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Abstract. This article fills the gap in the research on the motives of intergenerational support. Using qualitative data, it examines the question of intergenerational support between adult children and their parents. The theoretical premises for the study are derived from the theory of symbolic interactionism. The interviews with the dyads of support providers and receivers reveal a strong emphasis on the exchange. The exchange based on the logic of reciprocity is either latent or manifest. Other symbolic meanings of the logic of reciprocity, i.e., exchange as an investment and a social debt, can also be noticed. The analysis of the motives demonstrates the reasons for the formation of the intergenerational attitudes: a role of demonstration effect and a strong role of primary and secondary socialization with certain internalized attitudes. Altruism is expressed by emphasizing emotions and affection. Several thematic segments are apparent in the interviews: altruism as an unquestioned phenomenon, altruism as a primordial quality and attachment as an object of reflection. The article suggests that the inclusion of an action level into intergenerational relationship studies helps to deepen the understanding of family relationships.
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Introduction

The word generation in everyday language is usually used to emphasize the differences between the age groups or to link these groups with socio-historical contexts. However, the issue of generations has recently gained more importance not only in everyday language but also among both social researchers and policy makers. Due to the demographic factors causing imbalances in the allocation of resources to different generations, the issue of generations has become

---

1 This paper was prepared within the framework of the project entitled “Systems of Intergenerational Solidarity in Lithuania: Qualitative and Quantitative Insights,” as a part of the Generations in Dialogue Fellowship for Social Researchers funded by the ERSTE Foundation.
particularly significant in the countries experiencing the consequences of the second demographic transition. Currently, researchers addressed a number of issues related to intergenerational relationship: What forms of solidarity exist in societies and what structural factors can explain them? What imbalances in intergenerational support may be observed and what is the role of grandparents in it? However, the issue of the motives of intergenerational support that often seems a natural element of family relationships has received less attention. Yet, it should be analyzed sociologically.

Kohli and Künemund (2003) admit that the motives as factors remain vague and unexplored in intergenerational relationships. They argue that, first of all, the analysis of merely the socio-demographic characteristics of intergenerational support providers/receivers leaves an incomplete picture of intergenerational relationships. In order to understand it, the inclusion of an action level is essential. In other words, it is necessary to reveal the meanings that active individuals attach to social situations. Secondly, the analysis of motives between adult children and their parents allows us to understand how the behavior of individuals changes when the social settings are altered (for example, some changes in family policy take place). Finally, it is essential to become aware of the role of motives in the structure of social relationships. It may be important for the receivers of intergenerational support to understand whether this support is based on self-interest, love, altruism or other motives. To conclude, the research of motives of intergenerational support enables us to expand our understanding of family relationships.

Studies that examine intergenerational motives by using qualitative data are very rare. However, qualitative methodology is useful if we want to grasp the deeper meanings of intergenerational relationships. Thus, this article attempts to examine social meanings related to intergenerational support by using quantitative data. It raises the issue of the motives of intergenerational support between adult children and their parents.

The article is divided into four sections. It opens with a review of literature on research relevant to the study. The second section is devoted to the description of the theoretical framework. The following part explains the methodological procedures used. The fourth part based on quantitative data examines social meanings attached to the motives of intergenerational support. It analyzes different forms of intergenerational support and the ways the receivers and providers understand them. The article closes with conclusions.

1. Literature on Intergenerational Motives: Exchange, Altruism and Norms

The literature on the motives of intergenerational support includes contradictory arguments: intergenerational support as exchange, norms, altruism and attachment.
**Motive of exchange.** The motive of exchange is discussed in both sociological and economic texts. Although the motive of exchange in these disciplines is based on different principles, they use the same premise that reciprocity structures social relationships. Kohli and Künemund describe reciprocity in the following way: “... it is assumed that giving places an obligation to get something back in return for what was given, and that the values exchanged should be broadly equivalent” (Kohli, Künemund 2003, 129).

