Stability and change in intergenerational family relations across two decades: Findings from the German Ageing Survey, 1996-2014

Anja Steinbach[a], Katharina Mahne[b], Daniela Klaus[c], & Karsten Hank[d]

Abstract

Objectives. Using high quality data from Germany, this study aims to contribute to the yet little knowledge about possible changes in adult parent-child relationships within countries over time.

Method. Analyzing 13,106 interviews from four rounds of the German Ageing Survey (DEAS), covering the period 1996-2014, we monitor stability and change in four dimensions of adult parent-child relationships, namely geographic proximity, frequency of contact, emotional closeness, and exchange of support.

Results. We observed a continuous decrease in parent-child geographic proximity between 1996 and 2008, but no further increase in distance thereafter. There was no change in intergenerational frequency of contact or emotional closeness between 1996-2014. Parents' propensity to support a child tended to decrease in the early 2000s, with signs of recovery in 2014. Whereas parents' receipt of material support from children remained stable, their probability to receive instrumental support declined between 1996-2008, but not any further thereafter.

Discussion. Temporal patterns of intergenerational solidarities within countries might be characterized simultaneously by stability *and* change, where increasing geographic mobility, for example, is paralleled by continuous family cohesion. Family members appear to react to variations in social and economic circumstances with behavioral changes allowing them to maintain high levels of overall intergenerational solidarity.

Keywords: family sociology; intergenerational relations; social change

[a] University of Duisburg-Essen, Germany.
[b] German Center of Gerontology, Berlin, Germany.
[c] Technical University of Berlin, Germany.
[d] University of Cologne, Germany. (Corresponding author: hank@wiso.uni-koeln.de.)

Despite overall high levels of solidarity between family members across two or more generations throughout contemporary Europe and the United States (cf. Kalmijn, 2014; Seltzer & Bianchi, 2013), studies also indicate considerable cross-national variation in the strength of adult intergenerational ties (e.g., Brandt & Deindl, 2013; Hank, 2007; Silverstein et al., 2010). These geographic differences have been suggested to be fairly stable, reflecting longstanding variations in cultural and welfare state characteristics, social norms and preferences. Little is known yet, however, about possible *changes in adult parent-child relationships within countries over time*. Ever since Parsons' (1943) claim of the emergence of an 'isolated nuclear family' and the subsequent discussion, whether this claim really holds true (e.g., Litwak, 1960), many studies (implicitly or explicitly) argue in favor of or against the 'family decline' hypothesis (e.g., Popenoe, 1993). Even though historical census record linkage nowadays provides some opportunities to study kin relations beyond the household over longer historical periods (see Ruggles et al., 2018), suitable repeated cross-sectional data for more recent time periods are still rarely available.

The body of empirical research investigating temporal dynamics of intergenerational family relations around the turn to the 21st century – and the extent to which these may be associated with contemporary societal changes – has thus remained fairly small.[1] Analyzing data from four rounds of the *German Ageing Survey* (DEAS; see Klaus et al., 2017), our study contributes to this sparse literature in two ways: *First*, covering a period of nearly two decades from 1996-2014, our data allow us to monitor stability and change in the relationship between parents and up to four adult children over a longer and more recent period of time than previous studies. *Second*, the DEAS data provide information on multiple dimensions of intergenerational solidarity (Bengtson et al., 2002), which allows us to examine possible differences in the temporal dynamics of adult intergenerational relations by specific outcomes,

[1] A complementary strand of literature assesses the dynamics of intergenerational relationships across *individuals' life course* (cf. Steinbach, 2012).

namely geographic proximity, frequency of contact, emotional closeness, as well as the exchange of material and instrumental support. The German example seems well-suited for our investigation, because it represents – in several ways – an 'average' case with a pattern of intergenerational solidarity in-between the extremes of the (Western) European continuum of family ties, characterized by weaker ones in the Nordic countries and stronger ones in the Mediterranean countries (e.g., Brandt & Deindl, 2013; Hank, 2007; Silverstein et al., 2010).

Previous Research on Stability & Change in Intergenerational Relations

Alterations in adult parent-child relationships within countries over time might result from behavioral and/or compositional changes in the population (e.g., Kalmijn & De Vries, 2009; Treas & Guberskaya, 2012). *Behavioral changes* may be triggered by period effects, such as macroeconomic crises (e.g., Fonseca et al., 2016; Preoteasa et al., 2018), as well as by secular trends, such as declining norms of family obligations and rising values of individualism (e.g., Gans & Silverstein, 2006; Roberts & Bengtson, 1999). *Compositional changes* might be driven by population shifts in socio-demographic factors correlated with intergenerational relations, such as family structure or education (e.g., Kalmijn, 2006; Steinbach & Hank, 2016).

