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**Typologies of intergenerational relations in urban and rural China: A latent class analysis**

**Abstract**

Understanding intergenerational relations in China has become increasingly important against a backdrop of rapid social and demographic transitions and an ongoing urban-rural divide. From the parental perspective, this research investigates patterns and determinants of intergenerational relations between middle-aged and older parents and their non-coresident children in urban and rural China using data from the China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study (2018) (N=14,616). Latent class analysis revealed three typologies of intergenerational relations found across both urban and rural China—*Tight-knit, Support-at-distance* and *Material-oriented-detached*, and one typology particularly for urban China—*Staying-in-touch-but-independent.* The observed patterns suggest intergenerational bonds remain solid alongside the emergence of new trends, reflecting the modernization process. Multivariate multinomial regression analysis identified determinants for membership of each relationship typology. The findings will inform policy-makers and care professionals, supporting the identification of the vulnerable groups and the design of targeted policies for older parents with different family resources.

What this paper adds

* This study is among the first attempts to investigate intergenerational relationship typologies in both urban and rural China, thereby contributing to a more comprehensive understanding of intergenerational relationship patterns within the Chinese context.
* The results highlight the importance of education, physical health, and social participation for rural older adults to maintain close intergenerational bonds.
* This research points towards a greater level of autonomy and independence among urban older adults compared to their rural counterparts, and the changing gendered norms of intergenerational support in urban China.

Applications of study findings

* Policy-makers need to be aware of older adults at risk of having weaker family support and develop systems to support access to formal support when needed.
* Policy-makers need to recognize some urban older adults’ desire for greater independence in their future care expectations, and design comprehensive care alternatives to facilitate this.
* Local community care and long-term care insurance should be enhanced to prepare for older people’s future care needs as this study suggests that around half of older adults in China did not have an adult child living nearby.

**Introduction**

The parent-child relationship, compared with other interpersonal relations, is the most important social-tie in relation to the care resources and welfare for people’s later life (Falkingham, et al., 2020a). The associated intergenerational transfers and family support from adult children have been found to be crucial for older people’s health and wellbeing, as evidenced by studies in both rural and urban China (Chen & Silverstein, 2000; Cong, et al., 2004; Ren & Treiman, 2015). Over the past thirty years, intergenerational relations in China have become more diverse and complicated alongside rapid economic change, deepening social modernisation, shrinking family size and large-scale internal migration. Research on intergenerational relations is becoming increasingly important for China, in response to these major social and demographic transitions, and in the context of an on-going significant urban-rural divide (Leung, 2003).

Although numerous studies have been conducted to explore intergenerational relations in China, most have only focused on one or two particular aspects, such as financial transfers, adult children proximity, or contact (Feng, et al., 2017; Gruijters, 2017; Logan & Bian, 2003; Lu & Zhang, 2017). A few studies have investigated the influence of one aspect on the other (Liu, et al., 2017; Zhu & Xie, 2017). It is widely recognised that intergenerational relations are multidimensional, reflecting associational (i.e. frequency of intergenerational contact), affectual (i.e. reciprocity of sentiments), consensual (i.e. similar values between family members), functional (i.e. exchange of financial, physical and emotional resources), normative (i.e. obligations to familism norms and filial piety) and structural solidarity (i.e. opportunity structure that accommodates or constraints the intergenerational interaction) (Silverstein & Bengtson, 1997). However, few studies to date have considered the multi-faceted aspects of intergenerational relations and developed typologies to fully understand the underlying nature of relationship complexity in the Chinese context.

Studies developing intergenerational relationship typologies have been primarily conducted in other contexts, especially the western countries (Dykstra & Fokkema, 2011; Silverstein & Bengtson, 1997; Silverstein, et al., 2010). Guo, et al. (2012) provides one of the first endeavours to fill this research gap in China; however, their study was based on a small sample in rural Anhui province, and the generalizability of the results is limited. More recently, Emery, et al. (2018) used a national representative dataset and identified six patterns of intergenerational relationship; despite having acknowledged the urban-rural divide, they did not carry out separate analyses for urban and rural samples. Other recent studies either used small samples in one single city/region or focused on Chinese-American immigrants (Guo et al., 2018; Peng et al., 2022). To our knowledge, studies on the structure of the multi-dimensional aspects of intergenerational relations in China that pay particular attention to urban-rural differences remain scarce, leaving a notable research gap for further investigation.

