4 Filial obligations among immigrants and native Dutch: A comparison of perceptions and behaviour among ethnic groups and generations

Djamila Schans and Helga de Valk

4.1 Introduction

Filial obligation, both perceptions and behaviour thereof, are often supposed to differ across ethnic groups. Immigrants from non-Western countries are supposed to originate from, and be part of, family systems that have strong interdependent ties and obligations compared to natives in the host society (Bolzman, Poncioni-Derigo, Vial & Fibbi 2004; Reher 1998). How and to what extent the immigration experience affects perceptions and behaviour regarding filial obligations is still rather unexplored. The literature is contradictory on the importance of ethnic background for filial obligations. Some North American studies show that expectations parents have towards their children indeed differ by ethnic group (Burr & Mutchler 1999; Lee, Peek & Coward 1994; Rosenthal 1986). Other studies, however, point to the fact that inter-ethnic differences are the result of differences in demographic characteristics and socio-economic position between natives and immigrants (Glick & Van Hook 2002; Mitchell, Wister & Gee 2004; Sarkisian, Gerena & Gerstel 2007). Differences in family relations across ethnic groups may thus not be as large as assumed and may be partially explained by socio-economic position (Silverstein & Waite 1993; Schans & Komter 2006). De Valk and Schans (2008) found that older immigrants, especially, have higher filial obligation expectations than their Dutch counterparts, but few studies have examined both perceptions of filial obligation and actual support behaviour, nor has the importance of perceptions for behaviour received much attention yet.

In addition, the available research focuses on North America, and much less is known on how these compare to the European situation. Given the provision of welfare state arrangements in many European societies like the Netherlands, one could assume that perceptions and behaviour regarding care for the elderly are different from those societies in which the state offers only very limited support to families in this respect. The importance of ethnic characteristics for filial obligations may thus vary according to the social context (Baldassar 2008). Getting more advanced insights into the determinants of filial obligations of immigrants and their offspring is also of societal relevance now that a substantial and growing

proportion of the elderly in many Western countries has an immigrant origin. In the Netherlands, for example, the ethnic composition of the population has changed significantly since the 1960s; today, around 10 per cent of the 16.4 million inhabitants of the Netherlands originate from non-Western backgrounds, mostly from labour-exporting countries such as Turkey and Morocco and the former Dutch colonies of Suriname and the Antilles. These demographic developments may have serious implications for care, policy and family relations (Warnes, Friedrich, Kellaheer & Torres 2004).

The aims of this chapter are threefold. First of all, we ask whether perceptions and behaviour regarding filial obligations differ between immigrants and the Dutch. Secondly, we explore whether there are differences in perceptions between generations among each of the ethnic groups. Finally, we analyse actual support behaviour in immigrant and Dutch families and question the importance of filial norms for such support. For each of these three research topics we aim to show how immigrant background compares to other socio-demographic features that could be of influence. Our study focuses on the Netherlands and includes Turks, Moroccans, Surinamese, Caribbeans as well as native Dutch.

4.2 Theory on filial obligations

Filial obligations can be interpreted both as attitudes and actual behaviour. In the first sense, it refers to a societal attitude towards the duty of (adult) children to meet the needs of their ageing parents. In the latter way, filial obligations refer to the support provided by adult children to their parents. Rossi and Rossi (1990) defined norms of filial responsibility as culturally defined rights and duties that specify both the ways in which family members are expected to behave towards each other and the obligations to exchange and provide support to one another. It is argued that an individual's expectations of, and attitudes towards, filial obligation develop during socialisation, by personal experiences as well as by observing relationships between family members of different generations (Burr & Mutchler 1999). The provision of support, however, is determined by socio-demographic circumstances as well, and it is as of yet unclear whether ethnic differences in attitudes towards filial obligations can be directly translated into ethnic differences in support behaviour. Findings from previous research are indecisive on this point and seem to depend on the type of support under study. For example, Eggebeen (1992) found that immigrants in the United States were less likely to provide financial support to kin than were Euro-Americans, but found no ethnic differences in the case of emotional and practical support.

Two different points of view regarding the importance of ethnic background for filial obligations are found in the literature. From a cultural perspective, differences in attitudes towards familial norms and family responsibilities are emphasised to explain differences in levels of actual filial support. Theories of 'family systems' suggest that family relations and related expectations reflect the importance attached to kinship in a society. Several authors have argued that in more collectivistic societies kinship ties take centre stage (Todd 1985; Inglehart & Baker 2000; Kagitcibasi 1996; Reher 1998). Kagitcibasi (1996) refers to these societies as 'cultures of relatedness'. It can be assumed that many immigrant older people in the Netherlands were socialised in such kinship-oriented societies, where intergenerational interdependence was a prerequisite for a family's material well-being. Dutch society, on the other hand, as many Western countries, is characterised by individualism and the independence or autonomy of parents and children. According to Kagitcibasi (1996), family relations in the Netherlands exemplify the 'culture of separateness'. In these societies, support is mainly provided by the welfare state.

