008) that have examined related issues. Consistent with other work using different samples and obligation and support measures, we conclude that Dutch individuals are highly individualistic and actively engage in support of family members in response to personal or family-based preferences and routines, rather than in reaction to feelings of obligation, the needs of family members, or their own available resources. Living in an individualistic welfare-regime that offers a relatively high level of support for its citizens seems to allow the Dutch to act on their individual preferences. In contrast, we conclude that American adults are more influenced by obligatory feelings to family members—especially their ageing parents. Moreover, although in general American adults are less likely to provide support

to family members than are the Dutch, they are more responsive with providing support when either their adult offspring or ageing parents encounter pressing need for help. Thus, we concur with Kalmijn and Saraceno's (2008) conclusion that in countries that lean more toward the familialistic side of the welfare regime continuum (Esping-Anderson, 1999) "children are more important" because they contribute critical resources that help ageing parents deal with increasing needs in a context of limited public support. Additionally, in more familialistic countries individuals continue to benefit from having advantaged parents—well into adulthood, as parents with resources (good health, education, income) share their time and money with adult children in need (Henretta et al., 2002). It is up to future work to determine whether the provision of such supports plays a differential role in the well-being of ageing parents and adult offspring in these different welfare regimes.

References

Acock, A. C. (2005). Working with missing values. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 67,* 1012-1028.

Bengtson, V. (2001). Beyond the nuclear family: The increasing importance of multigenerational bonds. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 63,* 1-16.

Checkovich, T. J., & Stern, S. (2002). Shared caregiving responsibilities of adult siblings with elderly parents. *Journal of Human Resources, 37,* 441-478.

Cooney, T. M., & Uhlenberg, P. (1992). Support from parents over the life course: The adult child's perspective. *Social Forces, 71,* 63-84.

Daatland, S. O., & Herlofson, K. (2003). "Lost solidarity"or "changed solidarity": A comparative European view of normative family solidarity. *Ageing and Society, 23,* 537-560.

Daatland, S. O., & Lowenstein, A. (2005). Intergenerational solidarity and the family-welfare state balance. *European Journal of Ageing, 2,* 174-182.

De Leeuw, E. D., & De Heer, W. (2001). Trends in household survey nonresponse: A longitudinal and international comparison. In R. M. Groves, D. A. Dillman, J. L. Eltinge, & R. J. A. Little (Eds.),

Survey nonresponse (pp. 41-54). New York: Wiley.

Dykstra, P. A., Kalmijn, M., Knijn, T. C. M., Komter, A. E., Liefbroer, A. C., & Mulder, C. H. (2005). Codebook of the Netherlands Kinship Panel Study, a multi-actor, multi-method panel study on solidarity in family relationships, Wave 1. *NKPS Working Paper No. 4*. The Hague: Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute (NIDI).

Eggebeen, D., & Hogan, D. P. (1990). Giving between generations in American families. *Human Nature, 1,* 211-232.

Esping-Anderson, G. (1999). *Social foundations of postindustrial economies.* Oxford: Oxford University\ Press.

Esping-Anderson, G., & Sarsi, S. (2002). The generational conflict reconsidered. *Journal of European Social Policy, 12,* 5-21.

Gordon, C. (1989). *The Bevolkingsregisters and their use in analysing the co-residential behaviour of the elderly.* The Hague, NL: Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute.

Grundy, E., & Henretta, J. C. (2006). Between elderly parents and adult children: A new look at the intergenerational care provided by the "sandwich generation." *Ageing and Society, 26,* 707-722.

Hank, K. (2007). Proximity and contacts between older parents and their children: A European comparison. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 69,* 157-173.

Henretta, J. C., Grundy, E., & Harris, S. (2002). The influence of socio-economic and health differences on parents' provision of help to adult children: A British-United States comparison. *Ageing and Society, 22,* 441-458.

Kalmijn, M., & Saraceno, C. (2008). A comparative perspective on intergenerational support: Responsiveness to parental needs in individualistic and familistic countries. *European Societies, 10,* 479-508.

Klein Ikkink, K., van Tilburg, T., & Knipscheer, K. C. P. M. (1999). Perceived instrumental support exchanges in relationships between elderly parents and their adult children: Normative and structural explanations. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 61,* 831-833.

Lawton, L., Silverstein, M., & Bengtson, V. (1994). Affection, social contact, and geographic distance between adult children and their parents. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 56*, 57-68.

Lee, G. R., Netzer, J. K., & Coward, R. T. (1994). Filial responsibility expectations and patterns of intergenerational assistance. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 56,* 559-565.

Motel-Klingebiel, A., Gordo, L. R., & Betzin, J. (2009). Welfare states and quality of later life: Distributions and predictions in a comparative perspective. *European Journal of Ageing, 6,* 67-78.

Rossi, A. S., & Rossi, P. H. (1990). *Of human bonding: Parent-child relations across the life course.* New York: Aldine.

Royston, P. (2005). Multiple imputation of missing values: Update. *Stata Journal, 5,* 88-102.

Sarkisian, N., & Gerstel, N. (2008). Till marriage do us part: Adult children's relationships with their parents. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 70,* 360-376.