Against this background, the current study aims to fill the gap by using the latest wave of a national representative sample and investigates the patterns of intergenerational relations from the parents’ perspective in urban and rural China. From the outset, we theorise that the patterns will differ for urban and rural elders considering the large-scale internal migration and stronger traditional values for family support in rural China (Chen et al., 2017; Guo et al., 2012) and thus the analysis is conducted separately for the rural and urban samples. In doing so, we address the following questions: 1) what are the patterns (i.e. latent classes) of intergenerational relations in urban and rural China? 2) What are the predictors for each relationship pattern and their implications?

**The urban-rural context**

China has a long history of a dual structure between urban and rural areas, which creates significant divides in its societal, economic, and family domains. Although fertility is generally higher in rural China, the proportion of older people in the population and the speed of population aging have actually been higher and faster in rural areas as a result of highly age-specific patterns of rural to urban migration over the past three decades, with the percentage of the rural oldest-old projected to be twice as high as that in urban China by 2030 (Cai, et al., 2012; Zeng, 2010).

Even though population aging is more progressed in rural China, formal systems of social support such as old age pensions are much less mature than their urban counterparts and many rural elders still primarily rely on the family for support and old-age care (Shen & Williamson, 2010). In recent years, large scale rural-to-urban migration has separated adult children from their older parents and reshaped the intergenerational ties in rural China ( Liu, 2014). Comparatively, urban older adults have better pensions and higher economic independence in later life. Their relatively higher economic autonomy and fewer numbers of children might in turn influence urban elders’ care expectations and their intergenerational practices (Tang & Wang, 2022). In contrast, expectations around older age care in rural areas remain more traditional reflecting a considerable cultural lag (Hu, 2017; Qin et al., 2020).

**Factors influencing intergenerational relations**

Previous literature has identified two main motivations for intergenerational solidarity: altruistic and self-interest (strategic) (Logan & Spitze, 1995). Altruistic behaviours between family members are rooted in intergenerational affinity, norms and identity, and are related to the family member’s needs rather than the “market efficiency”; while the self-interest motivation regards intergenerational interactions as a “trade” between the two parties, reflecting an exchange of resources (Schwarz, 2006). Under the self-interest motivation, parents’ investments to children/grandchildren may be seen as being made in exchange for care in their own later life; and adult children’s support to older parents may be in turn motivated by potential bequests or other types of transfers.

Based on the above theories, we differentiate two sets of factors: factors that indicate parental “needs” and parental “resources”. “Needs”-related factors include biological aspects (e.g. age and health) as well as social-structural aspects (e.g. marital status); both have been found to influence the social welfare and social care resources that older people are entitled to (Evandrou et al., 2014). Considering the regional inequalities in social welfare and social support resources in China, the residential regions (eastern, central and western China) were also considered as a structural indicator for parental “needs” (Lin, 2002). “Resources”-related factors include parents’ socioeconomic status, which are associated with the tangible or intangible resources “available” for intergenerational exchange (Xie & Zhu, 2009). Some characteristics may be associated with both needs and resources; for example, older people’s frequent social participation was found to be associated with higher socioeconomic status and better peer support, and is related to better self-reported health, and thus may signal fewer needs and higher resources (Poortinga, 2006).

In addition to parental level characteristics, we also considered adult children’s characteristics and reciprocity (Klaus, 2009). For adult children’s characteristics, we considered their education, income as well as marital status (Bian, et al., 1998; Chen & Jordan, 2018); for reciprocity, we took into account material transfers from parents to adult children and time transfers to grandchild (Chen, et al., 2011; Falkingham, et al., 2020a).

**Methods**

*Data and sample*

We used the latest wave 4 (conducted in 2018) of a national representative dataset - China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study (CHARLS) for this study. Using the probability-proportional-to-size sampling method, CHARLS collects data from adults aged 45+ living in 28 provinces in mainland China, including information on their demographic background, household structure, flows of intergenerational transfers with their non-coresident children, health status, work status, etc. Respondents have been followed up biennially since 2011, with refreshed samples added in each wave (Zhao et al 2014). The target sample for this particular study is respondents born in 1940-49, 1950-59 and 1960-69 (N=16,685), who were at their late midlife to middle-old age at the time of interview. After excluding respondents who have no surviving child or non-coresident children (since the CHARLS team only collects information of intergenerational relations and transfers between parents and their non-coresident children), and those with missing values for other variables of interest, the final analytical sample contains 14,616 respondents (see Tables A-1 and A-2 in Supplementary File 1).