However, not all dimensions of the adult parent-child relationship – as described, for example, in the solidarity-conflict model proposed by Bengtson and colleagues (2002) – need to be affected in the same way by such shocks, trends, or shifts. It is therefore important to distinguish different aspects of this relationship. Previous research investigating temporal changes in parent-child proximity (*structural solidarity*) tended to focus on the decline of intergenerational coresidence during the 20th century (e.g., Grundy, 2000; Ruggles, 2007). This trend, however, appears to have reversed in recent years (Fingerman, 2017). Moreover, van der Pas et al. (2007) showed for the Netherlands that further declines in coresidence were paralleled by increasing intergenerational proximity between 1992 and 2002. Along the same lines,

Shelton and Grundy (2000) found that in Britain the proportion of non-coresident adult children living farther away from their mothers was significantly lower in 1999 than in 1986.

Also in contrast to notions of rising individualism and family fragmentation in Western societies, there is no clear indication of a trend towards reduced intergenerational contact frequency (*associational solidarity*) during the mid-1980s through the early-2000s; some studies even suggest an increase, especially if contacts other than face-to-face visits are considered (e.g., Grundy & Shelton, 2001; Kalmijn & De Vries, 2009; Treas & Gubernskaya, 2012; van der Pas et al., 2007; also see Fingerman, 2017). Emotional closeness (*affectual solidarity*) has been shown to bear a mutually reinforcing association with intergenerational contact (e.g., Hogerbrugge & Komter, 2012). Even though one may expect a trend towards greater emotional closeness between older parents and their children – resulting from declining generational differences in values and more liberal child-rearing styles – "[i]t is not well known if intergenerational relationships have [actually] become more or less positive over time" (Kalmijn, 2014, p. 387; also see Fingerman, 2017).

Finally, so far barely any research explicitly investigated temporal changes in intergenerational transfers of time or money (*functional solidarity*) between adult family members. Van der Pas et al. (2007), however, found that somewhat more emotional and instrumental support was exchanged between Dutch parents and children in 2002 than in 1992. Fingerman (2017) suggests that recently increasing rates of coresidence in some industrialized nations might indicate growing flows of in-kind transfers of material resources from parents to adult children and vice versa (especially in Southern Europe; see Albertini et al. 2007). Moreover, Kornrich and Furstenberg (2013) showed that from the early 1970s to the late 2000s US parents' spending on their children shifted from expenditures predominantly dedicated to teenage offspring towards young adult children in their mid-20s. Even though the authors explicitly focused on parental investments in children rather than on financial support, "it appears that parents are reconciled to the reality that it takes longer for their children to reach

economic maturity than it did a half-century ago" (Kornrich & Furstenberg, 2013, p. 3; also see Henretta et al., 2018).

Despite some indication of shifts in population composition, their net effect on observed change in intergenerational relations has been proposed to be small (e.g., Kalmijn & De Vries, 2009; Treas & Gubernskaya, 2012). Rather, van der Pas et al. (2007, p. 269), for example, "believe that the changes that have taken place in attitudes towards the family have had a more profound effect on parent-child relationships than social developments such as the increase of female participation in the labor market or an increase in divorce and remarriage." Greater autonomy in intergenerational family relations, where individual commitments partially replaced fixed obligations (Gans & Silverstein, 2006), thus seems to have contributed to closer rather than more distant ties. Moreover, advances in communication technologies and transportation facilitated proximity and contacts between parents and their non-coresident children (Fingerman, 2017). These developments in Western societies, together with parents' prolonged financial responsibilities for children (resulting from delays in the transition to adulthood), have created a situation, in which one may find some trend towards overall stronger adult intergenerational solidarities. Thus, if we were to expect any changes at all, there should be an increase in geographic proximity, frequency of contacts, emotional closeness, and material as well as instrumental support among parents and adult children in Germany during our observation period (that is, between 1996 and 2014).