Alternatively, some studies point to the fact that inter-ethnic differences in filial obligations are not so much cultural differences, but rather the result of differences in demographic characteristics and socio-economic position between natives and immigrants (Glick & Van Hook 2002; Mitchell, Wister & Gee 2004). This second point of view suggests that not only is difference between groups of importance, but also within groups. Acculturation theories, furthermore, suggest that over time immigrants adjust their perceptions and orientations to the cultural patterns of the country of residence (Alba & Nee 1997). This does not imply that norms and values from the country of origin are totally abandoned, but rather that the immigration experience prompts their revision (Kagitcibasi 1996). Living in the host society for a longer period of time or being born in the host society increases exposure to new values. This line of reasoning would lead to expectations of larger generational differences in the importance attached to filial obligation among immigrant families than is the case for natives.

4.3 Immigrant groups in the Netherlands

Large-scale immigration to the Netherlands started in the 1960s and, since then, there have been distinct successive flows. The earliest immigrants came from former Dutch colonies, like Surinam and the Antilles in the Caribbean. Due to the colonial ties, many Surinamese and Antillean immigrants were familiar with Dutch society and had some command of the language (Vermeulen & Penninx 2000).

The second large flow, as in many other Western European countries, was of predominantly unskilled, male labour immigrants from Southern

Europe and the Mediterranean, particularly Turkey and Morocco. Many of them had their families; wives and children, come to the Netherlands during the 1980s and 1990s. Today, first-generation Turkish and Moroccan immigrants have a low socio-economic status in the Netherlands. Due to economic recession and disability resulting from the physical work they performed, many became dependent on state benefits. The second generation is much more diversified, but even among second-generation Turks and Moroccans, unemployment and state dependency is much higher than among native Dutch. The Surinamese and Antillean socio-economic position is very diverse, though generally lies between the position of the native Dutch, on the one hand, and that of the Turks and Moroccans, on the other. All groups brought with them their own cultural and demographic features (De Valk & Liefbroer 2007). Turkish and Moroccan societies are predominantly Islamic, patrilineally organised and segregated by gender. Strong interdependent relations between family members exist that are prescribed by social norms. The Surinamese and Antillean Caribbean family system, in contrast to the Turkish and Moroccan family system, is often described as matrifocal with a relative absence of cultural norms that promote marriage and tolerance of non-marital childbearing. It is not unusual for households to be headed by women with male partners only occasionally, if ever, present.

4.4 Hypotheses

Based on the literature and theoretical notions we formulate six hypotheses.

4.4.1 Ethnic background and perceptions

Based on theories of different family systems (Todd 1985; Inglehart & Baker 2000; Kagitcibasi 1996; Reher 1998), immigrants in the Netherlands are expected to have grown up in more traditional group-oriented societies. Even though immigrant children are raised in the Netherlands, parental socialisation into ethnic specific behaviour is of importance for the perceptions and behaviour of children. This is especially the case for those issues that relate to the private sphere of life (De Valk & Liefbroer 2007). Contrary to societies from which many immigrants originate, Dutch society is generally characterised by individualisation and the independence of parents and children. We therefore hypothesise that immigrants will be more often of the opinion that children should support their parents than is the case for Dutch (H_1).

According to acculturation theories, immigrants will focus their perceptions and behaviour on their country of residence. This is particularly the case for immigrant children who are born or largely raised in the re-

ceiving society. A person's age can be a proxy for the norms in society at a certain point in time. Given the development of the welfare state, we can assume that over time and generations, attitudes towards support of the elderly have changed. Whereas the older generation still sees the necessity of support provided by children, this might be much less the case for the younger generations. Although the effects of generational shift may be universal, it could be even larger for immigrant families; many of the older immigrants born and raised in the countries of origin may still be attached to the cultural norms they were socialised in. The younger generation of immigrants, however, is more likely to have been raised in the Netherlands and their perceptions may thus be more similar to the Dutch. Based on these notions, we expect that older generations of immigrants will be more of the opinion that children should support their parents than younger generations of migrants (H_2).

4.4.2 *Support behaviour*

In the absence of direct measures of behaviour, studies generally assume that stronger cultural preferences for filial obligations among immigrants translate directly into higher levels of support behaviour. Nevertheless, empirical results studying familial support from a structural framework to understand familial support are mixed. Some insist that immigrant families rely even more on family support precisely because of their lower socio-economic backgrounds (Stack 1974; Scott & Black 1999). Other studies focusing on the structural position of immigrant families, however, found that resource constraints prevent immigrants from participating in family networks, and that lower income and education reduces the likelihood of support (Roschelle 1997; Silverstein & Waite 1993; Hogan, Eggebeen & Clogg 1993). Especially in the case where welfare state arrangements are available and affordable for everyone, the direct necessity of providing help to parents may be less.

