

Explaining family cohesion in an immigration context: patterns of intergenerational relationship quality among young adult Turks and their parents

Baykara-Krumme, Helen

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version

Arbeitspapier / working paper

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

pairfam - Das Beziehungs- und Familienpanel

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Baykara-Krumme, H. (2010). *Explaining family cohesion in an immigration context: patterns of intergenerational relationship quality among young adult Turks and their parents*. (Arbeitspapier des Beziehungs- und Familienpanels (pairfam), 20). Chemnitz: pairfam - Das Beziehungs- und Familienpanel. <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-369474>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer CC BY-NC-SA Lizenz (Namensnennung-Nicht-kommerziell-Weitergabe unter gleichen Bedingungen) zur Verfügung gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zu den CC-Lizenzen finden Sie hier: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/deed.de>

Terms of use:

This document is made available under a CC BY-NC-SA Licence (Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike). For more information see: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0>



Explaining family cohesion in an immigration context.

Patterns of intergenerational relationship quality among young adult Turks and their parents

Helen Baykara-Krumme

TU Chemnitz, Institut für Soziologie,
Juli 2010

Gefördert als Langfristvorhaben durch die Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG)

Abstract

This exploratory study examines patterns of intergenerational relationships among Turkish migrants in Germany. The aims are (1) to follow-up recent research on relationship types and extent it to migrant families, (2) to contrast patterns among migrants with those associated with non-immigrant Germans, and (3) to analyse the impact of migration-related stressors. We use data from the Germany's new Family Panel pairfam and a complementary survey on Turkish citizens. Descriptive comparisons indicate the high empirical relevance of all expected patterns, with a slightly higher prevalence of amicable and ambivalent relations, and a somewhat lower prevalence of disharmonious and detached ones among the immigrant community in comparison to the German population. Contrasting the theoretically derived hypotheses, regression analyses reveal the low impact of migration-related variables. Neither discrimination experiences nor acculturation levels seem to affect family ties. In line with the hypothesis, cultural retention in terms of Turkish language skills seems to positively affect the child-father relationship. Results are discussed with regard to family support resources in young and later life.

1. Introduction

The immigration experience affects family relationships in many ways (e.g. Schelsky 1950, Sluzki 1979, Schrader et al. 1979, Nauck 1985, 1989, 2007). The aspect of relationship quality between parents and children has been addressed in literature for a long time. One theory, the culture conflict thesis, suggests increased intergenerational conflict due to different socialisation contexts of migrant parents and their children. Research suggests, however, that the intergenerational cultural gap in migrant families is not necessarily larger than in the non-migrant population (cf. Dumon 1989, Nauck 2000). On the contrary, the intergenerational transmission of values and the co-orientation between parents and children is quite high, even higher when compared to the population in the home country (Nauck 1997, Nauck & Niephaus 2006). These findings have led to the opposite assumption that the immigration experience may not increase intergenerational distance but family cohesion. More recent research provides inconsistent evidence for intergenerational conflict in migrant families. Some findings in the US and Europe indicate more conflict about certain topics and in specific circumstances (e.g. Hämmig 2000, Portes & Rumbault 2001, Rabold & Diehl 2003), whereas others indicate few conflict areas (e.g. Jackson et al. 2007, Baykara-Krumme 2008a). At the same time, the emotional closeness between migrant family members is reported to be very high (e.g. Heitmeyer et al. 1997, Jackson et al. 2007, Baykara-Krumme 2008a). Little is known, so far, how both relate to each other, since both aspects have so far been studied separately only.

This exploratory research focuses on family cohesion from a broad perspective by including both dimensions of conflict and closeness for the first time. This integration has become very prominent in research on non-immigrant families since it allows the building of a more comprehensive picture of the nuances of the family situation and its support for individuals. The research question in this paper is not the traditional one which asks whether the family is experienced as a trouble spot or a place of emotional support and “counter-world” by children and parents. Here, we are interested in the extent to which these patterns apply simultaneously. Secondly, it is addressed in how far immigrants differ from non-immigrants and how differences can be explained. Thirdly, we address the issue how the observed relationship types among immigrants are affected by migration- and minority-related factors. Only very limited knowledge exist so far since adequate data including relationship characteristics as well as migration background variables, has been rare.

The centre of attention is the largest immigrant group in Germany, the Turks which make up 24.8% of the immigrant population. If all naturalised migrants of the first and the second generation are included, their number amounts to 2.7 million (Stat. Bundesamt 2009). Various studies have addressed the issue of family ties in Turkish migrant families, partly because of their substantial number, but also because of the perceived socio-cultural differences in the role of the family between the country of origin and various destination countries in Europe (Nauck 2001, Kagitcibasi 2005, Nauck & Suckow 2006). The quality of intergenerational relationships in migrant families is a prevailing issue as immigration flows continue. Moreover, this topic has regained importance in the face of the demographic change and the ageing of the migrant population (e.g. Dietzel-Papakyriakou 2005, Jackson et al. 2005, Attias-Donfut & Wolff 2008, Baykara-Krumme 2008b), as family cohesion has an impact on the potential for support to and well-being of the individual. In order to understand the potential for family support of the elderly, it is helpful to study intergenerational relationships among young adult children and their parents (Schütze 1993, Parrott & Bengtson 1999).

The following part 2 briefly discusses the concepts which evolved in intergenerational relations' research over the past decades and discusses the implications of the migration experience on family relationships. Following the presentation of the data base and the main definitions in part 3, the empirical results are presented in part 4. The article concludes with a discussion of the main findings.

2. Background: Intergenerational relationships and the impact of the migration context

Important contributions to the study of intergenerational relations have been developed in the field of social gerontology. The focus has been on family ties of the elderly in the face of decreasing birth rates and increasing longevity. For some time, research has been dominated by the approach of intergenerational solidarity, proposed by Bengtson and his colleagues, in an attempt to measure the family resource potential for the elderly (Bengtson 2001). This model captures the emotional aspect of the parent/adult child relationship ("affectual solidarity"). In the past decades several studies on non-immigrants provided evidence that parents and their adult children continue to feel closely related (cf. Bengtson et al. 2002, Kohli et al. 2005, Steinbach & Kopp 2008). Research also demonstrates that this global dimension of emotional relationship quality is closely related to other dimensions, such as contact frequency ("associational solidarity") or support ("functional solidarity", Lawton et

al. 1994, Silverstein & Bengtson 1997). Later, a dimension of conflict was added to the model after it had met with criticism as being too normative and positively biased (cf. Bengtson et al. 2002, Giarrusso et al. 2005).

This critique was put forward by authors who stressed the complexity of social relationships (e.g. Lüscher & Pillemer 1998, Lüscher 2004, Pillemer et al. 2007). Their alternative proposal of intergenerational ambivalence gained attention as it acknowledged contradictory emotions, i.e. “mixed feelings” towards other family members (e.g. Pillemer et al. 2007, 776). Since then various studies have aimed to describe these complex patterns which occur in intergenerational relations (e.g. Pillemer & Suitor 2002, Katz et al. 2005, Giarrusso et al. 2005, Van Gaalen & Dykstra 2006, Steinbach 2008, Ferring et al. 2009, Birditt et al. 2009a,b). For the US, Giarrusso et al. (2005) suggested a four-field pattern of relationships based on the combinations of affectual (high solidarity) and conflict dimensions. Accordingly, four types of relations can be distinguished:

- Ambivalent relations - High solidarity combined with high degrees of conflict,
- Amicable relations - high solidarity combined with low degrees of conflict,
- Disharmonious relations - low solidarity and high degrees of conflict,
- Civil relations - low solidarity with low conflict.

The older people’s perspective (e.g. Giarrusso et al. 2005) as well as that of their children has been studied (e.g. Lang 2004, Steinbach 2008, van Gaalen & Dykstra 2006, Ferring et al. 2009), but so far among non-immigrant populations only.

Indeed, research on immigrant families has rarely been linked to this research on intergenerational relationships (Baykara-Krumme 2008a). Whereas single dimensions of intergenerational relations have been studied for elderly immigrants in various countries (e.g. Lye 1996, Attias-Donfut & Wolff 2008, Katz 2009), the number of conceptual/theoretical contributions is limited (Nauck 1989) and the role of ethnicity or race in ambivalence or other relationships types has only recently received some attention (Pillemer et al. 2007). The notion of intergenerational conflict, however, is a prevailing issue, specifically with regard to young adolescent children and their parents (Dumon 1989, Rabold & Diehl 2003, Nauck & Niephaus 2006).