Some applications of this model in economic literature focus on bequest as a motivating factor for adult children to provide social support to their elderly parents (Bernheim et al. 1986). Other applications also emphasize egocentric motives. Cox and Stark (1994) propose the demonstration effect: adult children have an incentive to support their aging parents in order to demonstrate the importance of such support to their own children. If microeconomics focuses mostly on exchange transactions themselves, social exchange theory extends the scope of analysis by incorporating the relationship between the exchange partners, the history of the transaction, etc. Kalmijn (2005) summarizes the forms of exchanges. *Delayed exchange* is the most common form of exchange when parents invest in children until they become independent, and later adult children “pay back” their parents by supporting them and paying attention to them. The second form, *prospective exchange*, is a situation in which children support elderly parents in order to receive money or property when their parents die (Kalmijn 2005). The third form is *direct exchange* when parents and children exchange different goods at the same time.

This article discusses only a few applications of the exchange motive but it is clear that all research studies that incorporate the exchange motive emphasize strongly self-interest. For such an approach the exchange theory has been duly criticized.

**Altruism and attachment.** The theory of altruism contradicts the ideas of the exchange theory. It assumes that an affectionate relationship guides people to behave altruistically while a non-affectionate relationship causes people to behave egoistically (Altonji et al. 1992). In affectionate relationships, intergenerational exchanges are driven unconditionally by the needs of the recipients for the potential support. Some authors note that the concept of pure altruism is not a dominant motive; altruism may also be associated with the “joy of giving” and labeled as an “impure altruism” (Andreoni 1989). Some sociologists notice the operation of norms in dealing with the motives for altruism. For example, Klauss (2009) states that altruism is another form of strategic behavior, and helping behavior is only superficially altruistic. However, other sociologists find examples of pure altruism. Silverstein et al. (2002) argue that pure altruism exist in the instances when adult children provide social support for elderly parents although they did not receive any support from their parents. Even if previous relationships were bad, children react to their elderly parents’ needs. Therefore, these authors speak of the possibility of the existence
of unconditional help. Bengston and Parrot (1999) similarly suggest that previous conflicts between parents and children have no effect on the support provided by adult children to their elderly parents.

**Norms/normative approach.** This approach emphasizes unconditional rules of the modes behavior internalized during the process of socialization (Kalmijn 2005). In the case of intergenerational relationships, the most common examples of such norms are the obligation towards children and a filial obligation. A positive dependency is usually designated between stronger normative attitudes and an individual behavior. Lee et al. (1994) estimate that parents who keep stronger familial normative obligations provide more support for adult children than parents with weaker normative obligations. Whitbeck et al. (1994) identify the same relation for the opposite flow.

There is no agreement on the motives of intergenerational support. The main focus of the motive of exchange is the norm of reciprocity. Feelings of affection are at the center of altruism and attachment. The normative approach concentrates on dominant rules in society that affect the action.

2. Theoretical Framework

The conceptual framework of the article derives from the theory of symbolic interactionism. According to this theory, individuals do not merely react to each other’s actions but interpret or define each other’s actions (Blumer 1969). A response is based on the meaning attached to a certain action. Thus, “human interaction is mediated by the use of symbols, by interpretation, or by ascertaining the meaning of one another’s actions” (Blumer 1986, 79). Interaction enables individuals to gain meanings about the world and the self (Mead 1934; Blumer 1986). The declaration that a human being has a self is one of the key features of symbolic interactionism. It implies that individuals can be objects of their own actions. Moreover and foremost, the self is a reflexive process of social experience:

> It is by means of reflexiveness – the turning-back of the experience of the individual upon himself – that the whole social process is thus brought into the experience of the individuals involved in it; it is by such means, which enable the individual to take the attitude of the other toward himself, that the individual is able consciously to adjust himself to that process, and to modify the resultant of that process in any given social act in terms of his adjustment to it. Reflexiveness, then, is the essential condition, within the social process, for the development of mind (Mead 1934, 134).