Studies are thus indecisive concerning the effects of ethnic background and socio-economic position on support behaviour. In this study, we test two contrasting hypotheses against each other. First of all, we hypothesise that the culturally specific preference for strong intergenerational ties will continue to exert an influence on actual intergenerational support behaviour. Immigrant children are thus expected to support their parents more than Dutch children, not taking into account socio-economic standing (H_3'). As discussed previously, however, lower socio-economic standing could also prevent adult children from supporting their parents. Therefore, the alternative hypothesis is that although preferences for filial obligations might be stronger among immigrant groups, actual support is not higher due to limited resources (H_3'').

In order to disentangle possible cultural differences between ethnic

groups, a direct measure of parental support expectations is studied. The study by Silverstein, Gans and Yang (2006) showed that norms held by children stimulate supportive behaviour. They conclude that the family continues to have an essential function in providing support and care between generations. This suggests that existing norms within the family may determine the actual support provided. We thus hypothesise that parents who have higher support expectations receive more support from their children than those with fewer expectations (H4).

Various studies also point to the importance of the strength of family ties for support behaviour and show, for example, that a higher quality of relationship between parents and adult children is positively related to the exchange of support (Rossi & Rossi 1990; Roschelle 1997). Although it is difficult to determine the direction of causality between the two, it is clear that having a good relationship between parent and child coincides with more exchange and support between the generations. We hypothesise that parents who have good relationships with their adult children will receive more support from them than parents who do not have good relationships with their children (H5).

Finally, research suggests that family as well as parent-child characteristics are important for providing help. Three socio-demographic features are often related to opinions and perceptions regarding the family (Kalmijn 2004; Roschelle 1997; Rossi & Rossi 1990; Spitze & Logan 1990). First of all, younger people are likely to provide less support than older people. Secondly, mothers are more likely to receive help than fathers (Laditka & Laditka 2001; Rossi & Rossi 1990). Third, the need for parental help (indicated by their age, marital status and psychical well-being) may influence the help that children give (Gierveld 2003) (H6).

In the analyses we test these hypotheses after controlling for parents' level of education, their number of children and the presence of co-residing children.

4.5 Data

Data from the first round of the 'Netherlands kinship panel study' (NKPS) (Dykstra, Kalmijn, Knijn, Komter, Liefbroer & Mulder 2004) are used. We include the main sample (Dutch respondents) and immigrant samples (including Turkish, Moroccan, Surinamese and Antillean respondents). The main sample is nationally representative and includes 8,000 Dutch respondents. The immigrant sample was drawn from thirteen Dutch cities in which 50 per cent of the immigrants from the four main ethnic groups live. It includes 1,400 immigrants of Turkish, Moroccan, Surinamese or Antillean origin. Topics covered in the main and the immigrant questionnaires were similar, and provide comparable data. The respondents were

interviewed in their homes, in most cases by an interviewer of the same ethnic background. All interviews followed a structured questionnaire in Dutch that was available in Turkish and Arabic as well. The response rate among the immigrants was in the same range as that of the Dutch, from 41 per cent for the Surinamese to 52 per cent for the Turks.

In our study immigrants are compared with Dutch respondents living in the thirteen cities in which the immigrants were sampled. For the analyses of perceptions, all respondents aged 18-80 are included ($N=3,200$). The study of behaviour is limited to those respondents who have at least one child aged fifteen or over. Dyad data of parents and child from one family are included. This selection results in a sample of 132 Turkish, 103 Moroccan, 192 Surinamese, 105 Antillean and 551 Dutch families.

4.6 Measures

4.6.1 *Dependent variables*

Filial obligation norms

The first part of the analyses focuses on three variables related to norms of filial obligation of children towards parents. Respondents were asked on a five-point Likert scale whether they agreed with the statement that 'children who live nearby should visit their parents at least once a week', 'children should care for their sick parents' and 'if parents are old, children should provide co-residence for them'. Answer categories ranged from 1) fully agree (group-oriented) to 5) fully disagree (individualistically oriented). We studied differences between each of the five ethnic groups as well as between the generations of respondents in each of the groups.

Actual support behaviour

In the second part we study *actual support behaviour* by children as reported by the parent for up to two randomly selected children. We use two items that relate to practical help provided to parents in the past three months, namely: 1) help in household and 2) help with chores in and around the house, lending things, transportation and moving. In addition, two items on emotional support provided by children, advice given to parents and interest shown in parents' lives are analysed. Response categories were 1) not at all, 2) once or twice and 3) several times. The four dependent variables in the multivariate analyses are scales of the relative level of help constructed by adding the help received from each of the two selected children divided by the valid number of reports for these children. This results in a scale ranging from 1) no help received from either child to 3) received help from both children several times.