In theoretical terms, a comparative analyse which aims at an explanation of intergenerational relationships among immigrants needs to differentiate between two sets of factors according to which migrants differ systematically from non-immigrants. *Cultural* aspects of intergenerational relationships refer to the cultural context of origin, the place of

socialisation and prevalent values and norms. Accordingly, cultural differences between the home and the host society with regard to family values and family orientation may explain divergences in family cohesion between immigrants and non-immigrants. In the case of Turkey and Germany, the sending society is characterised by a descent kinship system which implies strong intergenerational bonds, a strong sense of familialism and related intergenerational obligations. In opposition to the Western European affinal kinship system, intergenerational solidarity is institutionally more secured and strong incentives exist to give priority to close emotional ties within the lineage (as compared to the spouse, Nauck & Suckow 2006, Nauck 2010). Psychological approaches categorise Turkey as a collectivistic rather than an individualistic culture with strong family obligations (Hofstede 2001) and a “culture of relatedness” (Kagitcibasi 1996, 2003) stressing intergenerational family cohesion and support. Intergenerational transmission processes are very strong in Turkish families in Turkey (Kagitcibasi 2003, de Valk & Liefbroer 2007, Güngör 2008). *Situational* aspects of intergenerational relationships encompass experiences related to the migration and minority membership. The observed patterns of relationship quality may not be transmitted from the home context, but result from an adaptation process in the receiving society (Nauck 1989, 2007). Extensive Turkish migration to Europe started in the 1960s. In the course of the recruitment contract 1961 non- and low qualified migrant workers came to Germany and were later joined by their families. Migrants of Turkish origin today not only include family members of the second, third and fourth generation of migrant workers, but also refugees and asylum seekers who arrived later in the 1980s and 1990s, and spouses who immigrated recently in the course of transnational marriages. While being the largest immigrant group, discrimination experiences play a certain role in individual life. Minority status stressors are, among others, disadvantages with regard to education and social exclusion (Seibert & Solga 2005, Kalter 2006, Gestring et al. 2006). In the following, these arguments are further developed in relation to the four patterns of intergenerational relationships which are expected to evolve in a migration context.

3. Recent findings and hypotheses: patterns and determinants

Amicable relationships: A high degree of intergenerational cohesion and little conflict are expected in the course of a transmission of the family values and high family orientation from the sending context to the receiving society. Turkish families may therefore show a higher likelihood for amicable relationships than the German non-immigrant population. The

migration and minority experience may further enhance family cohesion. Stressors in the migration context may boost family cohesion as the family becomes a retreat from the outer “foreign” world. This pattern has been described for upheavals such as wars (Schelsky 1950), the breakdown of political systems (Kohli et al. 2000), and with reference to migration experiences in terms of an “ethnic retreat” into the own ethnic group or family (Heckmann 1992, Nauck & Kohlmann 1998). The argument is that family cohesion is strengthened in order to cope with insecurities associated with migration (Herwartz-Emden 2000, Nauck 2007). The family constitutes an important coping resource as it provides continuity with the past. The extra efforts which are needed in such a situation of disruption and stress in order for the family to maintain a sense of family cohesiveness may result in an enhancement of ties (cf. Dumon 1989, Jackson et al. 2007). Moreover, migrant families put special efforts in the children’s socialisation as they lack the support of homogeneous cultural milieus of the kinship or social networks. This distinctive situation may cause a higher conformity of attitudes in migrant families (Nauck 1997, 2007, Phalet & Schönplflug 2001, Nauck & Niephaus 2006). With regard to the premise of the culture conflict thesis (see below), according to which acculturation is faster in the second generation, it has been argued that both generations may acculturate simultaneously in a parallel acculturation path or both may resist to acculturation, with a low intergenerational gap (“generational consonance”, Portes & Rumbault 1996, 2001). As a result, in a migration and minority context, intergenerational links may not be disrupted but increased and affected positively by the specific stressors, resulting in more intense intergenerational contact and family cohesion.

Disharmonious relationships: According to the culture conflict thesis large cultural differences between the contexts of origin and settlement increase the likelihood of a socio-cultural gap between parents and their children in the course of an international migration. A specific feature of socialisation in immigrant families is that first-generation parents have been brought up with the norms and preferences predominant in their countries of origin which they later transmit to their children. During child- and adulthood their children then become exposed to both the parental expectations and those of the receiving society as they go to school, use the media and socialise with native peers, resulting in a high prevalence of intergenerational conflict. Families are expected to experience the culture conflict at home, adding to the “normal” intergenerational tensions (Schrader et al. 1979, Nauck 1997, Clarke et al. 1999, Birditt et al. 2009b). Rabold & Diehl (2003) presented evidence for more conflict in Turkish as compared to non-migrant German families with regard to expectations which

cannot be fulfilled or parents dislike of the children's friends (361). Conflicts were more frequent when parents did not know German very well. Also a number of studies in the US support the finding of a negative correlation between acculturation gap and relationships quality among different migrant groups (e.g. Portes & Rumbaut 2001, Ying et al. 2007, Schofield et al. 2008). Next to an intergenerational cultural gap, minority status stressors such as discrimination, feeling of foreignness and social exclusion can affect family relationships negatively. This strain may contribute to worsened relationships when coping resources are overwhelmed. For example, perceived discrimination and low social standing have been shown to affect prevalence of violence by parents towards their children (Lau et al. 2006), as well as problems with parents reported by the adult child (Hämmig 2000). Recent research has started to look at the implications of transnational separation of families as a stressor for intergenerational relationships (e.g. Parrenas 2005, Nesteruk & Marks 2009). This work points to the results of geographical distance on increasing linguistic and cultural distance and to the influences of early separation in childhood. The emotional burden during separation is high. After reunion families have to re-establish relationships and may experience difficulties in adapting to family life (Kreidt 1989, Pekin 1989, Herwartz-Emden 2000, Hämmig 2000).

Detached relationships: Whereas the two described patterns either focus on emotionally close relationships or frequent conflict, a third possible pattern implies neither. Both, high intergenerational transmission and closeness as well as intergenerational arguments and disputes involve a high degree of interaction. Here, relations are less close, yet arguments are rare. In this pattern of "emotional strain and behavioral cordiality" (Giarrusso et al. 2005) children and parents get along moderately well. This may be a strategy of avoidance and retreat from the family. Such a withdrawal may be an alternative reaction to stress encountered in the migration context. Young adults may turn to other groups in search for company and (emotional) support where they feel better understood, e.g. peers of their own ethnic group or members of the receiving society (Nohl 2001, Gestring et al. 2006).

Ambivalent relationships: Rather than detachment, disharmonious *or* emotionally very close relationships, children and parents may in a migration and minority context develop mixed feelings towards each other, encompassing both kinds of amicable and disharmonious relations. Within the intergenerational ambivalence approach psychological ambivalence is characterised by contradictory emotions towards the relationship partner (Lüscher 2004). This pattern may evolve, first, as a consequence of the ambiguous influence of minority

status stressors in the migration situation. For instance, immigrant children may aim to keep close bonds to their parents in a search for shelter and support; they may anticipate and attempt to conform to their expectations, but at the same time struggle with them since they are difficult to be met, e.g. due to disadvantages in education and on the job market (Pillemer et al. 2007). Second, children may have internalised and agree with the family norms and values of the “culture of relatedness” and “interdependence” as transmitted by their parents, yet strive for a less family-oriented, more independent (family) life. As a result, respect and love for parents may go hand in hand with frequent arguments and conflict. Moreover, maintaining ambivalent relations may be a strategy to avoid a break-up of the family and allow for changes. Having arguments about sensitive topics while being embedded in emotionally close bonds allows intergenerational family members to stay closely in touch and develop and adapt together. While some authors argue that all close relationships encompass certain degrees of ambivalence (Lüscher & Pillemer 1998), this family pattern may be specifically likely in minority (stress) situations.

Next to a comparative description of the various patterns, the identification of migration-related influential impacts is a major aim of this research. Thus, based on the presented theoretical background and literature review we develop hypotheses with regard to (1) cultural, (2) situational and, controlling for composition effects, (3) demographic factors.