METHOD

Our analysis draws on data derived from the German Ageing Survey (DEAS; Klaus et al., 2017), a nationally representative study of non-institutionalized adults aged 40 to 85. Cross-sectional samples were drawn in 1996, 2002, 2008, and 2014, covering birth cohorts from 1911 through 1974. Because the first round of data collection was limited to German citizens, we exclude interviews with non-German respondents conducted in subsequent rounds. The

response rate declined from initially 59% to 27% in 2014, following a common trend also observed in international surveys, but remaining in the same order of magnitude achieved in other German studies.[2] The samples have been disproportionally stratified into three age groups (40-54; 55-69; 70-85), gender, and region (East; West). The oldest age group as well as men and East Germans were oversampled.

The pooled sample size across all waves is 19,746. Excluding respondents without any living children (2,524), relationships with minor and/or coresident[3] children (3,749), as well as cases with missing values on any of our dependent and control variables (367) leaves us with an analytic sample of 13,106 parents reporting on 24,450 dyadic relationships to a maximum of four adult children (see *Table 1* for detailed descriptive sample statistics). Our final dataset thus has a hierarchical structure, where multiple parent-child dyads (Level 1) may be nested in one respondent (Level 2). We therefore estimate two-level random intercept *hierarchical linear models* (see Gelman & Hill, 2007: Part 2A) for each dependent variable. Despite their binary or ordered outcomes (see below), we opted for linear probability models, because these have been suggested as a suitable alternative to, say, logistic models, if the comparison of coefficients across models with different independent variables in a sample is a primary concern (e.g., Mood 2010, p. 78), which is the case in our analysis.

[Table 1 about here]

The *dependent variables* are operationalized as follows: (a) Geographic proximity has four categories, namely 'living in the same town' [4], 'living in another town within a radius of

[2] Whereas there is no indication of increasing sample selectivity in the DEAS over time, we observe a general pattern of slightly lower participation rates in large cities, among women as well as in the middle-aged (40-54 years) and oldest (70-85 years) age groups. Overall, socio-demographic characteristics in the survey have been shown to match well the respective distribution in the population (Klaus et al., 2017; for more detailed analyses see Klaus & Engstler, 2017).

[3] Because DEAS does not provide any information on intergenerational contact and the exchange of material/instrumental support with coresiding children, these parent-child dyads were excluded from our analysis.

2 hours' [3], 'living farther away in Germany' [2], and 'living farther away abroad' [1]. (b) Frequency of contact (comprising all contact modes) has seven categories, namely 'never' [1], 'less often than several times a year' [2], 'several times a year' [3], '1-3 times per months' [4], 'once a week' [5], 'several times a week' [6], and 'daily' [7]. (c) Emotional closeness has five categories, namely 'not close at all' [1], 'not very close' [2], 'moderately close' [3], 'close' [4], and 'very close' [5]. (d) Exchange of support is assessed by a set of four binary variables allowing us to distinguish (i) which kind of support (material or instrumental) the parent may have (ii) provided to or received by a specific child in the 12 months preceding the DEAS interview. 'Material support' comprises regular financial support as well as larger monetary and non-monetary gifts, whereas 'instrumental support' refers to help with housework, such as cleaning, small repairs, or shopping.

Because we are primarily interested in assessing whether intergenerational relations have changed over time, the main 'explanatory' variable of interest in all models is *survey year* (represented by a set of dummies, where '1996' constitutes the reference). Starting out from baseline models without any *control variables*, we estimate further models including socio-demographic characteristics of the *respondents* which previous studies have shown to be associated with our outcome variables (e.g., Kalmijn, 2014), namely: age (40-85), sex (where 1 indicates that the respondent is a father, 0 otherwise), education (represented by three binary indicators for 'low' [ref.], 'medium', and 'high' levels of education), the number of children, partnership status (where 1 indicates that the respondent has a partner, 0 otherwise), self-rated health (five categories ranging from 'very bad' to 'very good'), and region (where 1 indicates residence in West Germany, 0 in East Germany). Moreover, several adult *child* characteristics enter the regressions, namely: relationship to parent (where 1 indicates a biological relationship, 0 otherwise), sex (where 1 indicates a son, 0 a daughter), marital and parental status (as binary outcomes), as well as employment status (represented by three binary indicators: 'working' [ref.], 'in education', 'other'). We thereby aim to account for possible changes in population

composition and a remaining effect of 'survey year' would thus indicate behavioral changes in adult parent-child relationships.