4.6.2 *Independent variables*

Immigrant group

The ethnic background of the respondents was defined according to their own and their parents' country of birth. Those born abroad or with at least one parent born abroad were assigned to one of the four immigrant groups.

Educational level of the parent

The educational level of the respondent was measured as the highest educational level to which the respondent had been enrolled (with or without completion or accreditation). Three levels were distinguished, from low '1' to high '3'.

Marital status of the parent

Respondents who were married at the time of the interview (coded '1') were compared with those who were divorced, widowed or never married (coded '0').

Parents' number of children

The number of surviving children (up to a maximum of seven) are included as a continuous variable.

Co-residence of children

A dummy variable indicating whether the parent had any co-residential children at the time of the interview was included. Those without co-residential children are the reference category.

General health assessment of the parent

Respondents were asked to rate their current health condition on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1) very good to 5) very poor.

Age of the parent

This is a continuous variable of the age of the parent at the time of the interview.

Gender of the parent

This is a dichotomous variable in which men are the reference category (women coded '1').

Relationship quality of parent and child

The parent-child relationship quality was determined based on the overall report of the parent indicated on a four-point Likert scale from 1) not so good to 4) very good. The reported quality of the relationship for each of

the two children indicated a very high correlation of 0.82. Therefore we can assume that the reported relationship quality for one child is indicative for relations within the family. We thus include the reported quality for one child only.

Support expectations of the parent

A support expectations scale was constructed based on the agreement with three items on filial obligation of children towards parents, namely: 'children who live nearby should visit their parents at least once a week', 'children should care for their sick parents' and 'if parents are old, children should provide co-residence for them'. The scale has an overall good reliability with alpha 0.73. Answers on each of the items were summed and divided by the number of valid answers resulting in a scale from 1) expecting much (group-oriented) to 5) expecting less (individualistically oriented) support from children.

Gender of the child

A dichotomous variable indicated whether at least one daughter was among the selected children for which provided help was reported. No daughters are the reference category.

Age group

For the first part of the analyses on generational differences in perceptions, the age of the respondent in years, at the time of the interview, has been recoded into three age groups: 1) 18-30, 2) 31-50 and 3) 51+.

4.7 Analyses

Descriptive analyses on perceptions and behaviour are provided by ethnic group. Differences in mean group opinions are tested using post hoc multi-group comparisons – least significant difference (LSD). In the first part that focuses on differences in perceptions between generations, differences between age groups are studied. In the second part, ordinary least squares (OLS) regression is used to study the effect of support expectations, ethnic and socio-demographic characteristics on the received support by parents.

4.8 Results

4.8.1 *Perceptions of filial obligations: an impression*

The socio-demographic profiles of the respondents are presented in Table 4.1 and Figures 4.1-4.3 show the level of agreement with the three statements of filial obligations. It is clear that around half of the Turkish and Moroccan respondents agreed with the statement that children who live nearby should visit their parents at least once a week, that 36 per cent of the Surinamese agreed with this statement, as did 16 per cent of the Antilleans and the Dutch. By contrast, around 4 per cent of Turks and Moroccans did not agree with the statement, against 26 per cent of the Dutch. Testing differences between the ethnic groups using a post hoc LSD comparison (not in the table) shows that the opinions of Turks and Moroccans differ significantly from each other. All other groups differ significantly from each other as well as from the Turkish and Moroccan respondents.

When respondents were asked 'when parents are old, children should provide co-residence for them', ethnic differences became even more pronounced. No less than 84 per cent of the Moroccans agree/strongly agree with this statement, against only 11 per cent of the Dutch. Turks, Surinamese and Antilleans (in descending order) hold a middle position, but clearly are more of the opinion that children should provide co-residence to their parents than the are Dutch. The results of the LSD post hoc test (not in the table) confirm that there are significant differences between each of the five ethnic groups.

Finally, around 40 per cent of Dutch respondents agree/strongly agree that adult children should take care of their parents if they become sick. Again, all immigrant groups agree/strongly agree with this statement more often, with 65 per cent of the Antilleans and up to 90 per cent of the Moroccans thinking this is a child's duty. Our test for group differences (not in table) revealed that the Surinamese and Antilleans did not differ from each other, though their opinion differed from all other groups. Overall, these bivariate comparisons indicate that the Dutch agreed least with all statements, and their views differ from each of the immigrant groups.

