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CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

Statement of Problem

Increasingly, societies are becoming modernized and at the same time there are growing aged populations. About 5.3 percent of the world population was 65 years of age or older in 1975 — 3.3 percent in the less developed countries and 10.5 percent in the more developed countries. The expected world population of the elderly in 2000 is 6.1 percent with a range from 4.4 to 12.6 percent depending upon the level of development (Siegel, 1981).

As health technology develops, the infant mortality and death rates decline and, thus, life expectancy is extended. Birth rates, which may increase in the early stage of development, will eventually decline with the introduction of birth control devices or education about the need for controlling population. In the long run, the combined effect of longevity and decreased fertility results in aging of the population (Hauser, 1976; McPherson, 1983).

In gerontology, the early work of Simmons (1945) and the more recent research of Cowgill and Holmes (1972, 1975) have stimulated interest in the effects of the modernization process on the circumstances of the elderly. Much research on modernization and aging has tested and supported the modernization hypothesis that the status of the aged will decline as societies become modernized and
developed (Bengtson et al., 1975; Cohn, 1982; Cowgill, 1975; Cowgill and Holmes, 1972; Palmore and Manton, 1974; Press and McKool, 1980). This tendency has been attributed to many factors, such as modern mass education, the decreased importance of land as a source of power, increased proportion of the aging population, the emergence of the nuclear family, retirement, residential segregation between generations, social differentiation, and rapid change of the social structure and cultural values system.

Most of studies have focused on cross-cultural comparisons, but some attempts (Goldstein and Beall, 1982; Goldstein and et al., 1983; Lipman, 1970; Palmore, 1975) have been made to describe the current situation of the elderly in relation to the effects of modernization within a specific society. These studies show that the unique situations or the cultural systems of particular societies may affect the elderly differently. Although the cross-cultural studies can project the general trend of the status of the elderly, research for each society is necessary to understand the conditions of the elderly more clearly within their own cultural context.

This research focuses on Korean elderly, specifically their decision-making power within the extended family system. The purpose of this research is twofold. First, the proposition that the status of the aged declines with societal modernization is tested at the micro level. In other words, are the elderly who are in a modern environment more likely to have lower status than those in the less modern circumstance? To answer this question, family environment variables (family income, residential area, education of children) and individual modernity, and decision-making power are used.

Until now, most studies of family power have focused on the husband-wife
dyad. In general, family power relationships can be determined by the relative resources or exchange of these resources. It is necessary for future studies to include other family members and to test family power in other settings like the extended family (McDonald, 1980). Following these suggestions, the second purpose of this research is to explore the power relationships between the younger and older generations in the extended family. Possible resources, such as employment status, education, health, and role performance of the elderly, which may affect decision-making power are investigated.

This study of Korean elderly living in the extended families is significant not only because the majority of the aged reside in less developed countries but also because many of the major Asian countries soon will age with unprecedented rapidity, leaving policy makers even less time to plan than their counterparts in developed countries have had (U.N., 1985). Such transitions may place a strain on traditional relationships of aged parents and their children.

Modernization and the Korean Elderly

The tremendous impact of Western culture on the traditional Korean social and cultural system has been observed during the past three decades. The first contacts with Western culture were through Christian missionaries and a few scholars who traveled to other countries in the late 19th century. Most Western culture and new technology were introduced during the Japanese occupation (1910-1945). Following decolonization and the civil war (1950-1953), political and economic development were important issues in Korea.

Significant development occurred in the late 1960s and the 1970s. During this
period, Western culture and modern technology replaced the traditional society. Korea is frequently used as a successful case of economic development within a short period.

The negative consequences of modernization, however, have appeared as serious social problems since the late 1970s. For example, the rapid population growth of the core region (36% of the total population lived in the Seoul metropolitan area in 1980; Vining, 1985), the economic disparity between the rural and the urban areas, the value differences between generations, and the destruction of traditional customs are currently important social problems in Korea, as they often have been in other developing countries (Korean Sociological Association, 1983).