RESULTS

The multivariate results for our first set of dependent variables – proximity, contact, and emotional closeness – are presented in *Table 2*; those for the second set – indicating intergenerational exchange of material and instrumental support – are displayed in *Table 3*.[4]

[Table 2 about here]

Table 2 (column (*a*)) shows that parent-child geographic proximity continuously decreased between 1996 and 2008, whereas we observe no statistically significant further increase in distance thereafter. Intergenerational contacts (column (*b*)) were most frequent in 2002 and emotional closeness (column (*c*)) was weakest in 2014, but there is no indication of any kind of trend, that is, systematic change in parent-child frequency of contact or closeness between 1996 and 2014.

Turning to the intergenerational exchange of support in *Table 3*, columns (*a*) and (*c*) show that the propensity to support a child materially or instrumentally tended to decrease in the early 2000s, with some signs of recovery in 2014. Whereas parents' receipt of material support from children remained stable – at a very low incidence level – over time (column (*c*)), their probability to receive instrumental support continuously declined between 1996 and 2008, but not any further thereafter (column (*d*)).

[Table 3 about here]

Controlling for parents' and children's socio-demographic characteristics in Models 2 did not have any substantial impact on the initially estimated associations between 'survey year'

[4] See Mahne and Huxhold (2017) as well as Klaus and Mahne (2017) for more detailed descriptive accounts.

and any of our dependent variables (in Models 1). The coefficients of the socio-demographic controls generally turned out to be as expected from previous research and shall therefore not be discussed in greater detail.

CONCLUSIONS

Using multiple rounds of data collected by the German Ageing Survey, this study aimed to investigate stability and change in various dimensions of adult parent-child relations across two decades, from 1996 through 2014. Four main conclusions can be derived from our analysis: *First*, if we observe any changes over time at all, these appear to result from behavioral rather than compositional changes, which we account for by controlling for an array of parent and child socio-demographic variables. This finding is consistent with, for example, Treas' and Gubernskaya's (2012) study of changes in maternal contact.

Second, different from our expectations derived from previous research, we observed a *decline* in adult parent-child geographic proximity and the propensity to exchange material/instrumental support in the early 2000s. Both trends, however, appear to be levelling off (or even reversing) in the most recent DEAS collected in 2014. Even though we controlled for a number of characteristics potentially affecting parents' and children's capacities and needs (such as their health or partnership status), we cannot fully determine the extent to which temporal variation in these factors mattered here. One might also speculate, whether the most recent financial and economic crisis played a role (e.g., Preoteasa et al., 2018), but this would clearly require further research.

Third, if we look at other important dimensions of intergenerational solidarity, namely frequency of contact and emotional closeness, our results indicate that they remained *stable*, at high levels, throughout the entire observation period. This supports Litwak's argument – put forward as early as 1960 – that increasing geographic mobility of family members need not be

paralleled by declining family cohesion (e.g. because of improvements in communication technologies; see Peng et al., 2018).

Fourth, and finally, even if we observed *statistically* significant temporal dynamics in some of the aforementioned dimensions of intergenerational solidarity, these are not necessarily *substantively*, that is, socially relevant (see Bernardi et al., 2017, for a general discussion of this issue).[5] The lack of support for our initial expectation of an increasing quality of adult parent-child relations over time should therefore not be any reason for concern, but might rather be interpreted as indication of some kind of 'ceiling effect', where already high levels of solidarity may leave relatively little room for further improvements in the German context (which has been suggested to be characterized by lower *preferences* for, say, intergenerational proximity and contact than Mediterranean contexts; e.g., Hank, 2007). Moreover, our study shows that temporal patterns of intergenerational solidarities within countries might be characterized simultaneously by stability *and* change, where increasing geographic mobility, for example, is paralleled by continuous family cohesion. Family members appear to react to variations in social and economic circumstances with behavioral changes allowing them to maintain high levels of overall intergenerational solidarity.

Next to having provided these novel insights, the present study also suffers from several *limitations*: *First*, similar to the study by van der Pas et al. (2007), our results may reflect both period and potentially confounding cohort effects, controlled for age effects (also see Henretta et al., 2018). *Second*, the time period covered by our study is purely determined by the availability of DEAS data. That is, we do not know whether – if seen from a longer-term historical perspective – the patterns observed here are typical or rather exceptional. *Third*, and finally, our study focused on parent-child relationships, excluding family relations across more

[5] This is also true for *coresidence*, which – for reasons explained above – we did not look into in greater detail. Adult parent-child coresidence rates in the DEAS sample decreased from 23% in 1996 to 21% in 2014, which is a statistically significant, but substantively negligible decline.

than two adult generations. Especially grandparent-grandchild relationships have received growing attention in the recent literature and are likely to exhibit temporal patterns of stability and change similar to those described here (e.g., Hank et al., 2018; Mahne & Klaus, 2017).