Moreover, we examined differences within ethnic groups, using three different age categories (18-30, 31-50 and 51+) to test our hypothesis (H2) that younger generations of immigrants – who most likely are more acculturated to Dutch society – will agree less with strong filial obligations. Our results show, however, that no such generational differences are found. In the Turkish, Moroccan and Surinamese groups no significant generational differences are found for any of our dependent variables. Only for the Antillean group, we see that the older generations agree more

Figure 4.1 Level of agreement with statement that 'Children should look after sick parents'

Source: NKPS (2002-2003, main and migrant sample)

Figure 4.2 Level of agreement with statement 'Parents should live with children in old age'

Source: NKPS 2002-2003 (main and migrant sample)

Figure 4.3 Level of agreement with statement 'Children should visit parents at least once a week'

Source: NKPS (2002-2003, main and migrant sample)

4.8.2 Actual support

Table 4.2 (in annex p. 118) provides insight into the support provided to parents as reported for one randomly selected child. Although our data include information on two randomly selected children, we limit the description to one child because similar patterns are found for the second child selected. It is clear that the Dutch most often do not receive any help in household chores from their children. Around half of the immigrant parents report receiving such assistance from their children, with Moroccans answering affirmatively most often. When we turn to other practical support, the majority of Dutch, but also Antilleans, do not receive such support (60 and 64 per cent, respectively). In the other groups, a small majority does indicate that they have received practical support from their children at least once or twice in the past three months.

A different picture emerges when we look at emotional support. An overwhelming majority, at almost 93 per cent, of Dutch parents report that their children showed interest in their lives during the past three months. Of these, 74 per cent showed interest several times. Although a similar pattern is found among the Surinamese, for the other groups, a larger percentage of parents report experiencing no interest at all (25 per cent of the Antilleans, 20 per cent of the Turks and 18 per cent of the Moroccans). Finally, when receiving advice is examined, Surinamese parents, in particular, are found to receive advice from their children several times; 52 per cent, where other percentages are substantially lower; between 24 and 30 per cent for all other ethnic groups. Nevertheless,

at least half of all parents in all ethnic groups get advice from their children at least once or twice (between 56 per cent for Antilleans and 78 per cent for Surinamese).

Table 4.3. (in annex) shows the mean level of support received by parents. Differences between each ethnic group are tested by using post hoc comparison. Comparing support behaviour between the groups, ethnic differences are less straightforward than they were for attitudes towards filial obligations. Unlike filial norms, we do not find a clear dichotomy between the immigrant groups and the Dutch for behaviour. For help with household chores, LSD post hoc comparisons indicate that the Dutch can be differentiated from all the immigrant groups, but the immigrant groups do not differ from each other. Also for practical support, the Dutch get less than any of the immigrant groups except the Antilleans. Surinamese and Moroccans do not differ from each other, nor do the Turkish and the Antilleans.

Moreover, when emotional support is considered, the Dutch do not differentiate from either the Surinamese or the Moroccans, but have a significantly higher score than the Turks and Antilleans. Turkish parents are found to report receiving the least emotional support from children compared to all the other groups. Finally, when we look at giving advice, it is the Surinamese who get more advice from children than all other ethnic groups. The other groups do not differ significantly from one another. These descriptive results seem to indicate that when we examine support behaviour, ethnic differences disappear based on the specific type of support under study.

In order to determine the role of ethnic origin, filial norms and socio-demographic characteristics, we conducted an OLS regression analyses on each of the four independent variables of support. Results are presented in Table 4.4 (in annex). The multivariate findings on ethnic differences partially support our bivariate findings. Our results show that differences between immigrants and the Dutch remain strongest for help with household chores. Immigrant parents receive more household help than Dutch parents even when background characteristics are controlled for (first column, Table 4.4). We also find that mothers report receiving more help than fathers. Having co-residing children and a good relationship with one's children also increases the likelihood of getting help in the household, whereas having more children reduces receiving this type of help. We do not find any effects of age, marital status, health status or educational level of the parent. Adding support expectations of parents, as a direct control for the effect of cultural preferences, initially indicates that those who expect more receive more. Including interaction effects of support expectations and ethnic origin (model 2, Table 4.4), however, reveals that no effect of support expectations is found except for the Turkish: for this group we find that those who expect more help from children indeed get more help in the household.

Regarding practical help, only Surinamese parents report getting this more often than the other ethnic groups. Being a woman, having co-residing children and enjoying a good relationship with one's children is again related to receiving more practical support, whereas having more children means getting less help with odd jobs. The health condition of the parent relates to getting help: those who are in a poor condition report receiving more help than those who are well. Support expectations are found to be unrelated to getting help with odd jobs among all groups.

Turning to emotional support, by showing interest in the personal life of the parent we find that Turkish and Antillean parents receive significantly less interest than is the case for parents in any of the other ethnic groups. At the same time, our analyses show that receiving interest in the personal life is unrelated to any of the studied background characteristics of parent and child except the relationship quality. Again, having a better relationship with your children is related to experiencing more interest. Once more, no effects are found for filial norms; when testing for interaction effects, we also do not find any relationship between parents' expectations of support and reported interest shown by their children.