(1) Cultural factors: The notion of an intergenerational dissonant acculturation process assumes different socialisation contexts for parent and child. Based on the assumption of higher conflict or alienation potentials in the case of divergent socialisation contexts (Nauck 1997, Portes & Rumbault 1996, 2001), we expect children who were born in Germany to report more disharmonious or detached relations with parents compared to children who were born in the country of origin of their parents (*country of birth*). In accordance with research on intergenerational solidarity in non-immigrant families we also expect for migrant families that behaviour-related items, such as norms on support to parents, are closely related to relationship quality (*norm*). People who support the norm should show a positive relationship quality (amicable). For ambivalent relations we expect a lower impact. The effect should be negative for detached and disharmonious relations. The prevalence of this norm is of great interest also with regard to support potentials in later life. Finally, religiosity is taken account of. Due to the strong normative role in the Christian as well as the Islam religion of family in

general, and love and respect towards elderly parents, in particular, a high religiosity should specifically increase the likelihood of amicable relations (*religiosity*).

(2) Situational factors: In terms of situational factors, a sense of discrimination may cause stress due to objective incidents of unfair treatment or to the emotional burden of heightened vigilance and perceived need to guard against victimisation and oppression (Dumon 1989, Jackson et al. 2007). Feelings of foreignness in the host society are expected either to increase family cohesion as individuals retreat and search for alternative sources of emotional support in their kinship and family networks, or lead to family conflict. We expect either relationship pattern, but specifically ambivalent relations to be highly likely in cases of *discrimination experiences* (notion of “mixed feelings/interactions”). The degree to which children retain their parents’ culture is expected to influence family relations positively. As suggested by Portes and Rumbault (2001), good knowledge of the mother tongue may indicate little difference in the acculturation pace between children and parents, and parents’ and children’s shared interest in continuing ties to the home culture (*Turkish language skills of child*). Acculturation in terms of social integration into the German host society is the other item referring to the cultural conflict approach. This item is closely related to German language skills and indicates a shift from the parental home and culture. If we assume parental contact with Germans to be low, a high degree of social integration should constitute an intergenerational gap. This is expected to affect the emotional relationship quality negatively (*contact of child with Germans*). A transnational (temporal) separation of children and parents is a characteristic of Turkish migrant families: Parents emigrated first and only later brought their children, who had until then stayed with their grandparents or other (non-) relatives. This separation is likely to have a negative impact on the emotional relationship between children and their parents. Specifically detached relations should be more likely in those cases, where children were separated (*separation*). A low socioeconomic status can be perceived as a stressor, specifically for minority migrants (Lau et al. 2006). Just as stress resulting from discrimination, a low social standing might affect intergenerational emotional quality negatively – if coping strategies cannot be applied – or positively if individuals choose to retreat to the family. Since migrant parents generally have high education aspirations for their children (Nauck 2000, Boos-Nünning & Karakasoglu 2005), low achievement levels should increase the likelihood of intergenerational disappointment and related conflict (*education level of child*).

(3) Demographic factors: Research repeatedly indicates the women as the kinkeeper with closest relations between mothers and daughters (Steinbach & Kopp 2008). Yet, the specifically high emotional intensity involves conflict as well (Fingerman 2001, Pillemer & Suito 2002, Szydlik 2008). We therefore expect amicable *and* ambivalent relations to evolve more often with mothers than with fathers (*gender of parent*). Relationships with fathers are expected to be rather detached (Birditt et al. 2009b). Accordingly, relationships are expected to be emotionally more intense with daughters, implying a higher likelihood of amicable or ambivalent relationships (*gender of child*). The basic conditions of intergenerational conflict and closeness obviously vary according to proximity and *cohabitation*. Children and parents who cohabit see each other and interact (involuntarily) on a very regular basis. The shared space is highly likely to affect conflict potentials as well as intimacy, resulting in a lower likelihood of detached relations. Age is an important correlating variable as cohabitation is more frequent in young adulthood. Since at the developmental stage of young adulthood tensions are likely to be more intense and evolve around other topics compared to later in life, we expect young and cohabiting dyads to be specifically disharmonious (Clarke et al. 1999, Suito & Pillemer 1991, Birditt et al. 2009a,b).

4. Method

4.1 Data Base

We analysed data from the German Panel Analysis of Intimate Relationships and Family Dynamics (“pairfam”). The main data base used here is a complementary study administered to a random (address) sample of individuals with Turkish nationality within private households in Berlin, the capital of Germany (N=429) (Baykara-Krumme 2010). It was carried out at the same time (2008/09) and under the same conditions as the first wave of the main “pairfam” survey. The latter is a national representative sample of individuals in private households in Germany. Focus groups in both samples are individuals aged 15-17 years, 25-27 years, 35-37 years. Data from the non-immigrant (German) population within the “pairfam” survey serves as the comparison group in the following analyses (N=9.077).

In both surveys, potential respondents were approached by the interviewer in person. Respondents who agreed to participate, were then interviewed for an hour using a computer-assisted schedule administered by the interviewer. In the Berlin “pairfam” survey, Turkish as well as German questionnaires were available and bilingual as well as only German-speaking interviewers were deployed, allowing less fluent German speaking Turks to participate. The

overall response rate was 36.4 percent in the Berlin “pairfam” survey, which is in line with the rate achieved in the main “pairfam” survey (36,9 percent). Themes included in the questionnaires ranged from demographic background, partnership trajectories, children and fertility behaviour to intergenerational relationships and covered opinions on a large range of topics related to family and partnerships. The Berlin “pairfam” survey also included migration and integration-related items. Thus, it is an outstanding data base for testing migration-related influences on family relationships. The perspective considered here is the young adult child who reports about relations with both biological parents.

4.2 Measures and Methods

Dependent variable: In this study we use items on intergenerational closeness and conflict which capture emotional, as well as behavioural, components. The two selected sub-scales of the Network of Relationship Inventory (NRI) from Furman and Buhrmester (1985) provides information on the frequency children have intimate (“Intimacy”) or conflict-ridden (“Conflict”) relations with their parents. Both sub-scales consist of two items. Children had to report about the relations with both their mother and their father on a scale from 1 = never to 5 = always. *Intimacy:* How much do you share your secrets and private feelings with mother/father? How often do you tell her/him what you have on your mind? *Conflict:* How often do you and your mother/father disagree and quarrel? How often does it happen that you are angry or mad at each other? Factor analysis resulted in one factor for each sub-scale. An average index for each of the two sub-scales was used for a cross-classification, using 2,5 as the cut-off point for generating four sub-groups of people with high or low degrees of conflict and intimacy, respectively (cf. Steinbach 2008). The four generated patterns, which will be studied in the following analysis, are labelled as suggested by Ferring et al. (2009): amicable, ambivalent, disharmonious and detached. The last dimension corresponds with the civil type.

Table 1: Patterns of intergenerational relations

		Intimacy	
		High	Low
Conflict	High	Ambivalent	Disharmonious
	Low	Amicable	Detached

In the bivariate and multivariate analyses, binary logistic regressions are calculated, aiming to give evidence for the likelihood of one relationship pattern in comparison to the three remaining patterns (cf. Andreß/Hagenaars/Kühnel 1997). These analyses allow identifying the specific characteristics which affect a single pattern. Various independent variables are included in the models which may constitute moderators or mediators in the comparative analyses.

Independent variables: The following Table 2 shows the distribution and measures of the independent variables for the non-immigrant German and Turkish population, Table 3 presents additional data for the Turkish population.

Table 2: Description of independent variables for Turkish and German population by gender of parent (in percent and mean/standard deviation)

	Mother		Father	
	Turkish	German	Turkish	German
Daughter	58,3	44,1	57,8	47,0
Existence of child(ren)	36,4	27,2	32,2	24,8
High level of education	63,3	87,1	63,1	86,9
Agreement with norm: Life long mutual intergenerational support	4,8 (.6)	4,5 (.8)	4,8 (.6)	4,5 (.8)
Religiosity	3,1 (1.8)	1,8 (1.5)	3,1 (1.7)	1,8 (1.5)
Cohabitation	51,0	38,0	47,8	30,5
<i>N</i>	365	706	320	689

The *existence of children* of the focus person was defined in a dummy variable (yes / no). Alternative definitions (e.g. number of children as a continuous variable) did not show different effects. Cohabitation was defined as *living under the same roof*, i.e. families sharing a household or a house with different household are considered to cohabit. With regard to *level of education*, respondents were asked to state the highest level of education. In the complementary survey on Turks, two separated questions entailed highest educational degree attained in Turkey and Germany. From this information the highest level was defined and

dichotomised with 1 = *high* (intermediate and upper secondary education) and 0 = *low* (none, primary and lower secondary education). Alternative recoding, using three or more categories showed a similar impact to the dummy variable. The item of *intergenerational norms* which is included in analysis with Germans and Turks was asked as follows: “How far do you personally agree with the following statement? Parents and children should support each other a whole lifetime.” Answer categories range from 1 = *do not agree at all* to 5 = *fully agree*. In the complementary Turkish data set, a more comprehensive scale was available. Here factor analysis was applied to a 11-item scale on attitudes towards family relationships, resulting in three factors. The factor representing bottom-up support, i.e. norms on children’s support towards their elderly parents, was based on two items which are included by means of a continuous index. Again, answer categories range from 1 = *do not agree at all* to 5 = *fully agree*. Regarding *religiosity*, the information on denomination and participation in religious meetings was combined. People without a denomination and those who belong to a denomination but never participate in religious events were categorised as not religious (6). Other answers ranged from 5 = *rarely*, 4 = *several times a year*, 3 = *1-3 times a month*, 2 = *once a week*, up to 1 = *more than once a week*.