These limitations, however, do not challenge the main substantive conclusion drawn here: In the two decades around the turn to the 21st century intergenerational family relations in Germany generally exhibited continuously high levels of solidarity. Our findings thus provide no indication of substantial changes in adult parent-child relationships over time, which might have lent support to previously expressed concerns regarding a possible decline in the importance of primary family ties in contemporary Western societies.

REFERENCES

Albertini, M., Kohli, M., & Vogel, C. (2007). Intergenerational transfers of time and money in European families: common patterns – different regimes? *Journal of European Social Policy*, *17*, 319-334. doi:10.1177/0958928707081068

Bengtson, V.L., Giarrusso, R., Mabry, J.B., & Silverstein, M. (2002). Solidarity, conflict, and ambivalence: complementary or competing perspectives on intergenerational relationships? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *64*, 568–576. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2002.00568.x

Bernardi, F., Chakhaia, L., & Leopold, L. (2017). 'Sing me a song with social significance': the (mis)use of statistical significance testing in European sociological research. *European Sociological Review*, 33, 1-15.

Brandt, M., & Deindl, C. (2013). Intergenerational transfers to adult children in Europe: do social policies matter? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *75*, 235-251. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2012.01028.x

Fingerman, K.L. (2017). Millenials and their parents: Implications of the new young adulthood for midlife adults. *Innovation in Aging*, *1*, 1-16. doi: 10.1093/geroni/igx02

Fonseca. G., Cinha, D., Crespo, C., & Relvas, A.P. (2016). Families in the context of macroeconomic crises: a systematic review. *Journal of Family Psychology*, *30*, 687-697. doi:10.1037/fam0000230

Gans, D., & Silverstein, M. (2006). Norms of filial responsibility for aging parents across time and generations. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *68*, 961-976. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2006.00307.x

Gelman, A. & Hill, J. (2007). *Data Analysis Using Regression and Multilevel / Hierarchical Models*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511790942

Grundy, E. (2000). Co-residence of mid-life children with their elderly parents in England and Wales: changes between 1981 and 1991. *Population Studies*, *54*, 193-206.

Grundy, E., & Shelton, N. (2001). Contact between adult children and their parents in Great Britain, 1986-99. *Environment and Planning A: Economic and Space*, *33*, 685-679.

Hank, K. (2007). Proximity and contacts between older parents and their children: a European comparison. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *69*, 157-173. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2006.00351.x

Hank, K., Cavrini, G., Di Gessa, G., & Tomassini, C. (2018). What do we know about grandparents? Insights from recent quantitative data and identification of future data needs. *European Journal of Ageing*, *15*, 225-235. doi:10.1007/s10433-018-0468-1

Henretta, J., Van Voorhis, M.F., & Soldo, B.J. (2018). Cohort differences in parental financial help to adult children. *Demography*, *55*, 1567-1582. doi:10.1007/s13524-018-0687-2

Hogerbrugge, M.J.A., & Komter, A.E. (2012). Solidarity and ambivalence: comparing two perspectives on intergenerational relations using longitudinal panel data. *Journals of Gerontology: Social Sciences*, *67*, 372-383. doi:10.1093/geronb/gbr157

Kalmijn, M. (2006). Educational inequality and family relationships: influences on contact and proximity. *European Sociological Review, 22*, 1-16. doi:10.1093/esr/jci036

Kalmijn, M. (2014). Adult intergenerational relationships. In J. Treas et al. (Eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to the Sociology of Families* (pp. 385-403), Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons. doi:10.1002/9781118374085.ch19

Kalmijn, M., & De Vries, J. (2009). Change and stability in parent-child contact in five Western countries. *European Journal of Population, 25*, 257-276. doi:10.1007/s10680-008-9176-4

Klaus, D., & Engstler, H. (2017). Daten und Methoden des Deutschen Alterssurveys. In K. Mahne, J.K. Wolff, J. Simonson, C. Tesch-Römer (Eds.), *Altern im Wandel. Zwei Jahrzehnte Deutscher Alterssurvey* (pp. 29-45). Wiesbaden: Springer VS. doi: 10.1007/978-3-658-12502-8_2