The theory of symbolic interactionism allows treating individual as active in social interaction. Moreover, based on the theory, social interaction can be considered a dynamic process in which meanings are constructed.
3. Methodology

For the qualitative analysis, 42 semi-structured interviews with providers and receivers of intergenerational support unfamiliar to the interviewer were conducted. The interviews were conducted in 2009–2010. The interviewees were selected by the principle of diversity according to the type of support that they provided to each other (the dyads “parent-adult child” were interviewed) in various cities and rural areas. The generation to which parents or children belong is marked in brackets (this way the position in the dyadic relationship is distinguished in the analysis of the qualitative data). The names of the interviewees were changed.

4. Results of the Qualitative Data: Motives of Intergenerational Support

In order to attribute the provided and received support to a certain group, Parrot and Bengston’s (1999, 85) classification scheme of support forms is applied in the article:

1. Instrumental support: household chores, transportation and shopping, child care, help when sick;
2. Expressive support: emotional support, information and advice, discussion of important decisions, leisure time spent together; and

4.1. Motive of Exchange: Why should I Bend the Stick if I am not Able to Lean on it Later?

The motive of exchange occurs often in the interviews; therefore it will be analyzed thoroughly. In the interviews, the category of mutual exchange such as “paying back,” “investment,” “debt,” “reciprocity,” “mutual benefit” and “mutual support” was articulated through the following expressions: “you get what you give” and “you give love – you get love.” The logic of reciprocity often manifested itself in interviewees’ narration on support given or received. Three thematic segments – exchange as reciprocity, investment and social debt – expressed the motive of exchange. We should emphasize that each interview contains a whole group of motives rather than one motive.

4.1.1. Exchange Based on Reciprocity

Exchange based on reciprocity is a common thematic segment in the motive of exchange. It is expressed in two ways: (a) in the way sentences and sequences of narratives are constructed without clear identification of the logic of reciprocity
Latent reciprocity. One of the most apparent examples of well-expressed latent reciprocity is Ramune’s case. The interview with 32-year-old Ramune revealed a variety of support forms between her, her sisters and parents. A portion of the narrative on the contribution of both generations implies an exchange-based logic that remains latent:

We lend a hand to our parents with hard farm labor. When they get sick, we find doctors… If there’s a need, we will help them financially. For the time being, this kind of support is not necessary and they don’t want it. Our parents help us do certain household tasks. For example, when I moved into my apartment, Dad helped me to renovate it, buy materials, and so on... When we need it, they help us financially but we take such support very unwillingly. I find myself very uncomfortable when I have to ask for money, even if I only borrow it. Our parents always give us their vegetables; my Mom brings me her prepared food similarly as during my study years. I never refuse it even if I can make it myself since I know how much joy it gives them… (Ramune, children’s generation).

Examples of latent reciprocity are very common in the interviews on the net flow of support “from above”: the older generation provides financial and other material support and the younger generation “repays” with instrumental and emotional support. These forms of support usually become gratitude for the goods received from the rural parents’ gardens. However, in several cases, latent reciprocity is evident in the net flow of support in the opposite direction (“from below”). Two cases when the financial support flows from the younger generation can be distinguish: (1) constant and (2) occasional support. The narrative of 67-year-old Laima who receives financial support from her daughters illustrates the first case. One of her daughters has a well-paid position, and the other has married a wealthy man. Laima accepts her daughters’ support very naturally. In her narrative, the latent logic of exchange is associated with an emotional level:

You know, I could manage by myself but why should I if I get it with love? I see it… Then why shouldn’t I take it? My needs are not the same as those of a young person. I work, I have a garden, and I provide them with vegetables. They would manage without it, for sure. But it’s very nice that they’re fertilizer-free and natural and mainly for my grandchildren (Laima, parents’ generation).