Finally, we studied the advice received by parents (last two columns, Table 3.4). Surinamese parents receive more advice compared to Dutch parents, but the other ethnic groups do not differ from the Dutch in this respect. Mothers receive more advice from their children than do fathers, which is also the case for those in poor health condition. In line with the previous findings, the results show that having a good relationship with your children is tied to getting more advice. None of the other characteristics of parent or child are related to receiving advice. Regarding support expectations, our analyses show an effect among Surinamese only. For the latter group, we find that having more support expectations of children is related to getting more advice from children.

4.9 Conclusion

In this chapter we go beyond existing research by studying not only perceptions of filial obligations, but also actual support behaviour between parents and adult children among five different ethnic groups in the Netherlands. The main aim was to determine the importance ethnic origin has for expectations on filial obligations and support behaviour and how this factor compares to filial norms and socio-demographic background.

Our findings show that expectations regarding support are largely determined by ethnic origin. All immigrant groups – Turks and Moroccans most prominently – agree more with the statements on intergenerational obligations that children have towards their ageing parents. Our expectation that younger generations of immigrants would agree less with such

statements was not supported by the data, whereby hardly any generational differences were found among the immigrant groups. It seems that opinions on intergenerational relations and support are among the core values that are, contrary to more practical domains of life, not easily changed or adjusted in a new context after migration. However, among the Dutch we did find larger differences in perceptions on filial obligations between the generations, with overall the younger respondents indicating higher levels of filial responsibility. It may be that in the Dutch context, where independence is highly valued, elderly parents do not want to be a burden to their children and therefore show less agreement with filial obligation attitudes. It also indicates that, contrary to arguments on the decline in family commitments, family ties in Dutch society remain highly important for support. Reciprocity of support between parents and children is therefore still valued among the younger generations who most likely are in the phase of receiving support from their parents as well.

Results for actual support, however, show that the extent to which parents receive support from their adult children in various domains is not determined by their ethnic origin in the same way perceptions are. Results are much less consistent in this respect. Whereas Moroccan parents more often receive support when it comes to household chores, Dutch parents receive emotional support through expressed interest from their children more often than any other ethnic group. Surinamese parents can count on the advice of their children relatively frequently. These results indicate that it is not possible to generalise ethnic differences for several types of intergenerational support. Of course we have to be aware that actual levels of support, reported by the parent, could be determined by their perception of dependence or independence between generations. This could very well differ between ethnic groups as is also reported in other studies (see e.g. Baldassar, Baldock & Wilding 2007).

Our findings also show that there is no direct relation between expectations of filial obligation and actual support received, as was suggested in previous studies in which actual support was not measured. Overall, expectations of filial obligations and practical support received are higher among immigrant groups than for the Dutch. At the same time, our multivariate analyses show that support expectations are rarely directly related to actual received support. This latter finding generally holds for all ethnic groups. The quality of the relationship between parent and child is a much more important indicator for receiving practical as well as emotional support. We should, however, be aware that our cross-sectional data prevents us from drawing any conclusions about the causal direction of this effect. Longitudinal data on immigrant and native families are needed to shed more light on the causal relationship between relationship quality and support, but also to determine the correlation between expectations and actual support.

Three additional limitations of our study should be taken into account. The amount of support that parents receive was reported by the parents themselves. It could be that immigrant parents, confronted with an interviewer of the same ethnic background, over-report the amount of support they receive (i.e. the social desirability effect), especially when indicating strong agreement with filial obligation norms. In addition, since we could not include the child's reported help for the immigrant groups, it could be that we underestimated the support potential. Having both parent and child reports among immigrants and natives could advance insights into these issues.

Furthermore, our measurement of filial norms is based on items that relate to taking care of the elderly overall. It could very well be that parents generally agree that children should provide help, though do have different expectations when it comes to their own son or daughter whom they see struggling with practical obstacles in providing help. Furthermore, it is possible that children did indeed take care of their parents if ill, for example, but did not provide help in the household or with odd jobs in the past three months, as was measured by our support indicator. A more direct comparison of perceptions regarding their own children and actual support on the same indicator would provide better insight into the direct relationship between the two.

Finally, although we assume cohort effects expecting that older generations of immigrants, rather than younger generations, will be more of the opinion that children should support their parents, we are unable to disentangle these effects from age effects due to the cross-sectional nature of the data. The data we used are, furthermore, limited in the extent to which they cover support provided: our study did not include all children, but was limited to randomly selected children in the migrant family. A more complete coverage of the family would allow for a more comprehensive view on possible differences in support-giving between siblings by, for example, birth order and gender.

The results of our study have three main implications. First of all, perceptions on filial obligation differ strongly by ethnic origin but not by generation within ethnic groups. This indicates that acculturation in the domain of filial obligations is not evident, and that immigrants do not rapidly adjust their perceptions and orientations in this domain to the cultural patterns of the country of residence.