Klaus, D., Engstler, H., Mahne, K., Wolff, J.K., Simonson, J., Wurm, S., & Tesch-Römer, C. (2017). Cohort profile: the German Ageing Survey (DEAS). *International Journal of Epidemiology, 46*, 1105-1105g. doi:10.1093/ije/dyw326

Klaus, D., & Mahne, K. (2017). Zeit gegen Geld? Der Austausch von Unterstützung zwischen den Generationen. In K. Mahne, J.K. Wolff, J. Simonson, C. Tesch-Römer (Eds.), *Altern im Wandel. Zwei Jahrzehnte Deutscher Alterssurvey* (pp. 247-256). Wiesbaden: Springer VS. doi: 10.1007/978-3-658-12502-8_16

Kornrich, S., & Furstenberg, F. (2013). Investing in children: changes in parental spending on children, 1972-2007. *Demography, 50*, 1-23. doi:10.1007/s 13524-012-0146-4

Litwak, E. (1960). Geographic mobility and extended family cohesion. *American Sociological Review, 25*, 385-394. doi:10.2307/2092085

Mahne, K., & Huxhold, O. (2017). Nähe auf Distanz: Bleiben die Beziehungen zwischen älteren Eltern und ihren erwachsenen Kindern trotz wachsender Wohnentfernungen gut? In K. Mahne, J.K. Wolff, J. Simonson, C. Tesch-Römer. (Eds.), *Altern im Wandel. Zwei*

Jahrzehnte Deutscher Alterssurvey (pp.215-230). Wiesbaden: Springer VS. doi:10.1007/978-3-658-12502-8_14

Mahne, K., & Klaus, D. (2017). Zwischen Enkelglück und (Groß-)Elternpflicht – die Bedeutung und Ausgestaltung von Beziehungen zwischen Großeltern und Enkelkindern. In K. Mahne, J.K. Wolff, J. Simonson, C. Tesch-Römer. (Eds.), *Altern im Wandel. Zwei Jahrzehnte Deutscher Alterssurvey* (pp.231-245). Wiesbaden: Springer VS. doi:10.1007/978-3-658-12502-8_15

Mood, C. (2010). Logistic regression: why we cannot do what we thing we can do, and what we can do about it. *European Sociological Review*, *26*, 67-82. doi:10.1093/esr/jcp006

Parsons, T. (1943). The kinship system of the contemporary U.S. *American Anthropologist*, *45*, 22-38. doi:10.1525/aa.1943.45.1.02a00030

Peng, S., Silverstein, M., Suitor, J.J., Gilligan, M., Hwang, W., Nam, S., & Routh, B. (2018). Use of communication technology to maintain intergenerational contact: toward an understanding of 'digital solidarity'. In B.B. Neves & C. Casimiro (Eds.), *Connecting families? Information & communication technologies, generations, and the life course* (pp. 159-179). Bristol: Policy Press.

Popenoe, D. (1993). American family decline, 1960–1990: A review and appraisal. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *55*, 527-555. doi:10.2307/353333

Preoteasa, A.M., Vlase, I., & Tufă, L.A. (2018). Intergenerational support as a reaction to socio-economic crisis: alteration of solidarity within precarious Romanian households. *European Societies*, *20*, 111-130. doi:10.1080/14616696.2017.1402123

Roberts, R.E.L., & Bengtson, V.L. (1999). The social psychology of values: effects of individual development, social change, and family transmission over the life span. In C. Ryff & V.W. Marshall (Eds.), *The self and social processes in aging* (pp. 453-482). New York: Springer.

Ruggles, S. (2007). The decline of intergenerational coresidence in the United States, 1850 to 2000. *American Sociological Review, 72,* 964-989. doi:10.1177/000312240707200606

Ruggles, S., Fitch, C.A., & Roberts, E. (2018). Historical census record linkage. *Annual Review of Sociology, 44,* 19-37. doi: 10.1146/annurev-soc-073117-041447

Seltzer, J.A. & Bianchi, S.M. (2013). Demographic change and parent-child relationships in adulthood. *Annual Review of Sociology, 39,* 275-290. doi:10.1146/annurev-soc-071312-145602

Shelton, N., & Grundy, E. (2000). Proximity of adults children to their parents in Great Britain. *International Journal of Population Geography, 6,* 181-195. doi:10.1002/1099-1220