In the second case, the younger generation’s occasional support has to do with parents’ financial difficulties. Linas, a 26-year-old interviewee whose parents live abroad, does not treat his financial support for parents as important. He gives them money for their travel tickets or business tax but he adds: “Well, but that isn’t serious money.”
The interviews with the oldest generation also reveal the logic of latent reciprocity and the support model from older to younger generations. Two women – 77-year-old Violeta and 80-year-old Onute – still manage to financially support their children from their pensions. However, it is characteristic of the interviewees from rural areas only.

With the few exceptions discussed above, the logic of latent reciprocity is most frequently expressed by the financial support flows from the older generation and emotional and instrumental support from the younger generation.

**Manifest reciprocity.** Some interviewees express reciprocity more clearly; to describe it, they use such words and phrases as “nice exchange,” “paying back,” “sharing,” “exchange” and “mutual benefit.” In her interview, Laima demonstrates manifest reciprocity in the description of her relationship to her mother. In discussing the models of exchange of earlier generations, she remembers her mother’s words on the logic of manifest reciprocity:

My mother lived next to a forest. Once a neighbor came and said: “Your daughter looks after you like nobody else.” So my mum answered very clearly: “Why should I bend the stick if I am not able to lean on it later?” It seemed normal to us that children take care of their parents. And that’s how it was from one generation to another… (67-year-old Laima, parents’ generation).

The interview with Marija, a 46-year-old woman living in a household with three generations under one roof, is another example of such clearly expressed motivation. The logic of manifest exchange comes from her evaluation of support received from her elderly mother:

I also get support. It is really mutual here. Actually, I know that people live together but they eat separately. But we even eat together. Also, she helps us financially very much. Her pension is not bad. She helps us, she buys ... or she has paid the rent for my daughter’s dormitory, for example. Almost 300 [Lt] ... I tearfully said that we couldn’t afford it and she gave us money from her pension... or if we need to buy something, shoes or something ... “I’ll give you money.” I buy food [for her], for instance, because it is hard for her to walk. She repays and even gives me a little bit more. And I feel bad sometimes (Marija, children’s generation).

Although the elderly parents’ support is indispensable in some situations, a sense of dependency and discomfort is also inevitable. The help of the older generation of the same household is appreciated but it also evokes some ambivalence, particularly among the so-called “sandwich” generation. This help incites domestic conflicts: “I still remember Mom saying: ‘Why are you stirring the soup this direction?’ She thought that I wasn’t stirring it in the right direction. I was just amazed and stirred it the other way (46-year old Marija, children’s generation).
Manifest exchange is often expressed by emphasizing feelings and affection. It is possible to speak here of the combined reflection of altruism and motives of exchange. The narrative of Birute, a 53-year-old woman who financially supports her children and looks after her elderly mother, is a good example. She calls the support between children and parents reciprocity but she also stresses affection. She contrasts an idealistic, affectionate relationship between parents and children to capitalistic customs characteristic of the Western countries. Similarly, the affectionate dimension is evident in the narrative of Violeta, a 77-year-old interviewee. Here the exchange motive is related to the quality of the relationship: “If, for example, I get my pension and if she says, ‘Give me some money, Mom, we don’t have any,’ how could I refuse to give it if we get along so well? She looks after me… How could I refuse? So, our support for each other is mutual… That’s how it is done if you get along (Violeta, parents’ generation).