*Measures of intergenerational relationship indicators*

Indicators of intergenerational relationship were chosen based on the intergenerational solidarity theory proposed by Silverstein and Bengston (1997) (See Endnote 1). In this study, we adopted the associational, functional, normative and structural aspects of solidarity to measure older parents’ intergenerational relations with their children (Silverstein & Bengston, 1997; Dykstra & Fokkema, 2011). The following variables were created, reflecting parent-child relations on aggregate: *Frequent meeting* pertained to whether the parent had more than weekly face-to-face meeting with at least one child in the past year (0=no, 1=yes). *Frequent contact* was whether the parents had more than weekly contact (via phone/message/WeChat/mail/email) with at least one child in the past year if they did not meet weekly (0=no, 1=yes). If the respondents had frequent meetings with children, then this question was skipped and a value 1 was assigned. These two variables are indicators for associational solidarity. *Material support from children*, which represents aspect of functional solidarity, was created based on any monetary or in-kind support received from any adult child in the past year (0=no, 1=yes). *Anticipating children to be the main carers* was measured as a dichotomous variable indicating whether the parent regarded his/her child as the main carer in the future (0=no, 1=yes); the variable provides an indicator of normative solidarity from the parents’ perspective, reflecting parents’ beliefs about familism norms and adult children’s filial piety. *Geographic proximity*, an indicator for structural solidarity, was measured by whether the parent had at least one adult child who 1) aged 25+, 2) had completed his/her education and 3) lived in the same neighborhood or closer (which included co-resident children) (0=no, 1=yes) – the indicator is adopted from the work of Lei et al. (2015). We were not able to measure affectual and consensual aspects of solidarity due to data availability.

*Measures of characteristics of parents and children*

Demographic characteristics of parents included sex (0=male, 1=female), birth cohort (0=1940-1949, 1=1950-1959, 2=1960-1969), marital status (0=married, 1=divorced/separated, 2=widowed), number of surviving children, and region (0=eastern, 1=central, 2=western region). For parents’ socioeconomic characteristics, we controlled for educational attainment (0=no formal education, 1=primary school, 2=middle school, 3=high school and above) and current working status (0=not working, 1=currently working). Health status was measured by difficulties with Activities of Daily Living (ADLs) or Instrumental Activities of Daily Living (IADLs). Respondents were regarded as having any ADL or IADL difficulties if they answered “having difficulty and need help” or “I cannot do it” to at least one ADL/IADL item (0=no, 1=yes). Moreover, we controlled for parents’ social participation (1=social participation for at least one item of social activity, 0=otherwise), parents’ provision of downward material support to children in the past year (1=Yes, 0=No) and time transfer to grandchildren in the past year (1=Yes, 0=No) in the analysis (Chen & Jordan, 2018).

We also considered adult children’s socioeconomic and demographic characteristics, measured by their aggregate education, income category, and marital status (Gruijters, 2017; Xie & Zhu, 2009). To be more specific, adult children’s socioeconomic and sociodemographic characteristics were summarised as the respondent having at least one child with a college degree or above (0=no, 1=yes), the respondent having at least one adult child with higher income (0=no, 1=yes), and the respondent having at least one child married (0=no, 1=yes). Higher income was defined as a child’s (and the child’s spouse’s) annual income being more than 100,000 Chinese Yuan.

*Data analysis*

We explored the typologies underlying intergenerational relations using Latent class analysis (LCA). LCA is a statistical method which can be used for building typologies based on dichotomous observed variables (Vermunt & Magidson, 2004). It assumes there is an underlying unobserved categorical variable that divides a population into mutually exclusive and exhaustive latent classes and that the class membership can be inferred from a set of measured items (Lanza & Rhoades, 2013). According to existing research, parent-child relationships reflect underlying patterns manifested by different indicators (Guo et al., 2012; Silverstein & Bengtson, 1997). In this study, we developed the relationship typology using five distinct indicators of intergenerational relationship discussed above.