Secondly, we show that attitudes towards filial obligations do not translate directly into actual support. Ethnic differences in such support are therefore less pronounced than differences in attitudes. Suggestions sometimes made by policymakers, that elderly immigrants will not need any state support since 'it's their culture' to take care of the elderly might be mistaken. Finally, our analyses point to the importance of the quality of the relationship between parents and children for the amount of support

received by parents. Although we have no evidence that the quality of the relationship differs for different ethnic groups, it is known that differential rates of acculturation between first- and second-generation immigrants can lead to tensions between parents and children. More insight into possible tensions within migrant families and their effects on support between parents and adult children is also highly relevant for policies aimed at the family and integration of immigrants. Although our study contributed to the literature by focusing on one of the European welfare states, comparative cross-national research is needed to gain a fuller understanding of the effect of advanced welfare state arrangements on intergenerational support behaviour in immigrant families.

References

- Alba, R. & V. Nee (1997), 'Rethinking assimilation for a new era of immigration', *International Migration Review* 31 (4): 826-874.
- Baldassar, L. (2008), 'Debating culture across distance: Transnational families and the obligation to care' in R. Grillo (ed.), *The family in question: Immigrant and ethnic minorities in multicultural Europe*, 269-291. IMISCOE Research Series. Amsterdam University Press.
- Baldassar, L., C. Baldock & R. Wilding (2007), *Families caring across borders: Migration, aging and transnational caregiving*. London: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Bolzman, C., R. Poncioni-Derigo, M. Vial & R. Fibbi (2004), 'Older labour migrants' wellbeing in Europe: The case of Switzerland', *Ageing and Society* 24: 411-429.
- Burr, J.A. & J.E. Mutchler (1999), Race and ethnic variation in norms of filial responsibility among older persons, *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 61: 647-687.
- De Valk, H.A.G. & A.C. Liefbroer (2007), 'Timing preferences for women's family-life transitions: Intergenerational transmission among migrants and Dutch'. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 69 (1): 190-206.
- De Valk, H.A.G. & D. Schans (2008), '"They ought to do this for their parents": Perceptions of filial obligations among immigrant and Dutch older people', *Ageing & Society* 28 (1): 49-66.
- Eggebeen, D.J. (1992), 'Family structure and intergenerational exchange', *Research on Ageing* 14: 427-447.
- Gierveld, J. (2003), 'Sociale positionering van ouderen', in CBS, *Sturen op statistieken: visies uit de samenleving*, 36-37. Voorburg: Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek.
- Glick, J.E. & J. van Hook (2002), 'Parents' coresidence with adult children: Can immigration explain race and ethnic variation?' *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 64(1): 240-253.
- Hogan, D.P., D.J. Eggebeen & C.C. Clogg (1993), 'The structure of intergenerational exchanges in American families', *American Journal of Sociology* 98: 1428-1458.
- Inglehart, R. & W.E. Baker (2000), 'Modernization, cultural change and the persistence of traditional values', *American Sociological Review* 65: 19-51.
- Kagitsibasi, C. (1996), *Family and human development across cultures: A view from the other side*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Kalmijn, M. (2004), 'Educational inequality and extended family relationships', paper presented at the Ross Colloquium Series, University of California, Los Angeles, 7

April 2004.

- Laditka, J. N. & S.B. Laditka (2001), 'Adult children helping older parents: Variations in the likelihood and hours by gender, race, and family role', *Research on Aging* 23: 429-456.
- Lee, G.R., C.W. Peek & R.T. Coward (1994), 'Race differences in filial responsibility expectations among older parents', *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 60: 404-412.
- Mitchell, B.A., A.V. Wister & E.M. Gee (2004), 'The ethnic and family nexus of homeleaving and returning among Canadian young adults', *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 29 (4): 543-575.
- Reher, D.S. (1998), 'Family ties in Western Europe: Persistent contrasts', *Population and Development Review* 24 (2): 203-234.
- Roschelle, A.R. (1997), *No more kin: Exploring race, class, and gender in family networks*. London: Sage Publications.
- Rosenthal, C.J. (1986), 'Family supports in later life: Does ethnicity make a difference?', *The Gerontologist* 26 (1): 19-24.
- Rossi, A.S. & P.H. Rossi (1990), *Of human bonding: Parent-child relations across the life-course*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Sarkisian, N., M. Gerena & N. Gerstel (2007), 'Extended family integration among Euro and Mexican Americans: Ethnicity, gender, and class', *Journal of Marriage and Family* 69: 40-54.
- Schans, D. & A. Komter (2006), 'Intergenerationele solidariteit en etnische diversiteit', *Migrantenstudies* 22 (1): 2-21.
- Scott, J.W. & A. Black (1999), 'Deep structures of black family life: Female and male kin networks', in R. Staples (ed.), *The black family: Essays and studies*, 232-240. Belmont: Wadsworth.
- Silverstein, M., D. Gans & F.M. Yang (2006), 'Intergenerational support to ageing parents: The role of norms and needs', *Journal of Family Issues* 27 (8): 1068-1084.
- Silverstein, M. & L. Waite (1993), 'Are blacks more likely than whites to receive and provide social support in middle and old age? Yes, no and maybe so', *Journal of Gerontology: Social Sciences* 48: 212-222.
- Spitze, G. & L. Logan (1990), 'Sons, daughters and intergenerational social support', *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 52: 420-430.
- Stack, C.B. (1974), *All our kin*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Todd, E. (1985), *The explanation of ideology: Family structures and social systems*. Oxford/New York: Basil Blackwell.
- Vermeulen, H. & R. Penninx (2000), *Immigrant integration: The Dutch case*. Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis.
- Warnes, T., K. Friedrich, L. Kellaher & S. Torres (2004), 'The diversity and welfare of older migrants in Europe', *Ageing and Society* 24: 307-326.