The quantitative studies (Bengston and Parrot 1999) demonstrating that a close relationship leads to higher levels of support between generations confirm this opinion. While some interviews highlight affection, others use laws of the market economy to describe the motives of intergenerational support. The economic terms of exchange are obvious in the narrative of Akvile, a 39-year-old interviewee. In her interview, she talks of an extensive intergenerational support: financial (provided for the parents when they have difficulties, received from them in order to purchase an apartment) and instrumental (parents look after their grandchildren, Akvile helps parents with domestic tasks). According to Akvile, the support is based on a model of reciprocity developed in the family and transferred from one generation to the next by the way of demonstration. From the interview, it is clear that both emotions and economic terms motivate exchange in the family:

They [parents] say (and they are ready for it) that in case of any problem, they are coming to live with me. It seems like they gave me the apartment and secured a place for themselves at the same time. I’m joking, of course. But I had to confirm it. I responded by telling them that if necessary, I would [allow them to] do it. My sister is responsible for looking after Grandma because she has promised her an apartment. But, God, whether these apartments are something like an exchange or not … [it] is not important. With an apartment or without it, our relationships would not change but it is like validation… (Akvilė, children’s generation).

This case reflects the complexity of relationships and exchange in the family. Economic and emotional motives drive the exchange. Some bargaining, although not very serious, is evident in the family (“I had to confirm”) and it is based not only on emotions but also on legal terms. This case reflects the ideas of Bernheim et al. (1996) about the strategic behavior of parents using property as a way of bargaining for care in the old age.
4.1.2. Exchange as a Social Debt

The term *social debt* is most often used in the literature on the motives of exchange. The interviews reveal that unfulfilled reciprocity incites feelings of guilt and inequality. Thus, an opportunity to return the social debt usually makes an interviewee happy. Although 44-year-old Raimonda supports her children and parents financially, she does not expect the same from her children (she would prefer to support herself in the old age). She regards the opportunity to return the social debt as a compensatory mechanism for the previously received support: “I wasn’t very independent and my parents really helped me. From one point of view, I didn’t have much choice; from the other, I was very ashamed … because they were forced to help their only child constantly. So, I’ve made some radical decisions in my life and now I’m happy that it’s possible for me to pay my parents back in some way (Raimonda, parents’ generation).

In her story, the logic of manifest exchange is obvious. It is interesting that modern technologies allow her to provide support in a more neutral way: she transfers some money to her parents’ debit card and calls it a “granny grant.” It is a less demonstrative way to create the giver-receiver relationship. Some researchers (Szydlík 2008) have pointed out that too much support from children has a negative impact on their parents. Raimonda, however, has found a strategy to bypass this problem and create reciprocity in the relationship: “As I said, I don’t push them into the corner with my support... Sometimes I even intentionally ask them to do something for me, to pickle cucumbers for me, for instance. They live in the city and lack activities, so my intention to use their help makes them feel useful (Raimonda, parents’ generation).

To repay the social debt, this woman finds flexible strategies that preserve her parents’ autonomy. The interviews with younger generations often demonstrate the discomfort related to the received support. In these cases, other strategies are used to compensate the debt, for instance, showing more attention, buying presents, etc.

4.1.3. Exchange Based on Investment

The narratives of both generations reveal exchange as an investment. This logic is based on the notion that parents invest in children in the early years of their lives and later this “investment” comes back in various forms. Laima uses the concept of investment to define good parent-child relationships: “First of all, it depends on the parents. The amount you give will be the amount you get back. It is an investment. How much you invest into the child from the early years on... They feel all of it; you won’t fool a child; they pay back this much” (67-year-old Laima, parents’ generation).

Dalia’s insights serve as another example in which exchange is based on investment. She reflects on the principle of delayed exchange discussed by Kalmijn (2005): parents invest in the education of their children, and later their
children pay them back. Dalia plans to return what she has received (i.e., financial support) from her parents. The principle of reciprocity, in this case, is clearly understood and expressed. Moreover, reciprocity is related to the fundamental laws on how social relationships are structured: “Well, my parents were always saying: ‘You’re our investment; when we get old you are going to work.’ I realize it perfectly and I am willing to do it. It all depends on how much I earn. It was really an investment. I could not say that everything has such a basis but our society works in this way, in one way or another” (26-year-old Dalia, children’s generation).