The optimal number of classes was decided upon based on a series of model fit statistics including the Akaike information criterion (AIC), Schwarz’s Bayesian information criterion (BIC) and the sample-size-adjusted BIC (A-BIC), where a smaller AIC, BIC or A-BIC value indicates a better model fit (Falkingham, et al., 2020b). We also performed the Lo-Mendell-Rubin likelihood ratio test (LMR), Vuong-Lo-Mendell-Rubin likelihood ratio test (vLMR) and bootstrap likelihood ratio test (bLRT) to test if the solution of K classes is preferred than K-1 classes (Finch & Bronk, 2011). The final decision was guided by these statistics as well as the authors’ judgement of model interpretability. We conducted LCA using Mplus version 8.1.

To explore the determinants for the derived typologies of intergenerational relations in urban and rural China, multivariate multinomial logistic regressions were applied using **Stata** 16.0.

**Results**

*Sample Characteristics*

Table 1 presents the descriptive characteristics. Females constituted a slightly higher proportion of the overall sample (52.5%), although males formed the majority of the urban sample (52.3%). The largest birth cohort was respondents born in 1950-1959 (38.9%), followed by 1960-1969 (37.4%), and 1940-1949 (23.7%). The majority of respondents were married (87.5%). The average number of surviving sons and daughters was 1.37 and 1.30 respectively, and as expected rural respondents had more surviving children than their urban counterparts, reflecting historical differences in fertility rates between urban (where the one-child-policy was more strictly applied) and rural areas. Regarding educational attainments, 22.3% of the sample had no formal education, 21.6% did not finish primary school, 22.2%, 21.8% and 12.0% had primary, middle and high school/above degree respectively; again, there are clear differences between those urban and rural respondents, with only 7.2% of the urban sample having no formal education. About 39.4% and 71.7% of urban and rural respondents were working, while 33.9% and 49.6% urban and rural respondents had ADL/IADL difficulties respectively. More urban respondents had engaged in social participation than their rural counterparts (67.1%vs**.** 49.1%). About 30% of respondents had a child with a college degree, 15% had a child with higher income, and 91.3% had a married child. Around half of the respondents had provided material support to their children (55.4%) and slightly less than half provided grandparental childcare (45.2%). A higher percentage of respondents lived in central China (39.3%), followed by eastern (32.8%) and western China (27.9%).

<Table 1>

Focussing on the five indicators of intergenerational relations, most respondents had received some material support from children in the past year (83.4%) and had frequent contact with them (81.3%). The percentages reporting frequent face-to-face meeting with children and geographic proximity were 42.4% and 38.6% respectively, indicating intergenerational physical contact may be limited by geographic distance. More than half of the respondents (59.1%) anticipated that their children would be their main future carers, reflecting somewhat mixed opinions on normative solidarity. As expected, there were clear urban-rural differences; rural respondents met and contacted their non-co-resident adult children less frequently, while they were more likely to receive material support, anticipate their children to be the main carers and live close to their children.

*Typology of intergenerational relations in rural and urban China*

Table 2 and Table 3 report the model fit statistics for the number of latent classes for intergenerational relations in our rural and urban samples respectively. Based on these results, three-class and four-class solutions were chosen as the optimal option for rural and urban samples respectively.

<Table 2> and <Table 3>

We then named these classes based on the predicted probability for each of the intergenerational relationship indicator. For the rural sample (Table 4), Class 1 was labelled as “*Tight-knit*,” since members of this class had the highest probability of experiencing all five indicators of solidarity. Class 2 was named as “*Support-at-distance*”, where members were less likely to have frequent physical meeting with children and having adult children living in close proximity, but more likely to have frequent digital contact and to receive material support from their children. Class 3 was labelled as “*Material-oriented-detached*” as its members had weaker intergenerational relations from all sides except for material support. For the urban sample (Table 5), the four classes were labelled as “*Tight-Knit*”, “*Support-at-distance*”, “*Staying-in-touch-but-independent*” and “*Material-oriented-detached*” respectively. The class of “*Staying-in-touch-but-independent*”, which indicates frequent intergenerational contact but a lower probability of intergenerational proximity and anticipating children to be the future main carers, emerged from the urban sample, suggesting that some older people in urban areas may have different expectations of support from their adult children.