Silverstein, M., & Bengtson, V. L. (1997). Intergenerational solidarity and the structure of adult child-parent relationship in American families. *American Journal of Sociology, 103,* 429-460.

Silverstein, M., Gans, D., & Yang, F. M. (2006).Intergenerational support to aging parents: The role of norms and needs. *Journal of Family Issues, 27,* 1068-1084.

Silverstein, M., Parrott, T. M. & Bengtson, V. L. (1995).Factors that predispose middle aged sons and daughters to provide social support to older persons. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 57,* 465-475.

Stoop, I. A. L. (2005). *The hunt for the last respondent: Nonresponse in sample surveys.* The Hague: Social and

Cultural Planning Office.

Suitor, J. J., & Pillemer, K. (2006). Choosing daughters: Exploring why mothers favor adult daughters over sons.

Sociological Perspectives, 49, 139-161. uitor, J. J., Pillemer, K., & Sechrist, J. (2006). Within-family

differences in mothers' support to adult children. *Journal of Gerontology: SOCIAL SCIENCES, 61B,* S10-S17.

Suitor, J. J., Sechrist, J., & Pillemer, K. (2007). Within-family differences in mothers' support to adult children in

Black and White families. *Research on Aging, 29 (5),* 410-435.

Sweet, J. A. & 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).

van der Heijden, M. (2004). Contradictory interests: Work, parents, and offspring in early modern

Holland. *History of the Family, 9,* 355-370.

van der veen, W. J., & van Poppel, F. (1992). Institutional care for the elderly in the 19th Century: Old

people in The Hague and their institutions. *Ageing and Society, 12,* 185-212.

Ward, R. A. (2001). Linkages between family and societal-level intergenerational attitudes. *Research on*

Ageing, 23, 179-208.

Wong, R., Capoferro, C., & Soldo, B. J. (1999). Financial assistance from middle-aged couples to parents and

children: Racial-ethnic differences. *Journal of Gerontology: SOCIAL SCIENCES, 54B,* S145-S153.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for key study variables, by country.

Variable	United States	Netherlands
Respondent Characteristics		
Mean Age (sd)	52.87 (6.47)	53.89 (5.88)
% Female	67.21	62.75
Mean Years of Education (sd)	13.29 (2.73)	11.49 (3.15)
% in Relationship	76.06	76.89
Mean Number of Siblings (sd)	3.41 (2.34)	3.63 (2.67)
Median Income	67,225	29,400
% Disabled	26.46	28.16
Mean Number of Adult Children	2.22 (1.11)	2.20 (.97)
Parent Characteristics		
Mean Age (sd)	77.66 (7.88)	82.12 (6.40)
% Female	68.34	77.27
% Lives Alone	58.28	77.00
Mean Health Status (1 -5l) (sd)	3.24 (1.05)	3.55 (.79)
Relationship Quality with Respondent (sd)	3.27 (.84)	3.07 (.84)
Median Kilometers to Respondent	40.23	9.77

Adult Child Characteristics

Mean Age (sd)	27.77 (6.05)	27.98 (5.90)
% Female	52.19	56.24
% Married	41.31	29.67
Mean Years of Education (sd)	13.78 (2.14)	12.17 (2.70)
% Working Full-time	65.91	51.26
Median Kilometers to Respondent	48.6	10.8

Table 2. Reports of family obligation and support provision to aged parents and adult offspring, by country

COUNTRY	Mean Family Obligation Score (2-10)	% Providing Support to Either Generation	% Providing Support to Adult Child	% Providing Support to Aged Parent	% Providing Support to Both Generations
Netherlands (n=792)	5.417 (1.33)	86.24	68.31	68 .43	50.51
United States (n=1232)	6.768 (1.26)	58.12	36.53	35.23	13.64

Table 3. Reports of financial and instrumental support to aged parents and adult offspring, by country

COUNTRY	% Reporting Financial Support to Child	% Reporting Instrumental Support to Child	% Reporting Financial Support to Parent	% Reporting Instrumental Support to Parent
Netherlands (n=792)	20.58	63.26	1.77	68 .18
United States (n=1232)	24.27	19.48	2.60	33.60

Table 4. Reports of financial and instrumental support to aged parents and adult offspring for respondents living nearby[1] family members, by country.

COUNTRY	% Giving Financial Support to Adult Child	% Giving Instrumental Support to Adult Child	% Providing Any Support to Adult Child	% Giving Financial Support to Aged Parent	% Giving Instrumental Support to Aged Parent	% Providing Any Support to Aged Parent
Netherlands	15.32 (n=385)	64.94 (n=385)	67.53 (n=385)	1.31 (n=381)	72.97 (n=381)	72.97 (n=381)
United States	26.24 (n=263)	28.90 (n=263)	42.59 (n=263)	2.62 (n=344)	58.14 (n=344)	59.88 (n=344)

[1] Defined as within 10 kilometers of the respondent's home.

Table 5a. Estimates of respondents providing any support to ageing parents, Dutch sample.