Silverstein, M., Gans, D., Lowenstein, A., Giarrusso R., & Bengtson, V. L. (2010). Older parent-child relationships in six nations: the intersection of affection and conflict. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 72,* 1006-1021. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00745.x

Steinbach, A. (2012). Intergenerational relations across the life-course. *Advances in Life Course Research,* 17, 93-99. doi:10.1016/j.alcr.2012.06.002

Steinbach, A., & Hank, K. (2016). Intergenerational relations in older stepfamilies: a comparison of France, Germany, and Russia. *Journals of Gerontology: Social Sciences*, *71,* 880-888. doi:10.1093/geronb/gbw046

Treas, J., & Gubernskaya, Z. (2012). Farewell to moms? Maternal contact for seven countries in 1986 and 2001. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *74,* 297-311. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2012.00956.x

van der Pas, S., van Tilburg, T., & Knipscheer, K. (2007). Changes in contact and support within intergenerational relationships in the Netherlands: a cohort and time-sequential perspective. *Advances in Life Course Research*, *12*, 243-274. doi:10.1016/S1040-2608(07)12009-8

TABLES

Table 1: *Descriptive sample statistics – unweighted percentages / means (standard errors)*

	All	1996	2002	2008	2014
Dependent variables					
Geographic proximity (1-4)	2.2 (0.9)	2.4 (1.0)	2.3 (0.9)	2.2 (0.9)	2.2 (0.9)
Frequency of contact (1-7)	5.2 (1.4)	5.2 (1.4)	5.3 (1.3)	5.2 (1.3)	5.2 (1.4)
Emotional closeness (1-5)	4.3 (0.9)	4.3 (0.8)	4.4 (0.8)	4.3 (0.8)	4.3 (0.9)
Material support *for* children	22	23	21	18	25
Material support *from* children	2	2	2	1	2
Instrumental support *for* children	6	7	5	5	8
Instrumental support *from* children	7	12	9	4	5
Respondent (parent) characteristics					
Age (40-85)	65.8 (10.0)	64.5 (10.1)	65.5 (10.1)	66.2 (10.0)	66.4 (9.9)
Sex (resp. is child's father)	50	49	49	50	51
'Low' level of education	15	20	19	15	10
'Medium' level of education	54	58	52	53	51
'High' level of education	31	22	29	32	39
# of children	2.7 (1.2)	2.8 (1.3)	2.7 (1.2)	2.7 (1.2)	2.6 (1.2)
Respondent has a partner	79	78	78	80	81
Self-rated health (1-5)	3.4 (0.9)	3.4 (0.8)	3.4 (0.9)	3.4 (0.9)	3.4 (0.8)
Resp. lives in West Germany	64	63	64	63	64
Adult child characteristics					
Relationship to parent: biological	94	93	93	95	94
Sex (child is resp.'s son)	49	47	49	49	49
Marital status (married)	56	65	61	54	49
Parental status (has children)	61	66	64	60	58

Employment – working	77	76	76	77	80
Employment – in education	8	6	8	8	9
Employment – other	15	18	16	15	11
N (parent-child dyads)	24,450	5,539	3,622	7,757	7,532
N (respondents)	13,106	2,971	1,920	4,121	4,094

Note: DEAS 1996 (Release 3.0), 2002 (Release 3.0), 2008 (Release 3.0), and 2014 (Release 1.0).

Table 2: *Hierarchical linear regression results for parent-child geographic proximity, frequency of contact, and emotional closeness, 1996-2014*

	(a) Proximity		*(b) Contact*		*(c) Closeness*	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
Survey year (ref.: 1996)						
2002	-0.07**	-0.05*	0.10**	0.10**	0.04	0.03
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.02)
2008	-0.18***[(a)]	-0.14***[(a)]	0.03	0.02[(a)]	-0.00	-0.03[(a)]
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.02)
2014	-0.21***	-0.16***	-0.02	-0.04	-0.05**[(a)]	-0.09***[(a)]
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.02)
Resp. (parent) characteristics						
Age (40-85)		-0.00***		-0.00*		0.00
		(0.00)		(0.00)		(0.00)
Sex (father)		0.04**		-0.31***		-0.26***
		(0.01)		(0.02)		(0.01)
Education (ref.: low)						
Medium		-0.08***		0.06		0.05*
		(0.02)		(0.03)		(0.02)
High		-0.25***		0.06		0.14***
		(0.02)		(0.04)		(0.02)
# of children		-0.04***		-0.16***		-0.06***
		(0.01)		(0.01)		(0.01)
Resp. has a partner		-0.02		0.31***		0.17***
		(0.02)		(0.03)		(0.02)
Self-rated health		-0.02**		0.03*		0.05***
		(0.01)		(0.01)		(0.01)