Table 3: Description of independent variables for Turkish population by gender of parent (in percent and mean/standard deviation)

	Mother	Father
Daughter	56,2	56,4
Existence of child(ren)	35,1	30,8
Cohabitation	52,5	53,3
Turkish language skills	3,4 (.7)	3,5 (.6)
Born in Germany	58,7	60,2
Experience of discrimination	1,7 (.7)	1,7 (.7)
Contact with Germans	2,8 (1.0)	2,8 (1.0)
Separation from parent in childhood	17,2	20,1
Agreement with norm: Children’s support to elderly parents	4,5 (.8)	4,4 (.8)
<i>N</i>	322	288

Only in the Turkish pairfam survey further migration-related items were included. *Migrant generation* is defined as a dummy variable with 1 = *born in Germany* (2nd generation) and 0 = *born abroad* (1st generation).¹ *Turkish language skills*. Respondents were asked how well they spoke Turkish. Answers ranged from 1 = *hardly/none*, 2 = *poor*, 3 = *well*, 4 = *very well*. Oral language skills were applied here, rather than writing skills, in order to capture the oral communication opportunities between children and parents. *Experience of discrimination*. This index (a continuous variable) was based on five different items. Respondents were asked how often they had experienced discrimination due to their nationality or origin in the past two years, a) in school or in the workplace, b) in the neighbourhood, c) when doing shopping, d) at public authorities/in administrative offices, e) in restaurants, cafes or pubs. Answer categories ranged from 1 = *never* to 5 = *very often*. *Contact with Germans*. The question was as follows. “If you think of contacts with Germans in your daily life, that is gatherings or conversations not only a brief hello, how often does this occur?” Respondents were asked with regard to four different contexts, a) at work, in school, b) in the neighbourhood, c) in their peer group /circle of friends, d) in hobby groups. Based on all four contexts and answer categories ranging from 1 = *hardly ever/never* to 5 = *very often*, an index was defined. *Separation from parent*. One item deals with the experience of a separation lasting at least six months from either mother or father in childhood or youth (up to the age of 16 years). To ensure that only migration-related, rather than divorce-related, separations are taken account of, all those cases in which parents were reported to have a new partner were not included. More detailed information on divorce of parents is not available from the questionnaire. Since divorce rates are considered comparatively low for Turkish couples, any errors from this should be small.

Data in Table 2 indicate large differences between the Turkish and the German non-immigrant population for both parents. The Turkish sample includes a higher proportion of women, more children with children and higher cohabitation rates. The educational attainment is much higher in the German non-immigrant population. At the same time the

¹ Next to first and second generation migrants, this sample includes a small number of third generation Turks. Both their parents were born in Turkey (4,9 percent). This group will increase as time goes by and it requires specific attention. The common theoretical frameworks on intergenerational relationships among immigrants refer to families in which children and parents experience different socialisation contexts, i.e. children who emigrated with their parents or were born after their parents had emigrated as adults. The impact of acculturative differences has to be conceptualised differently if parents and children both grow up in the same country: In principal, cultural differences should be less salient in these families with regard to cohesion and conflict. Future research needs to address the question of an ethnic revival in the third generation and its consequences for family relationships, indicated for instance by recent anecdotal issues about young people being more Islamic in dress, religiosity and food codes than their acculturated parents. So far, this pattern has been studied for second generation children only (Schiffauer 1999, Reuter & Gamper 2007).

agreement with the norm of intergenerational support is slightly and religiosity much lower among in that group. With regard to the distribution of migration-specific variables within the Turkish population, Table 3 indicates that Turkish language skills are overall quite high, although quite a high proportion of the children were born in Germany. Discrimination is not often experienced, and there is a medium level of contact with Germans. Separation from a parent occurred more frequently with fathers. About a fifth of all Turks in the sample experienced such a separation from a father and more than a sixth from the mother. Agreement with the norm on bottom-up support is fairly high.

5. Results

Table 4 indicates the prevalence of the four types which were derived from the two factors of conflict and intimacy. With regard to the relations with mothers we find for Turks the amicable relationship is most frequent (39,4 percent), followed by the detached (24,7 percent). Ambivalent (18,2 percent) and disharmonious relations (17,7 percent) are almost equally rare. With fathers, on the contrary, detached relations are the most prevalent (48,9 percent), followed by disharmonious (23,0 percent) and amicable relations (21,6 percent). Ambivalent relations, including conflict and intimacy, are seldom reported (6,5 percent).

Table 4: Relationship patterns among Turks and non-immigrant Germans, %

	Amicable		Ambivalent		Disharmonious		Detached	
	Turks	German non-immigr.	Turks	German non-immigr.	Turks	German non-immigr.	Turks	German non-immigr.
With mother	39,4	35,2+	18,2	15,9	17,7	21,3+	24,7	27,6
With father	21,6	18,5	6,5	5,8	23,0	25,6	48,9	50,0

Data Base: pairfam, main and complementary survey. Turks: mother dyads N=401, father dyads N=356. German non-immigrants: mother dyads N=8.588, father dyads N=7.459, *** p<.001, ** p<.01, * p<.05, + p<.10 for comparisons between both population groups.

Comparative data for non-immigrant Germans are presented to determine whether this pattern is distinct for a migrant population. In comparison with same-aged non-immigrant Germans we find some, but overall small differences. With regard to mothers, amicable relations are significantly more prevalent among Turks (p<.10). Also ambivalent relations are more common (n.s.). Disharmonious (p<.10) relations are significantly less frequent among Turks, as are detached relations (n.s.). We can conclude that in Turkish migrant families

relations with mothers are closer, but not only in “positive” terms. The higher frequency of ambivalent relations is an indicator of the complex nature of social relations among migrants. Differences with regard to fathers are lower and not significant at all. Results indicate that the amicable relationship – which is already less prevalent for fathers as compared to mothers – is slightly more common in Turkish families. Conflict occurs more often in non-immigrant families, detached relations are similarly common in both population groups. These data give no support to the conflict thesis which states that disagreement is more frequent in migrant families. Results show, however, that the absence of (or alternative to) conflict is not only intimacy and closeness but rather a detached relationship in terms of civil relations or even alienation – which might well be a reaction pattern following the migration experience.

The following Table 5 addresses the question of divergence in mother and father relations (Suitor et al. 2009, Ferring et al. 2009). It shows the cross-tabulation of father and mother relations for those respondents with both parents alive. The table contains the relative frequencies observed for Turks (numbers above in each cell) and non-immigrant Germans (numbers below in each cell in italics). The fact that there are results for all patterns of interaction indicates the great variety of children’s relationships with their parents. In the Turkish population only 41,5 percent of respondents show the same pattern of relationships to either parent, in the non-immigrant population this share is only marginally higher (43,0 percent): For the majority, relationship quality differs between mothers and fathers.

Table 5: Cross-tabulation of relationship patterns for fathers and mothers, Turks (N=344) and non-immigrant Germans (*in italics*, N= 7.684) (%)

	Father	Amicable	Ambivalent	Disharmonious	Detached
Mother					
Amicable		12,5 <i>11,4</i>	2,3 <i>1,9</i>	7,6 <i>6,7</i>	18,0 <i>15,3</i>
Ambivalent		3,2 <i>2,9</i>	3,5 <i>2,9</i>	5,8 <i>5,2</i>	6,1 <i>5,2</i>
Disharmonious		3,2 <i>2,1</i>	0,3 <i>0,5</i>	7,8 <i>8,8</i>	7,0 <i>9,9</i>
Detached		2,0 <i>1,8</i>	0,6 <i>0,3</i>	2,5 <i>5,3</i>	17,7 <i>19,9</i>

Data Base: pairfam, main and complementary survey.