Independent Variable	Model 1	Model II	Model III	Model IV
Family Obligation	1.002	0.99	0.967	0.977
Distance (K. Log)		.841***	.849**	.773***
Parent's Age			1.021	1.037
Male Parent (1-0)			.569**	.568**
Relationship Qual.			1.500***	1.54***
Parent's Health			1.01	0.941
Parent Alone (1-0)			1.489	1.954**
Respondent Characteristics				
Education				1.089**
Female (1-0)				1.302
In Relationship 1-0				1.355
Disabled (1-0)				0.824
Age				0.979
Number of Sibs.				0.954
Income				1.177

(logged)				
Supports Kids (1-0)				2.487***
BIC	1000.949	995.672	981.708	978.239
Log Likelihood	-493.8	-487.82	-464.16	-435.72
Model Chi-Square	0.1	12.06	59.38	116.26
df	2	3	8	16
N	792	792	792	792

Table 5b. Estimates of respondents providing any support to ageing parents, American sample.

Independent Variable	Model 1	Model II	Model III	Model IV
Family Obligation	1.158**	1.139*	1.125*	1.142*
Distance (K. Log)		.650***	.642***	.631***
Parent's Age			1.042***	1.049***
Male Parent (1-0)			.568***	.533***
Relationship Qual.			1.677***	1.711***
Parent's Health			.811**	.749***
Parent Alone (1-0)			1.629**	1.765***
Respondent Characteristics				
Education				1.018
Female (1-0)				1.245
In Relationship 1-0				.562**
Disabled (1-0)				.708*
Age				0.99
Number of Sibs.				0.962
Income				1.106**

(logged)				
Supports Kids (1-0)				1.343*
BIC	1603.54	1380.649	1307.18	1326.952
Log Likelihood	-794.66	-679.65	-625.12	-606.54
Model Chi-Square	9.42	239.44	348.5	385.66
Df	2	3	8	16
N	1232	1232	1232	1232

Table 6a. Estimates of respondents providing any support to adult offspring, Dutch sample.

Independent Variable	Model 1	Model II	Model III	Model IV
Family Obligation	1.084	1.087	1.1	1.094
Distance (K. Log)		1.021	0.923	0.908
Offspring Age			.902***	.918***
Son (1-0)			0.922	0.879
Offspring Educ.			1.148***	1.12**
Offspring Married (1-0)			1.326	1.255
Offspring FT Work (1-0)			0.605	0.65
Respondent Characteristics				
Education				1.053
Female (1-0)				0.8
In Relationship 1-0				1.46
Disabled (1-0)				1.448*
Age				0.996
Number of Children				0.866
Income (logged)				1.002
Supports Parents (1-0)				1.972***
BIC	1000.56	1007	969	992.65

Log Likelihood	-493.6	-493.49	-457.8	-442.93
Model Chi-Square	2.04	2.26	73.64	103.38
Df	2	3	8	16
N	792	792	792	792

Table 6b. Estimates of respondents providing any support to adult offspring, American sample.

Independent Variable	Model 1	Model II	Model III	Model IV
Family Obligation	0.988	0.978	0.965	0.97
Distance (K. Log)		.908**	.853***	.856***
Offspring Age			.940***	.920***
Son (1-0)			.766*	.739*
Offspring Educ.			1.139***	1.079*
Offspring Married (1-0)			.618***	.614***
Offspring FT Work (1-0)			.509***	.501***
Respondent Characteristics				
Education				1.03
Female (1-0)				1.361*
In Relationship 1-0				1.105
Disabled (1-0)				0.883
Age				1.052***
Number of Children				.709*
Income (logged)				1.13*
Supports Parents (1-0)				1.122
BIC	1631.5	1628.8	1546.38	1560.87

Log Likelihood	-808.63	-803.73	-744.72	-723.5
Model Chi-Square	0.08	9.88	127.9	170.34
df	2	3	8	16
N	1232	1232	1232	1232

Notes

1. Comparisons of the multivariate models that were estimated for the various dependent variables using multiple imputation, listwise deletion, and mean (and mode in the case of categorical data) imputation revealed few differences based on method. The coefficients found to be significant in the Model IV of each table presented in the paper are also significant in at least one of the other two methods that were used to estimate missing data, and in most cases they were significant across all three estimation methods. There were just two exceptions to this pattern: (1) In the models pertaining to support provided to ageing parents in the United States, the positive effect of having given support to adult children was only found when using mean imputation (and, even then, $p = .05$). In the models pertaining to support to adult offspring in the United States' data the coefficient for adult child's education level was significant when using the multiple imputation method, but was only marginally significant ($p = .06$) when using the other missing data methods.

2. Funding of the public data sets:

NSFH3 was jointly funded by NICHD (Center for Population Research of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development) grant # HD21009 and by NIA (National Institute on Ageing), grant # AG10266.

The Netherlands Kinship Panel Study (NKPS) was financially supported by the "Major Investments Fund" of the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO), under grant 480-10-009. Financial institutional support also was provided by The Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute (NIDI), the Faculty of Social Sciences (Utrecht University), the Faculty of Social and Behavioral Sciences (University of Amsterdam) and the Faculty of Social Science (Tilburg University).