The interview with 46-years-old Marija is also an example of how the older generation invests in the education of its offspring. Marija talked of the unusual support strategy in her family: her mother and aunt saved 50 Lt every month to pay for her daughter’s driving license.

4.2. The Motive of Norms: the Role of Socialization and Demonstration Effect

The quantitative Generation and Gender Survey reveals strong normative attitudes towards children’s obligations to parents (Gedvilaitė-Kordušienė 2009). Interviews also put a strong emphasis on norms. The interview with 51-year-old Lina is the most obvious example of how obligations to parents as a normative behavior structure a person’s entire life.

Lina was born in exile in Siberia as the only child in the family when her mother was 40 years old. When they returned to Lithuania, “it was very difficult to get a normal place to live and to find a job.” After she finished her studies, she was to be sent to work in Klaipėda as she wanted. However, during the last year of her studies, her father died and her mother did not want to remain alone. In this situation, she decided to return. She called the loss of independence a very depressing experience for a young person. It is clear, in her narrative, that she had no other choice because of her responsibility towards her mother. This woman later married a foreigner but she refused to move abroad because of her mother. Her husband came to live in Lithuania.

The interview with Lina revealed how her sense of responsibility towards her mother influenced her matrimonial and procreative behavior. Although Lina has made several radical decisions to conform to the needs of her mother, her emphasis on responsibility can be explained not only by her pure altruism but also by her deeply internalized norms:

As the only child I bear a very big responsibility. If there were more children... Why do I have two children in a not very successful marriage? Although I was not sure whether I was going to live with that man anymore… I didn’t want their lives paralyzed because of the obligation: when you cannot leave, you cannot go away, you sacrifice your career, sacrifice
the city you want to live in, even sacrifice your love (51-year old Lina, parents’ generation).

Lina’s narrative is rather ambivalent. Although her sacrifice is very obvious, Lina admits her mother is her closest person. Finally, Lina talks about the transformation of the relationships and responsibilities: “She was my mother before and now she has become my child.”

The interviews allow us to look more carefully to the ways the attitudes towards intergenerational responsibilities are constructed. Primary/secondary socialization and the effect of demonstration are two ways that influence the formation of these attitudes. According to a number of the interviewees, the attitude that children must look after their parents gets formed during childhood. Both parent and children generations stress socialization via education. The phrases: “The willingness to help, I would say, first of all is inherited from parents” (67-year-old interviewee, parents’ generation), “It stuck in my mind what Mom said: ‘You will have to look after me’” (30-year-old interviewee, children’s generation), “Because my Mom always says to me ... and Dad too. They raised us so that we would look after each other” (39-year-old interviewee, children’s generation) serve as examples of internalized norms via education. Other means such as folklore morals are also employed to transmit values to younger generations:

I have heard these words for sure: “Children, when we get old, who will look after us?” “Why do you ask? You have children, so we will look after you...” “That’s right. And your children will look after you. Do you remember that tale when the son took his father into the woods? Remember this tale, children. If you are going to take your parents into the woods, then your children will do the same to you. These words have stuck in my mind” (59-year old Rita, parents’ generation).

In speaking of their obligations to parents, others emphasize secondary socialization. (30-year-old Kamile said she had older teachers at school who “taught us this kind of respect.” 50-year-old Petras, on the other hand, argued that these cultural attitudes were taught very forcefully in the Soviet system through school, media and children’s tales. In his opinion, Soviet cartoons were very educational: “They indoctrinated you with the idea that it’s important to respect your elders, not to hurt anyone weaker than you and so on.”

The demonstration effect was another important means of forming these attitudes. It is particularly characteristic of the interviewees of the generation of children. They emphasize the importance of examples seen in childhood and transmitted to the offspring:

Parents took care and they are taking care of their parents; thus, an example is more crucial than words (32-year-old Ramune, children’s generation).
It is my responsibility and it is an example for my children. They need to understand that it can’t be any other way; it is necessary to take care of elderly parents (35-year-old Agne, children’s generation).