High quality relationships with both parents, i.e. the amicable pattern, can be found in a minority of relations, for 12,5 percent of Turks and 11,4 percent of non-immigrant Germans. About a third of Turks (34,8 percent) and even more non-immigrant Germans (43,9 percent) report low quality relations with either parent, i.e. disharmonious or detached relations, indicating a slight advantage for Turks with regard to relationship quality. More Turks (27,9 percent) than non-immigrant Germans (23,9 percent) favour their mothers, i.e. report a better relationship with their mothers. The difference for fathers goes in the same direction, but is lower (8,4 percent Turks, 6,8 percent non-immigrant Germans). As one major finding we have established that differences in relationship patterns between migrant families, Turks, and non-migrant families in Germany, are lower than often anticipated. Even a closer investigation of “parental favouritism” (cf. Steinbach 2008, Ferring et al. 2009) reveals that only few differences exist.

The following section now aims to further explore these patterns and specifically the observed differences. First, this research tries to explain the observed patterns between Turks and non-immigrant Germans directly by integrating both groups in one regression model (cf. Pillemer et al. 2007, Baykara-Krumme 2008a, Baykara-Krumme et al. 2010). This analysis will give a first answer to the question whether differences between both groups are based on socio-structural divergences in composition or rather different cultural backgrounds. Then the analysis focuses on the Turks only and studies the impact of migration-related experiences and characteristics. Obviously, the relevance of migration-specific characteristics can only be studied within a migrant population (cf. Hämmig 2000, Jackson et al. 2007).

Tables 7 and 8 present bivariate and multivariate logistic regression models, indicating the correlations of the predictor variables and the different relationship patterns for mothers and fathers. In each model, the reference category is the three remaining relationship patterns. With regard to amicable relations, results replicate the presented finding that amicable relations with mothers are significantly more frequent among Turkish immigrants. This effect, however, is not longer significant in the multivariate model (moderator effect). Highly significant is the gender of the child, with daughters having a much higher likelihood of amicable relations with mothers than sons. Also a higher agreement with the norm of intergenerational support increases the likelihood of amicable relationships. Neither the level of education nor religiosity has an impact on the relationship. Highly relevant, however, is the living pattern which is highly correlated with age and status in the life course: Children who do not share the same house as their parents are typically older and more often parents

themselves. This greater spatial distance and independence from parents affects intergenerational relationships positively.

Table 6: Logistic regression of relationship patterns of Turks and Germans: Mother, Exp(β)

	Amicable		Ambivalent		Disharmonious		Detached	
	Bi-variate	Multi-variate	Bi-variate	Multi-variate	Bi-variate	Multi-variate	Bi-variate	Multi-variate
Turks (Ref. German non-immigrants)	1.25+	1.10	1.15	1.14	.79	.88	.83	.87
Daughter (Ref. Son)	2.14***	1.95***	1.92***	2.76***	.74*	.81***	.32***	.28***
Parenthood (Ref. No child)	1.36*	.83**	.50***	.70***	.55***	1.00	1.72***	1.57***
Education (Ref. Low level)	.97	1.28***	.93	.94	1.04	.81**	1.06	.95
Agreement with norm: Life-long mutual intergenerational support	1.27**	1.30***	1.03	1.12*	.76**	.71***	.97	.97
Religiosity	1.03	1.03	1.00	1.03	.98	.97+	.98	.98
Separate houses (Ref. Cohabitation)	1.83***	1.74***	.46***	.48***	.51***	.60***	1.48**	1.37***
Pseudo-R ²		.04		.06		.03		.07

N = 8.515

Data Base: pairfam, main and complementary survey. *** p<.001, ** p<.01, * p<.05, + p<.10.

The other models present similar and to some extent complementary results. Firstly, differences between immigrants and non-immigrants are insignificant with regard to all three patterns. Gender has a significant affect as it increases the likelihood of ambivalent relations and reduces the likelihood of detached relations. Education and religiosity do not impact any relationship pattern significantly. The attitude towards the role of support in intergenerational relationships, however, contributes to the prevalence of the disharmonious pattern: The stronger the agreement, the less likely is conflict. Cohabitation patterns again are an important predictor. As hypothesised, ambivalent relations are more likely if family members live together. The same applies to disharmonious relations. On the contrary, detached relations are more common if children live separate and have at least one child themselves: If grandchildren exist, relations are less intense. This might be due to time constraints with

children have fewer opportunities to exchange thoughts and feelings with parents (e.g. Szydlik 2000). Thus, separate houses increase the chance for intergenerational amicability, but for detachment as well, whereas great spatial closeness in a shared house implies intergenerational ambivalence and disharmony. People who sought to improve the relationship might have left their parental house. Yet, the Pseudo-R² value is quite low, indicating a low model fit for all presented models.

Table 7: Logistic regression of relationship patterns of Turks and Germans: Father, Exp(B)

	Amicable		Ambivalent		Disharmonious		Detached	
	Bi-variate	Multi-variate	Bi-variate	Multi-variate	Bi-variate	Multi-variate	Bi-variate	Multi-variate
Turks (Ref. German non-immigrants)	1.26	1.15	1.15	1.10	.96	.96	.86	.98
Daughter (Ref. Son)	1.16	1.26***	1.05	1.17	.92	.91+	.96	.82***
Parenthood (Ref. No child)	.95	.73***	.77	1.06	.47***	.60***	1.79***	1.36***
Education (Ref. Low level)	1.33	1.20*	1.17	1.02	1.07	.90	.78+	1.02
Agreement with norm: Life-long mutual intergenerational support	1.35*	1.30***	1.20	1.07	.87	.86***	.92	.98
Religiosity	1.06	1.05*	1.00	.98	1.01	1.00	.96	.99
Separate houses (Ref. Cohabitation)	1.08	1.40***	.62+	.63***	.46***	.50***	1.84**	1.48***
Pseudo-R ²	0.01		0.01		0.02		0.02	

N = 7.432

Data Base: pairfam, main and complementary survey. *** p<.001, ** p<.01, * p<.05, + p<.10.

This also applies to the models calculated for the relationships with fathers, stressing the exploratory character of this analysis. With regard to fathers, hardly any factor reaches a significant impact level. Differences between Turkish immigrants and non-immigrants Germans remain very low. In contrast to other findings, gender is irrelevant in relationships with fathers. A higher education level increases the likelihood of amicable relations even in the multivariate model, yet is insignificant with regard to all other patterns. Similarly, the

norm on intergenerational relations only affects amicable relations positively. The impact of cohabitation resembles that for mother relationships. If family members live separate, disharmonious relations are significantly less likely whereas detached relations have a higher chance. The coefficients for amicable and ambivalent relationship patterns stress the higher likelihood of ambivalence in cohabiting dyads and amicability in separately living dyads; however, they do not reach the level of statistical significance.

A further major aim of this research is to detect impacts of the immigration experience and migrant status-related characteristics on family relationships. The two following tables present findings for relationships of Turkish citizens with their fathers and mothers. Again, in each model, the three alternative relationship patterns constitute the reference category. First of all, the model replicates the strong impact of the gender of the child and the cohabitation patterns for relationships with mothers: Living in separate houses decreases the chance of conflicts in relationships, with disharmonious relationships significantly less, but amicable relationships more likely. We find no significant gender and proximity effect for relations with fathers.

Table 8: Logistic regression of relationship patterns of Turks: Mother, Exp(β)

	Amicable		Ambivalent		Disharmonious		Detached	
	Bi-variate	Multi-variate	Bi-variate	Multi-variate	Bi-variate	Multi-variate	Bi-variate	Multi-variate
Daughter (Ref. Son)	2.24**	1.98**	1.38	1.68+	.77	.84	.33***	.29***
Country of birth Germany (Ref. Turkey)	.54**	.82	1.57	1.31	2.97**	2.44*	.68	.56+
Turkish language skills	1.23	1.08	1.07	1.17	.82	1.03	.82	.76
Discrimination exp.	.80	.87	1.34	1.35	1.19	1.14	.86	.80
Contact with Germans	.80*	.95	1.23	1.17	1.00	.81	1.12	1.11
Separation from parent in childhood (Ref. No)	.79	.70	1.36	1.81	1.09	1.72	.93	.60
Norm: Support to parents	1.16	1.23	.93	.95	.76+	.62**	1.16	1.19
Separate houses (Ref. Cohabitation)	2.05**	1.86**	.6+	.59	.38**	.43*	1.31	1.39
Pseudo-R ²		.06		.04		.08		.08

N = 322

Data Base: pairfam, main and complementary survey. *** p<.001, ** p<.01, * p<.05, + p<.10.