<Table 4> and <Table 5>

*Factors associated with the patterns of intergenerational relations*

Table 6 shows the multivariate multinomial logistic analysis for the rural and urban samples respectively. A relative risk ratio higher than 1 means the indicator is related to a higher probability of being in the specific class compared to the *Tight-knit* class, which is chosen as the reference group as it most closely reflects the “traditional” model of intergenerational relations in China.

<Table 6>

A few characteristics were found to have similar effects in the urban and rural samples. Being male, divorced/separated and residing in central/western regions were all associated with a higher probability of being members of the *Material-oriented-detached* class compared to *Tight-knit*. On the other hand, respondents with married children and respondents with care provision to grandchildren, were less likely to be members of the *Support-at-distance* as well as the *Material-oriented-detached* compared to the *Tight-knit* class.

Some urban-rural differences were observed. Being female was related to a lower probability of being a member of the *Support-as-distance* class within the urban sample, but not in the rural sample. Widowed respondents were less likely to be members of the *Support-at-distance* class within the rural sample, but not the urban sample. Regarding health status, respondents with ADL/IADL difficulties were more likely to be in the *Support-as-distance* class and *Material-oriented-detached* class within the rural sample; however, urban respondents with ADL/IADL difficulties were less likely to be in the *Support-at-distance* class, indicating having good health was more important for rural older people to achieve/maintain close intergenerational relations. Residing in central or western China was only significantly related to a higher probability of being members of the *Support-at-distance* class within the rural sample. Regarding educational status, having any education was significantly related to a lower probability of being in the *Material-oriented-detached* class for rural respondents, while having middle-school/above education was significant for the urban respondents, suggesting education is an important factor for rural adults to achieve close intergenerational relations. Working respondents were more likely to be members of the *Support-at-distance* class and *Material-oriented-detached* class within the rural sample, whereas such an effect was only significant regarding the *Support-at-distance* class within the urban sample. Respondents reporting higher social participation were less likely to be members of the *Material-oriented-detached* class, but such an effect was not significant within the urban sample.

Regarding the impact of the characteristics of adult children, respondents with more sons and daughters were less likely to be members of the *Support-at-distance* class compared to the *Tight-knit* class within the rural sample; however, the effect was only significant for having more daughters (not more sons) within the urban respondents. These results imply that daughters play a more important role in maintaining contact with their parents than sons in modern urban China. On the other hand, respondents who have adult children with higher educational attainment and higher incomes and who provide financial support to their children had a higher probability of being members of the *Support-at-distance* class within the rural sample but not the urban sample. These results suggest that rural children’s social mobility may lead to them living a long distance from their parents, and in turn influences the patterning of their intergenerational relationships.

The *Staying-in-touch-but-independent* class was exclusively found within the urban sample. These respondents maintained frequent contact with their children but anticipated receiving less help from them. Being from the more recent birth (younger) cohorts, not being widowed, having high school/above education, having fewer, unmarried and better-educated children, providing no care to grandchildren, and living in central or western China were all shown to be associated with a higher probability of belonging to this class. To summarise, the members of this class were younger and had better socioeconomic status and self-supported (independent) adult children.

**Discussion**

This study investigates typologies of intergenerational relationship in urban and rural China, using the most recently available nationally representative dataset. It contributes to a more nuanced understanding of intergenerational relations in China by considering multiple domains of intergenerational solidarity. It also adds clarity to our understanding of the similarity and differences between urban and rural regions, highlighting the emerging trends with social modernization and identifies the most vulnerable groups with weak intergenerational ties for intervention.

Overall, the analysis revealed three typologies of intergenerational relations that are common across both urban and rural China, which were *Tight-knit*, *Support-at-distance* and *Material-oriented-detached*, and one typology that was found exclusively in urban China, reflecting the emergence of new social norms associated with the process of modernisation, i.e. the *Staying-in-touch-but-independent*. The most common typology in both rural and urban areas was *Tight-knit* which was characterized by high probabilities of all relationship indicators. In contrast, the *Material-oriented-detached* was the least common typology in both areas, characterized by a low probability of all relationship indicators, except for material support. The *Support-at-distance* represented good material support from children and frequent contact, but low geographical proximity and meeting frequency, was the second most common typology in rural areas while the *Staying-in-touch-but-independent* (characterized by frequent contact but low probability of proximity and anticipating children to be future caregivers) was the second most common in urban areas.