Attitudes towards parents’ responsibilities are usually taken for granted. However, different cultures shatter the “natural” normative principles. 47-year-old Svaja who lives in the US hides from her American husband that she is still financially supporting her son because he would not understand it (“…he would have a hard time understanding it”).

4.3. Attachment and Altruism as Natural Human Qualities

When emotions (for instance, love and affection) influence the motives of reciprocity, altruism and attachment are emphasized. The motives of attachment and altruism can be divided into three thematic segments: altruism as an unquestioned phenomenon, altruism as a primordial quality, and altruism as a reflection of attachment.

The first segment was widely narrated in the interviews with both parent and children generations. A close relationship between parents and children when reciprocity is seen as natural and unquestionable is most frequently emphasized: “Where are the roots of the willingness to help? You simply love your children... It’s just natural, I think” (44-year-old Sonata, parents’ generation).

Sonata supports her elderly parents and two grown daughters. She playfully calls this support a “mom’s grant” and a “grandma’s grant” accordingly. She fulfills her desire of helping her elderly parents by supplying them with her attention and financial support but she does not provide them with instrumental support since “they manage things perfectly alone.” It can be argued that she wants to keep her parents independent.

Linas, a 26-year-old father of two children, also explains mutual support in emotional terms. However, in his narrative, he clearly separates two forms of expressing love: love as a material support and love leading towards individualization and self-realization: “If you love, you can give but I don’t speak about this kind of love as my parents did… I love you, so I will buy something expensive for you. My love is different… I love you so I want you to become someone in ten years…” (Linas, children’s generation). He expresses the logic of altruism in the following way: “You give and don’t expect to get anything back.” According to Linas, relationships based on the exchange were more characteristic of earlier societies than of contemporary society in which the relationships between parents and children were based on completely different laws: “Perhaps the attitudes of those born around the 1940s still reflected the times of serfdom when children used to be the labor force.” The interviewee emphasizes the shift in the value of a child (from a child as a laborer to a child as a valuable person) and the importance of emotional ties instead of the profit.
The second thematic segment is altruism derived from the primordial quality of human nature (biological interpretations). Female interviewees of the older generation (53, 64, 66 and 80-year-old) more frequently talked about it. For instance, 53-year-old Auguste bases her financial support for her adult children on the natural ties with her offspring. She does not question the sources of her motivation and uses biosocial terms to explain it: “You don’t even think, you do it automatically. It’s probably the bond between a child and his parents. It is the voice of blood. Whether it is your responsibility or not, I don’t know; you just do it automatically. You don’t think that you suffer from this burden; it is done automatically” (Auguste, parents’ generation).

80-year-old Onute calls intergenerational support a “nature and habit.” By “habit” she means the norms transmitted from one generation to another. She illustrates her ideas by a detailed story about how her father and grandfather help to everyone who needed it.

Younger interviewees do not emphasize the nature as often but in some narratives naturalistic and normative aspects intertwine. According to 26-year-old Mantas:

First of all, I can say this exchange has a certain tribal aspect. It is your children, your flesh and blood. If you brought them into this world, you are responsible for them and it should be taken for granted because those parents who don’t take care of their children their children grow up in an orphanage. We could learn something from the Muslim societies in which, as far as I know, orphanages do not exist at all because it is a family’s business. If somebody from a family has a child but abandon him or if parents, God forbid, can’t raise him or if they die, then their relatives look after him (Mantas, children’s generation).

The third segment of attachment is best pronounced in 53-year-old Auguste’s narrative. During the life course when parents get older, there is a threat of losing the intergenerational bond associated with stability and security. According to Auguste, having both parents provides her with a sense of security:

It is stressful for me. When both my parents were still alive, I thought that I had some kind of support system. If there was any misfortune, I could always go there. Or if I had financial difficulties, I could borrow some money or something. But when my father died and my mother moved in to live with us, it was very stressful. When my mom lived separately, I didn’t feel it so much, but now… It’s a huge amount of stress that only I am responsible for myself. When you know that nobody will help you if something happens… Now, of course, she gets a pension. But it is not the same as when I used to go to Mom’s to ask for some money in a critical situation. That’s it; I alone stand for myself (Auguste, parents’ generation).