The impact of migration-related experiences is fairly low. Stressors such as discrimination (or low educational achievement, not shown here) do not affect relationships with parents significantly. However, there are significant effects with regard to place of birth. Children who were born and raised in Germany are more likely to report disharmonious relations with both parents. Detached ($p < .10$) relations with mothers are less likely even after controlling for all other variables, as are amicable relations (n.s.). Since the large majority of all parents were brought up in Turkey, intergenerational relations may be affected by intergenerational differing socialisation contexts.

The effects for the item on Turkish language skills remain insignificant in the multivariate model but indicate support for the hypothesis of an acculturation gap caused by different socialisation contexts. If children know their mother tongue well, disharmonious relations with fathers are less likely and amicable relations are more likely.

Table 9: Logistic regression of relationship patterns of Turks: Father, Exp(β)

	Amicable		Ambivalent		Disharmonious		Detached	
	Bi-variate	Multi-variate	Bi-variate	Multi-variate	Bi-variate	Multi-variate	Bi-variate	Multi-variate
Daughter (Ref. Son)	1.10	1.12	.68	.74	.90	1.01	1.11	.99
Country of birth Germany (Ref. Turkey)	.83	.73	.57	.88	2.17**	1.78	.77	.88
Turkish language skills	1.53+	1.47	.91	.71	.67+	.77	1.07	1.04
Discrimination exp.	.85	.81	1.34	1.37	1.11	1.04	.95	1.03
Contact with Germans	1.19	1.22	1.07	1.0	1.19	1.10	.77*	.81+
Separation from parent in childhood (Ref. No)	.99	.84	2.49+	2.12	.94	1.39	.80	.73
Norm: Support to parents	.96	.98	.90	.97	.81	.75	1.25	1.23
Separate houses (Ref. Cohabitation)	1.00	.75	2.05	2.12	.50**	.64	1.37	1.34
Pseudo-R ²		.02		.05		.04		.02

N = 289

Data Base: pairfam, main and complementary survey. *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$, + $p < .10$.

The degree of social integration shows hardly significant effects on relationships with mothers. Yet, for fathers, detached relations are significantly less likely if contact with Germans is frequent ($p < .10$). In contrast to the suggested hypothesis, children who have more

contact with Germans seem to have amicable relations with their fathers (n.s.): Frequent contact with Germans seems to increase the degree of involvement with fathers, in a positive as well as a negative direction. A separation from parents in childhood appears only to affect the relationships with fathers (coefficient of 2.1). Because of the low case numbers the coefficient does not reach statistical significance in the multivariate model. Norms have an impact on the degree of conflict in relationship, but with mothers only. Children, who support the norm of children's support towards their parents in case of need, are less likely to experience disharmonious relations with mothers and fathers. This latter finding is not statistically significant, which may be partly attributed to low case numbers.

6. Discussion

In this study, we have examined patterns of intergenerational relationship quality among migrants from a comparative perspective in order to understand the influence of socioeconomic, cultural and migration-related characteristics. The focus has been on family ties which can be an important source of support for the individual. The dominant story of intergenerational relations in immigrant communities stresses tensions and conflict. Migration is expected to weaken and disrupt family ties. For some time, however, arguments for stronger family ties in migration have been supported empirically. This study addresses this issue for a group of first and second generation Turkish people, who live in Germany. Their reports about relations to their parents are studied in terms of patterns which consider positive as well as negative aspects of the relationship simultaneously. This solidarity-conflict approach can be found in the international research on intergenerational relations in the last decade, but has not been applied to date, to an immigrant population (cf. Giarusso et al. 2005, Pillemer et al. 2007, Ferring et al. 2009).

Results indicate that disharmonious relationships, involving a high degree of arguments and dispute are by no means the most frequent pattern. Instead, amicable relationships which imply intensive exchange of intimate information and closeness are most common. They are even more frequent in this group as compared to non-immigrants. At the same time, ambivalent relations, implying conflict as well as intimacy, occur more frequently among Turkish migrants. This result clearly indicates that the focus on conflicts does not cover the complexity of intergenerational relationships: Conflicts may occur while being embedded in close and intimate relationships.

The issue here is whether this pattern of relationship quality is due to different cultural backgrounds and socialisation contexts or rather the immigration experience. Different hypotheses have been outlined. The fact that the described differences can be found in relationships with mothers, but not with fathers, is a first indicator that neither cultural nor migration-related situational factors may be influential.

In multivariate analyses, no “ethnic” differences persist. Cultural attitude differences may explain part of the variance, supporting the hypothesis of cultural influences, since Turks agree to the norm on intergenerational support to a larger extent than non-immigrants and the impact of this factor is significant. Most influential, however, are the gender of the child and cohabitation patterns. As proposed with reference to the research literature on women as kinkeepers, results confirm the strength of daughter-mother ties: Daughters are more likely to have amicable, but also ambivalent relationships (cf. Fingerman 2001, 2008). The larger proportion of women in the Turkish sample may thus explain part of the variance in terms of a composition effect. Moreover, cohabitation increases the likelihood of ambivalent as well as disharmonious relationships. Moving out of the parental home may be a means to avoid conflict and retain intimate relationships.

The notion of gendered family ties among immigrants and non-immigrants was supported by an analysis of “parental favouritism”. It showed that, if a parent is favoured, it is usually the mother rather than the father. Overall, a comparison between both groups indicates few differences.

Finally, this research aimed to explain the role of situational migration-related predictors. Whereas many hypotheses mentioned in the literature deal with these factors, they have rarely been tested empirically, due mainly to lack of data sources. The pairfam complementary study provides representative data for many of the theoretically important concepts. First of all, we can resume that gender and cohabitation again explain large parts of the variance. In contrast to the expectations, migration-related characteristics and experiences have only a small impact on intergenerational relationship quality. For instance, stress caused by low social standing or discrimination do not seem to lead to either a retreat into the family with intensified interaction, or to increased family conflicts, detachment or ambivalence. Complying with the hypothesis of increased intergenerational troubles, children’s likelihood of ambivalent relations with fathers increases if they were separated in childhood. However, this effect is not significant in the multivariate model and does not apply to relations with mothers. One explanation may be specific protection factors for the immigrant children such as remaining in a familiar environment and being looked after by kinship members in the

home context, with continuing intense relationships with the biological parents (Wilpert 1992).

The impact of (divergent) acculturation processes is studied with regard to three aspects (country of birth, language skills, social integration). They show some, but inconsistent and overall very little influences. As very general information on socialisation context, country of birth is taken account of. Results indicate that children born in Germany have a higher likelihood of disharmonious and ambivalent relations with their mother, complying with the hypothesis on the effect of different socialisation contexts. Children of the second generation may differ with regard to attitudes and behaviour to a larger extent from their parents, than those of the first generation who were born in the same country as their parents.

The effect of contact with Germans is fairly low and only partly in line with the hypothesis. With mothers, social integration into the host society reduces the likelihood of amicable relations. The importance of family relations decreases as children have more contact with members of the receiving society. However, this effect is significant only in bivariate analysis. With fathers, quite on the contrary, detached relations are less likely and amicable relations are slightly more likely, implying an enhancement of family ties and no clear trend in the effect of social integration. Finally, Turkish language skills only appear to affect relations with fathers. The better the communication opportunities due to good Turkish language skills, the less likely are detached or disharmonious relations as cultural retention positively influences relations with fathers and reduces likelihood of conflict. This is in line with the hypothesis and supports findings from the USA (e.g. Portes & Rumbault 2001). Yet again, the statistical support for this hypothesis is fairly low.

The small explanatory power of migration-related variables corresponds with the overall small differences in the non-immigrant population. Intergenerational relations in terms of emotional and behavioural quality are largely unaffected by context-related situational and cultural factors, but rather appear as quite stable patterns. Individuals seem to experience family life independent of the outer sphere. The culturally different socialisation contexts may imply different foci of family solidarity (Nauck & Suckow 2006, Nauck 2010). With regard to intergenerational relationship quality after migration the impact is rather low. Similarly, migration-related stress or high degrees of acculturation of the children do not impair intergenerational relationships; neither do they enhance them tremendously. Overall, migrant youth and their parents experience conflict and detachment, emotional support and ambivalence in a similar way to non-migrants. Also for later life relations, regarding the

family embeddedness of the elderly, these data do not give any indication of great disruption or upheavals to be expected within the (migrant) family (Baykara-Krumme 2008a, Baykara-Krumme et al. 2010).