West Germany		0.07***		0.20***		-0.02
		(0.01)		(0.02)		(0.01)
Adult child characteristics						
Biological child		-0.01		0.36***		0.37***
		(0.03)		(0.04)		(0.02)
Sex (son)		0.02		-0.30***		-0.13***
		(0.01)		(0.02)		(0.01)
Married		-0.01		0.02		0.03**
		(0.01)		(0.02)		(0.01)
Has children		0.17***		0.14***		0.00
		(0.01)		(0.02)		(0.01)
Employment (ref.: working)						
In education		-0.15***		0.07*		0.11***
		(0.02)		(0.03)		(0.02)
Other		0.04*		-0.03		-0.10***
		(0.02)		(0.02)		(0.01)
Constant	2.36***	2.69***	5.25***	5.16***	4.36***	3.89***
	(0.01)	(0.07)	(0.02)	(0.11)	(0.01)	(0.07)
r^2	0.01	0.03	0.00	0.06	0.00	0.06
N (parent-child)			24,450			
N (respondents)			13,106			

Note: Own calculations based on DEAS 1996 (Release 3.0), 2002 (Release 3.0), 2008 (Release 3.0), and 2014 (Release 1.0). [(a)] F-test of equality of regression coefficients indicates significant difference (p<.001) from previous survey year. *Significance:* *** p<.001; ** p<.01; * p<.05.

Table 3: *Hierarchical linear regression results for parent-child exchange of material and instrumental support, 1996-2014*

	(a) Material support for *children*		*(b) Material support* from *children*		*(c) Instrumental support* for *children*		*(d) Instrumental support* from *children*	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
Survey year (ref.: 1996)								
2002	-0.03*	-0.04***	-0.01	-0.01	-0.02***	-0.02***	-0.04***	-0.04***
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
2008	-0.06***[(a)]	-0.08***[(a)]	-0.01**	-0.01**	-0.02***	-0.02***	-0.08***[(a)]	-0.08***[(a)]
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
2014	0.02[(a)]	-0.02*[(a)]	0.00[(a)]	0.00[(a)]	0.00[(a)]	0.00[(a)]	-0.07***	-0.07***
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Resp. (parent) characteristics								
Age (40-85)		-0.00***		-0.00		-0.00***		0.00*
		(0.00)		(0.00)		(0.00)		(0.00)
Sex (father)		-0.01		-0.00		0.02***		0.00
		(0.01)		(0.00)		(0.00)		(0.00)
Education (ref.: low)								
Medium		0.04***		-0.00		0.00		0.00

	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.01)
High	0.15***	0.00	0.02***	0.01
	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.01)
# of children	-0.04***	-0.00	-0.01***	-0.01***
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Respondent has partner	0.05***	-0.01***	0.01**	-0.04***
	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.00)
Self-rated health	0.01***	-0.00	0.01*	-0.02***
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
West Germany	0.06***	-0.00	0.01	-0.02***
	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Adult child characteristics				
Biological child	0.03**	0.01*	0.02*	0.01
	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Sex (son)	-0.01	-0.00	-0.01***	-0.00
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Married	-0.03***	0.00	-0.01*	0.00
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Has children	0.01	0.00	0.02***	0.00

		(0.01)		(0.00)		(0.00)		(0.00)
Employment (ref.: working)								
In Education		0.20***		-0.01*		-0.01*		-0.00
		(0.01)		(0.00)		(0.01)		(0.01)
Other		0.02***		-0.00*		0.01		0.00
		(0.01)		(0.00)		(0.00)		(0.00)
Constant	0.25***	0.27***	0.02***	0.04***	0.07***	0.13***	0.12***	0.22***
	(0.01)	(0.03)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.02)	(0.00)	(0.02)
r^2	0.00	0.09	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.02	0.03
N (parent-child)					24,450			
N (respondents)					13,106			

Note: Own calculations based on DEAS 1996 (Release 3.0), 2002 (Release 3.0), 2008 (Release 3.0), and 2014 (Release 1.0). [(a)] F-test of equality of regression coefficients indicates significant difference (p<.001) from previous survey year. *Significance:* *** p<.001; ** p<.01; * p<.05.