Annex

Table 4.2 Support received by type of support and ethnic group (in %)

		<i>Turkish</i>	<i>Moroc- can</i>	<i>Suri- name se</i>	<i>Antillean</i>	<i>Dutch</i>
Help received with house- hold chores	Several times	24	29	37	31	6
	Once or twice	33	35	20	18	17
	Never	43	37	43	52	77
Practical help received	Several times	15	24	31	21	14
	Once or twice	39	35	24	15	26
	Never	46	41	45	64	60
Interest received	Several times	49	76	80	63	74
	Once or twice	30	7	13	12	19
	Never	22	18	7	25	7
Advice received	Several times	30	26	52	28	24
	Once or twice	33	39	27	29	35
	Never	37	35	22	44	41

Source: NKPS (2002-2003, main and migrant samples)

Table 4.3 Means of type of support received by ethnic group

	<i>Turkish</i>	<i>Moroccan</i>	<i>Surinamese</i>	<i>Antillean</i>	<i>Dutch</i>
Help with house- hold chores	1.81 A	1.89 A	1.94 A	1.77 A	1.31 B
Practical help received	1.69 A	1.83 A	1.85 A	1.55 B	1.51 B
Interest received	2.26 A	2.61 B	2.71 B	2.42 A	2.68 B
Advice received	1.92 A	1.88 A	2.26 B	1.89 A	1.81 A

Note: Means in the same row that do not share subscripts differ at $p < .05$ in the multiple comparison Least Significant Differences (LSD) test.

Source: NKPS (2002-2003, main and migrant samples)

Table 4.4 OLS regression coefficients for four different types of help parents report to have received from their children in the past three months

	Household chores		Practical help		Interest in personal life		Advice	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
Constant	0.99***	0.82***	0.95***	0.86***	1.17***	1.23***	0.60**	0.47*
Ethnic background (reference Dutch)								
Turkish	0.27***	0.92***	0.00	0.27	-0.36***	-0.52***	0.07	0.20
Moroccan	0.46***	0.78***	0.21	0.47	0.03	0.08	0.08	0.30
Surinamese	0.46***	0.61***	0.19*	0.32	0.02	-0.10	0.38***	0.75***
Antillean	0.31***	0.16	-0.04	-0.24	-0.16*	-0.15	0.12	0.18
Age parent	-0.00	-0.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Gender of the parent (reference men)	0.20***	0.20***	0.23***	0.23***	0.07	0.07	0.12*	0.11*
Marital status parent (reference not married)	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02	-0.03	-0.02	-0.08	-0.08
General health assessment parent (1 = good/5 = poor)	0.02	0.02	0.06**	0.06**	0.00	0.00	0.06*	0.06*
Educational level parent (1 = low/3 = high)	0.04	0.04	-0.01	-0.01	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.01
Number of children	-0.04*	-0.04*	-0.04*	-0.04*	0.00	0.00	-0.02	-0.02
Gender of children (reference: no daughter)	0.10*	0.10*	0.01	0.00	0.06	0.06	0.03	0.02
Co-residence of children (reference: no co-resident child)	0.27***	0.28***	0.14*	0.14*	0.00	-0.00	0.08	0.08
Relationship quality (1 = not good/4 = very good)	0.14***	0.15***	0.16***	0.16***	0.33***	0.33***	0.28***	0.28***
Support expectations (1 = high/5 = low)	-0.06*	-0.01	-0.07	-0.04	0.03	0.01	-0.05	-0.02
Support expectations*Turkish		-0.31***		-0.13		0.08		-0.04
Support expectations*Moroc.		-0.15		-0.14		-0.05		-0.09
Support expectations*Surinam		-0.05		-0.04		0.05		-0.14*
Support expectations*Antill.		0.07		0.09		-0.00		-0.01
R ²	0.23	0.24	0.11	0.12	0.21	0.21	0.15	0.15

*p < .05 **p < .01 ***p < .001

Source: NKPS (2002-2003, main and migrant samples)