Although these findings permit a unique insight into family life in a migration context, a major drawback is the sample size which only allows for limited interpretations. Moreover, for a more detailed analysis of the effects of intergenerational (dis)similar acculturation, dyadic data is required which includes information on parents as well. With regard to Turkish family resources, studies on the effects of migration on intergenerational relationships and transmission in the future have to conceptualize the existence of the third and fourth generation of immigrants. Here, not the immigration itself, but ongoing experiences of discrimination and ethnic boundary-making may have an impact on family resources. Most desirable, though, are longitudinal data which enable the dynamics of relationship types to be identified and an analysis of the direct causal effects of intra-individual changes, to be studied. This data would also enable such aspects as the relevance of critical events in life such as migration, giving birth to a child, becoming unemployed, experiencing discrimination and racism, on intergenerational relationships to be considered (Hoff 2008, Nauck & Steinbach 2009). Only when this is done will we be able to fully grasp the complexities of how families function in migration-related circumstances.

References

- Andreß, H.J., Hagenars, J.A. & S. Kühnel (1997): Analyse von Tabellen und kategorialen Daten. Berlin.
- Attias-Donfut, C., Wolff, F.-C. (2008): Patterns of intergenerational transfers among immigrants in France. A comparative perspective. In: Saraceno, C. (Ed.): Families, Ageing and Social Policy. Generational Solidarity in European Welfare State. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 259-284.
- Baykara-Krumme, H. (2008a): Immigrant families in Germany. Intergenerational solidarity in later life. Berlin: Weißensee Verlag.
- Baykara-Krumme, H. (2008b): Reliable bonds? A comparative perspective of intergenerational support patterns among migrant families in Germany. In: Saraceno, C. (Ed.): Families, Ageing and Social Policy. Generational Solidarity in European Welfare States. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 285-311.

- Baykara-Krumme, H. (2010): Die Berliner pairfam Studie – Ein Methodenbericht. Working Paper. Technische Universität Chemnitz.
- Baykara-Krumme, H., Klaus, D. & A. Steinbach (2010): Generationenbeziehungen in Deutschland (Published in 2010).
- Boos-Nünning, U., Karakasoglu, Y. (2005): Viele Welten leben. Zur Lebenssituation von Mädchen und jungen Frauen mit Migrationshintergrund. Münster: Waxmann.
- Bengtson, V. (2001): Beyond the nuclear family: The increasing importance of multigenerational bonds. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 63, 1-16.
- Bengtson, V. L., Giarrusso, R. et al. (2002): Solidarity, conflict, and ambivalence: Complementary or competing perspectives on intergenerational relationships? *Journal of Marriage and Family* 64, 568-576.
- Birditt, K. S., Rott, L. M. et al. (2009a): "If you can't say something nice, don't say anything at all": Coping with interpersonal tensions in the parent-child relationship during adulthood. *Journal of Family Psychology* 23(6), 769-778.
- Birditt, K. S., Miller, L. M. et al. (2009b): Tensions in the parent and adult child relationship: Links to solidarity and ambivalence. *Psychology and Aging* 24(2), 287-295.
- Clarke, E. J., Preston, M. et al. (1999): Types of conflicts and tensions between older parents and adult children. *The Gerontologist* 39, 3, 261-270.
- De Valk, H. A. G., Liefbroer, A. C. (2007): Timing preferences for women's family-life transitions: Intergenerational transmission among migrants and Dutch. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 69, 190-206.
- Dietzel-Papakyriakou, M. (2005): Potenziale älterer Migranten und Migrantinnen. *Zeitschrift für Gerontologie und Geriatrie* 38, 6, 396-406.
- Dumon, W. A. (1989): Family and migration. *International Migration* 27, 2, 251-270.
- Ferring, D., Michels, T. et al. (2009): Emotional relationship quality of adult children with ageing parents: on solidarity, conflict and ambivalence. *European Journal of Aging* 6, 235-265.
- Fingerman, K.L. (2001): *Aging mothers and their adult daughters: A study in mixed emotions*. New York: Springer
- Fingerman, K. L., Pitzer, L. et al. (2008): Ambivalent relationship qualities between adults and their parents: implications for the well-being of both parties. *Journal of Gerontology B Psychology* 61, P362-P371.
- Furman, W., D. Burmester (1985): Children's perceptions of the personal relationships in their social networks. In: *Developmental Psychology*, 21, 1016–1024.

- Gestring, N., Janssen, A., Polat, A. (2006): Prozesse der Integration und Ausgrenzung: Türkische Migranten der zweiten Generation. Wiesbaden: VS-Verlag.
- Giarrusso, R., Silverstein, M. et al. (2005): Aging parents and adult children: New perspectives on international relationships. In: Johnson, M. L. (Ed.): The Cambridge Handbook of Age and Ageing. Cambridge: University Press, 413-421.
- Güngör, D. (2008): The meaning of parental control in migrant, sending and host communities: adaptation or persistence? *Applied Psychology. An International Review* 57, 3, 397-416.
- Hämmig, O. (2000): Zwischen zwei Kulturen. Spannungen, Konflikte und ihre Bewältigung bei der zweiten Ausländergeneration. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.
- Heckmann, F. (1992): Ethnische Minderheiten, Volk und Nation. Soziologie inter-ethnischer Beziehungen. Stuttgart: Friedrich Enke Verlag.
- Heitmeyer, W., Müller, J. et al. (1997): Verlockender Fundamentalismus. Türkische Jugendliche in Deutschland. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp.
- Herwartz-Emden, L. (Ed.) (2000): Einwandererfamilien. Osnabrück: Universitätsverlag Rasch.
- Hoff, A. (2006): Intergenerationale Familienbeziehungen im Wandel. In: Tesch-Römer, C. Engstler, H. & S. Wurm (eds.): Altwerden in Deutschland. Sozialer Wandel und individuelle Entwicklung in der zweiten Lebenshälfte. Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 231-287.
- Hofstede, G. (2001): Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviours, institutions and organisations across nations. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Jackson, J. S., Brown, E. et al. (2005): Ethnic diversity in ageing, multicultural societies. In: Johnson, M. L. (Ed.): The Cambridge Handbook of Age and Ageing. Cambridge: University Press.
- Jackson, J. S., Forsythe-Brown, I. et al. (2007): Age cohort, ancestry, and immigrant generation influences in family relations and psychological well-being among black Caribbean family members. *Journal of Social Issues* 63, 4, 729-743.
- Kagitcibasi, C. (1996): Family and human development across cultures: a view from the other side. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Ass.
- Kagitcibasi, C. (2003): Autonomy, embeddedness and adaptability in immigration contexts. *Human Development* 46, 145-150.
- Kagitcibasi, C. (2005): Autonomy and relatedness in cultural context. Implications for self and family. In: *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 36, 403-422.

- Kalter, F. (2006): Auf der Suche nach einer Erklärung für die spezifischen Arbeitsmarktnachteile von Jugendlichen türkischer Herkunft. In: *Zeitschrift für Soziologie*, 35, 2, 144–160.
- Katz, R., Lowenstein, A. et al. (2005): Theorising intergenerational family relations. Solidarity, conflict and ambivalence in cross-national contexts. In: Bengtson, V., Acock, A. C. et al. (Eds.): *Sourcebook of Family Theory and Research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 393-407.
- Katz, R. (2009): Intergenerational family relations and life satisfaction among three elderly population groups in transition in the Israel multi-cultural society. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Gerontology* 24: 77-91.
- Kohli, M., Künemund, H. et al. (2000): Families apart? Intergenerational transfers in East and West Germany. In: Arber, S., Attias-Donfut, C. (Eds.): *The myth of generational conflict. The family and state in ageing societies*. London, New York: Routledge, 88-98.
- Kohli, M., Künemund, H. et al. (2005): Generationenbeziehungen. In: Kohli, M., Künemund, H. (Eds.): *Die zweite Lebenshälfte. Gesellschaftliche Lage und Partizipation im Spiegel des Alters-Survey*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag, 176-211.
- Kreidt, U., Leenen, W. R. et al. (1989): Trennungserfahrung und Lebenslauf. Folgen von "Familienfragmentierung" bei türkischen Migranten der Zweiten Generation. *Zeitschrift für Pädagogik* 35, 3, 337-355.
- Lang, F. R. (2004): The filial task in midlife: ambivalence and the quality of adult children's relationships with their older parents. In: Pillemer, K., Lüscher, K. (Eds.): *Intergenerational ambivalences: new perspectives on parent-child relations in later life*. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 85-113.
- Lau, A. S., Takeuchi, D. T. et al. (2006): Parent-to-child aggression among Asian American parents: culture, context, and vulnerability. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 68, 1261-1275.
- Lawton, L., Silverstein, M. et al. (1994): Affection, social contact and geographic distance between adult children and their parents. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 56, 57-68.
- Lüscher, K. & Pillemer, K. (1998): Intergenerational ambivalence: A new approach to the study of parent-child relations in later life. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 60, 413-425.