Among the relationship indicators, the indicator of “receiving material support from children” varies very little across different relationship typologies, suggesting that the majority of contemporary Chinese elders receive monetary or in-kind support from their adult children, no matter whether they are close with children in other aspects of intergenerational relationship (Guo, et al.,2012). Consistent with previous studies in western context, our study also found that geographic proximity and frequency of digital contact were two key indicators driving variations in these relationship typologies (Dykstra & Fokkema, 2011; Guo, et al., 2012). This reflects the far-reaching impact of internal migration on parent-children proximity that in turn impacts upon the ability of the generations to come together and highlights the salience of associational solidarity in characterizing intergenerational relations.

The findings indicate that current patterns of intergenerational relationship are widely shaped by social modernization (Djundeva et al., 2019). Although evidence suggests traditional norms of intergenerational support remain widespread in China, the results also highlight new patterns of intergenerational relations shaped by internal migration and increased geographic distance, and the emerging trend of autonomy and independence among some urban Chinese older adults, who have higher socioeconomic status, better education and self-supported adult children, and who are not expecting to rely on children for future care (Cheung et al., 2019; Qin et al., 2020; Tang & Wang, 2022).

This study also examined the factors that influence membership of alternative relationship typologies. Generally, parents who were female, better educated, had more daughters, had married children, had college degree children, and provided children with financial support or grandchild care, were more likely to be in the *Tight-knit* than in the *Material-oriented-detached* group, in both urban and rural China. The results highlighted the importance of education, physical health, and social participation for rural elders to maintain close intergenerational bonds. It also revealed that rural children’s social mobility may lead to them living long distances from parents and in turn results in the older parents being in the class of “*Support-at-distance”*. Moreover, this research suggests a changing gendered norm of intergenerational support, as the number of surviving daughters, rather than sons, was crucial for urban parents to have the *Tight-knit* intergenerational relations (Hu, 2017).

The findings have important policy implications. Our results will support policy-makers and community care professionals in better understanding the potential family care resources that particular elders are likely to have, and to identify those vulnerable groups that maybe most in need of social support in later life. Our results suggest that urban and rural older men who are separated/divorced, less educated, have no surviving daughters, have no married children (and thus no daughter-in-law), and who are living in central or western China, and some rural elders with functional difficulties, may have very weak systems of family support. Although these older people may receive some material support from their adult children, they are less likely to have an adult child living in close proximity, to have face-to-face meetings and digital contact with children and to expect to receive future care from them. Existing research has suggested that intergenerational relations influence older people’s health and wellbeing (Chen & Silverstein, 2000), therefore, policy-makers should be aware of those groups with weaker intergenerational ties and to design more targeted social support for them. Community care professionals need to pay particular attention to their care needs and health status in later life and help them access formal support when needed. Echoing Qin et al. (2020) and Cheung (2019)’s research, this study offers support to the argument that in future more urban older adults will be desiring greater autonomy and independence in their future care choices. Policy-makers need to note this shift in their care preferences and expectations, and begin designing comprehensive care alternatives to support this choice. Finally, our study found that around half of older parents in both urban and rural China did not currently have a surviving adult child living nearby, signalling the need to enhance the provision of local community care and long-term care insurance for their future dependency.

Some limitations are worthy of notice. First, due to the study being based on secondary analyses of a particular survey instrument, all indicators of intergenerational relations were derived from the perspective of older parents, and we were not able to take account of the perspectives of adult children in the analysis. Second, we were not able to include aspects of consensual and affectual solidarity in our LCA indicators due to lack of relevant data in CHARLS, which may restrict our research scope. Third, due to data availability, we were not able to discuss intergenerational relations between parents and co-resident children.

Despite the limitations, this study is among the first attempts to examine intergenerational relationship typologies in both urban and rural China, and contributes to the wider gerontological literature by providing a more comprehensive understanding of intergenerational relationship patterns in the Chinese context. It confirms that intergenerational relationships in contemporary China are still largely intact (evidenced by high prevalence of *tight-knit* relationship type), but are also adapting to broad social change and modernization processes. It is becoming more common for parents and children to bond across miles, and some urban parents are also demonstrating a preference for independence in their future care arrangements. Social policy needs to be cognizant of these transitions and design effective strategies to facilitate long-distant communication between generations and cultivate their bonds, and be on-hand to provide physical care services for older adults when they become frail.
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