Auguste’s insights correspond to Cicirelli’s (1993) ideas on the adult
attachment model of help. According to him, attached adult children take care of their parent to maintain their survival and preserve the emotional bond between them.

In conclusion, the interviews reveal various motives behind the provided support and various ways to provide and receive it: wither naturally or with discomfort and a sense of dependency. Ambivalent feelings are evident in the interviews with both generations. They also demonstrate that various strategies, for instance, the provision of another kind of support, the refusal to provide a certain support in order to preserve independence, etc., are used to overcome ambivalent situations.

Conclusions

The analysis of the qualitative data showed a number of intergenerational support models. Moreover, it revealed the perceptions and meanings attached to support. The exchange based on reciprocity was the most common motive found in the interviews. This motive was based on either latent or manifest exchange. Besides the exchange as reciprocity, other thematic groups of exchange were noticed: exchange as an investment and as a social debt.

Other groups of motives, norms and altruism/attachment were also analyzed. The analysis of norms demonstrated that a strong role of primary and secondary socialization and the effect of demonstration were sources of the formation of the intergenerational attitudes. By emphasizing emotions and affection, the interviewees distinguished several thematic segments of altruism: altruism as an unquestioned phenomenon, altruism as a fundamental quality, and altruism as a reflection of attachment. The analysis of the motives of intergenerational support both provided insights into the family relationships and disclosed some consequences of intergenerational support, namely a sense of dependency/autonomy and ambivalent feelings towards this support.
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Tarpgeneracinės paramos motyvai Lietuvoje

Santrauka

Straipsniu siekiama užpildyti tyrimų spragą tarpgeneracinės paramos motyvų srityje. Naudojantys kokybiniais duomenimis, nagrinėjama, kokie motyvai skatina teikti paramą suaugusiems vaikams ir tėvams. Teorines prielaidas analizėi teikia simbolinio interakcionizmo teorijos.

Apklausus paramos teikėjų ir gavėjų diadas, paaiškėjo, kad informantų pasakojuomuose atsiskleidžia motyvų grupės, o ne vienas dominuojantis motyvas. Paramos teikimą skatinantis veiksniai dažnai įvardijami net neuždavus klausimo, kodėl tarpgeneracinė parama yra teikiamą. Iš visuolai informantų naratyvuose sutinkamas mainų motyvas, atsiskleidžiantis arba kaip akivaizdus, arba kaip latentinis. Straipsnyje išskiriami trys tematiniai mainų motyvo segmentai: mainai kaip abipusis apsikeitimas, investicija ir socialinė skola.

Analizuojant normų motyvą, kuris išreiškiamas akcentuojant pareigų tėvams ar vaikams svarbą, atsiskleidžia, kaip pareigos ar būklės veikia gyvenimo kelio pasirinkimus;
Altruizmo motyvą interviu išreiškė emocijų ir artumo reikšmės. Šio motyvo raišką galima apibendrinti trimis tematiniais segmentais: altruizmas kaip nekuestionuojamas fenomenas, altruizmas kaip natūrali bendražmogiška vertybė ir altruizmas kaip prisirišimo atspindys.
Tarpgeneracinės paramos motyvų analizė leido pažvelgti į šeiminių santykių modelius, taip pat atskleidė kai kurias tarpgeneracinės paramos pasekmes. Gaunant ar teikiant tarpgeneracinę paramą, iškilo priklausumo / autonomijos bei ambivalentiškų jausmų temos bei strategijos, padedančios išvengti šių jausmų.