- Lüscher, K. (2004): Conceptualizing and uncovering intergenerational ambivalence. In: K. Pillemer, Lüscher, K. (Eds.): Intergenerational ambivalences: New perspectives on parent-child relations in later life.
- Lye, D. N. (1996): Adult child-parent relationships. *Annual Review of Sociology* 22: 79-102.
- Nauck, B. (1985): Arbeitsmigration und Familienstruktur. Eine Analyse der mikrosozialen Folgen von Migrationsprozessen. Frankfurt/M.: Campus.
- Nauck, B. (1989): Assimilation process and group integration of migrant families. *International Migration* 27, 1, 27-47.
- Nauck, B. (1997): Intergenerative Konflikte und gesundheitliches Wohlbefinden in türkischen Familien. Ein interkultureller und interkontextueller Vergleich. In: Nauck, B. & Schönflug, U. (Hrsg.): Familien in verschiedenen Kulturen. Stuttgart: Enke, 324-354.
- Nauck, B. (2000): Eltern-Kind-Beziehungen in Migrantenfamilien - ein Vergleich zwischen griechischen, italienischen, türkischen und vietnamesischen Familien in Deutschland. In: Sachverständigenkommission 6. Familienbericht (Hrsg.): Familien ausländischer Herkunft in Deutschland: Empirische Beiträge zur Familienentwicklung und Akkulturation. Materialien zum 6. Familienbericht, Band I. Opladen: Leske + Budrich, 347-392.
- Nauck, B. (2001): Generationenbeziehungen und Heiratsregimes - theoretische Überlegungen zur Struktur von Heiratsmärkten und Partnerwahlprozessen am Beispiel der Türkei und Deutschland. In: T. Klein (Ed.): Partnerwahl und Heiratsmuster. Sozialstrukturelle Voraussetzungen der Liebe. Opladen, 35-56.
- Nauck, B. (2007): Immigrant families in Germany. Family change between situational adaption, acculturation, segregation and remigration. *Zeitschrift für Familienforschung* 19, 34-54.
- Nauck, B. (2009): Kinship relationships in eleven societies in Asia, Europe and North America. Working Paper.
- Nauck, B., Kohlmann, A. (1998): Verwandtschaft als soziales Kapital – Netzwerkbeziehungen in türkischen Migrantenfamilien. In: Wagner, M., Schütze, Y. (eds.): Verwandtschaft. Sozialwissenschaftliche Beiträge zu einem vernachlässigten Thema. Stuttgart: Enke, 203-235.
- Nauck, B., Suckow, J. (2006): Intergenerational relationships in cross-cultural comparison: How social networks frame intergenerational relations between mothers and grand-

- mothers in Japan, Korea, China, Indonesia, Israel, Germany, and Turkey. *Journal of Family Issues* 27, 1159-1185.
- Nauck, B., Niephaus, Y. (2006): Intergenerative conflicts and health hazards in migrant families. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 37, 275-298.
- Nauck, B., Steinbach, A. (2009): Intergenerational relationships. Working Paper 116. German Council for Social and Economic Data (RatSWD). Berlin.
- Nesteruk, O., Marks, L. (2009). Grandparents across the ocean: Eastern European immigrants' struggle to maintain intergenerational relationships. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 40, 1, 77-95.
- Nohl, A.-M. (2001): Migration und Differenzenerfahrung. Junge Einheimische und Migranten im Milieuvvergleich. Opladen: Leske+Budrich.
- Parrenas, R. (2005): Long distance intimacy: Class, gender and intergenerational relations between mothers and children in Filipino transnational families. *Global Networks* 5, 4, 317-336.
- Parrott, T. M., Bengtson, V. L. (1999): The effects of earlier intergenerational affection, normative expectations, and family conflict on contemporary exchanges of help and support. *Research in Aging* 21, 1, 73-105.
- Pekin, H. (1989): Effects of migration on family structure. *International Migration* 27, 2, 281-294.
- Phalet, K., Schönplflug, U. (2001): Intergenerational transmission of collectivism and achievement values in two acculturation contexts. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 32, 2, 186-201.
- Pillemer, K., Suitor, J.J. (2002): Explaining mothers' ambivalence toward their adult children. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 64, 602-613.
- Pillemer, K., Suitor, J. J. et al. (2007): Capturing the complexity of intergenerational relations: Exploring ambivalence within later-life families. *Journal of Social Issues* 63, 4, 775-791.
- Portes, A. & Rumbaut, R. G. (1996): *Immigrant America: a portrait*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Portes, A. & Rumbaut, R. G. (2001): *Legacies. The Story of the Immigrant Second generation*. Berkeley and Los Angeles/New York: University of California Press/Sage.
- Rabold, S., Diehl, C. (2003): Migration und familiale Konflikte. *Zeitschrift für Bevölkerungswissenschaft* 28, 2-4, 355-368.

- Schelsky, H. (1950): Die Flüchtlingsfamilie. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie* 3, 2, 159-177.
- Schofield, T. J., Young, K. et al. (2008): Bridging the acculturation gap: Parent-child relationship quality as a moderator in Mexican American families. *Developmental Psychology* 44, 4, 1190-1184.
- Schrader, A., Nikles, B. W., Griese, H.M. (1979): Die zweite Generation. Sozialisation und Akkulturation ausländischer Kinder in der Bundesrepublik. Königstein: Athenäum Verlag.
- Schütze, Y. (1993): Beziehungen zwischen erwachsenen Kindern und ihren Eltern. In: Auhagen, E., von Salisch, M. (Eds.): *Zwischenmenschliche Beziehungen*. Göttingen: 105-118.
- Seibert, H., Solga, H. (2005): Gleiche Chancen dank der abgeschlossenen Ausbildung? Zum Signalwert von Ausbildungsabschlüssen bei ausländischen und deutschen jungen Erwachsenen. In: *Zeitschrift für Soziologie* 34, 5, 364-382.
- Silverstein, M., Bengtson, V. (1997): Intergenerational solidarity and the structure of adult child-parent relationships in American families. *American Journal of Sociology* 103, 429-460.
- Sluzki, C. E. (1979): Migration and family conflict. *Family Process* 18, 4, 379-390.
- Statistisches Bundesamt (2009): Bevölkerung und Erwerbstätigkeit. Bevölkerung mit Migrationshintergrund. Ergebnisse des Mikrozensus 2007. Wiesbaden.
- Steinbach, A. (2008): Intergenerational Solidarity and Ambivalence: Types of Relationships in German Families. In: *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 34, 115-127.
- Steinbach, A. & Kopp, J. (2008): Intergenerationale Beziehungen. Theoretische Diskussionen, empirische Befunde und offene Fragen. In: Feldhaus, M. & Huinink, J. (Hrsg.): *Neuere Entwicklungen in der Beziehungs- und Familienforschung. Vorstudien zum Beziehungs- und Familienentwicklungspanel (PAIRFAM)*. Würzburg: Ergon, 403-430.
- Suitor, J. J., Pillemer, K. (1991): Family conflict when adult children and elderly parents share a home. In: K. Pillemer, McCarthy, K. (Eds.): *Parent-child relations throughout life*. New Jersey, London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 179-199.
- Suitor, J. J., Sechrist, J. et al. (2009): The Role of Parental Favoritism in Sibling Relations in Midlife. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 71, 1026-1038.
- Szydlik, M. (2000): Lebenslange Solidarität? Generationenbeziehungen zwischen erwachsenen Kindern und Eltern. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.

- Szydlik, M. (2008): Intergenerational Solidarity and Conflict. In: *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 34, 97-114.
- Van Galen, R. I., Dykstra, P.A. (2006): Solidarity and conflict between adult children and parents: a latent class analysis. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 68, 947-960.
- Wilpert, C. (1992): The use of social networks in Turkish migration to Germany. In: Kritz, M. M., Lim, L. L.; Zlotnik, H. (eds.): *International migration systems. A global approach*. Oxford, 177-189.
- Zelinsky, Wilbur; Barrett, A. Lee, 1998: Ying, Y.-W., Han, M. (2007): The longitudinal effect of intergenerational gap in acculturation on conflict and mental health in Southeast Asian American adolescents. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 77, 1, 61-66.