Korea is in the middle of modernization, which affects the life of the elderly in many ways. First of all, together with declining fertility, improved health technology results in an increased older population. The older population (persons aged 65 and over) slowly increased from 822 thousand in 1960, to 1,039 thousand in 1970, to 1,466 thousand in 1980. It was 3.8 percent of the total population in 1980, and the older population in 2000 is expected to grow to 6.0 percent (Yoon, 1985).

Living arrangements

Economic growth is highly interrelated with industrialization and urbanization. The percentage of the population living in the cities, which is an indicator of urbanization, increased from 28% in 1960 to 51% in 1975. The estimated percentage in 1986 is about 66% (Kim, 1985).

The younger generation tends to move to urban areas for new jobs and a better life, which results in geographical separation from the older generation and which in
turn leads to change in the family system from the extended family to the nuclear family. Reports from the Korean Economic Planning Board show that two-thirds of Korean families have a nuclear family structure.

A survey done by Park et al. (1984) found that 39.7% of Koreans aged 60 and over (n=1,856) lived with their first son, 17.3% of lived with their spouse only, and 3.3% lived alone. If the figure for elderly living with their son is combined with the percentage of elderly living with all of their children, four-fifths of Korean elderly live with their children. This is similar to living arrangements of the Japanese elderly in 1973 (Palmore, 1975).

But middle aged couples in their 50s whose children are already married are more likely to live separately. Some other factors, such as income and education, as well as age, may have significant effects on attitudes toward not living with the married children. One cultural difference between Koreans and Americans which should be mentioned is that the typical behavior in Korea is still that parents live with their unmarried adult children. The percentage of older couple families will increase in the near future.

Care for the elderly

The family is the major source of support for older people in traditional Korean society. As the society developed and modernized, the functions of the formal support system became more important. But the informal support system (family and kinship) is still the main provider of help to old people even in the advanced societies, especially to the disabled aged.

Living with the parents and taking care of them have been considered as
normative behavior and are recommended in Korea. Filial piety, which came from the Confucian precepts, is the most important norm among the adult children. The members of the family who are the principal caregivers are daughters-in-law. They are the main helpers to the old who need care and services.

But attitudes toward filial responsibility are slowly changing. In a survey of the elderly and the adult children (n=225), 63% of the respondents agreed that care for the elderly was a primary responsibility of the children and that the government should provide support at the same time. Another 32% of the respondents answered that the care of the parents was the duty of their children only and only 5% suggested that the government and the society should provide the care system for the aged (Choi, 1982).

Status of the elderly

The Korean elderly occupied a position of power in a traditional agricultural society, in which the extended family was the center of life and provided a sense of self-identity, work, education, etc. The aged men, the heads of household, were highly respected and their empirical experiences were used to solve problems. They also had power to make important decisions within and outside the family. The high status of the elderly also came from the Korean culture of Confucianism that emphasizes filial piety and strong obedience to parents.

Even so, there is a general trend toward a lowered status of the aged as modernization occurs in Korea (Kim, 1985). The power of the elderly tends to be lower in modern society which favors the nuclear form of the family. In modern society, the familial roles of the elderly have become ambiguous or reduced. For
example, a study of persons over 60 years of age (n=609) found that, despite joint living arrangements, only 27 percent of the children discussed possible choices before making important decisions, and 31 percent of the children ignored their parents' opinions. About one-third of the elderly had no special roles within the family (Park and Lim, 1983).

**Economic conditions of the elderly**

There are few data available on the general economic situation of Korean elderly. In fact, there are no statistics on poverty in the population by age. But according to statistics from the Ministry of Health and Social Affairs in 1981, about 15 percent of the households with elderly householders fell below the poverty line. Most of the following discussion is based on two chapters of the book *Welfare for the Aged*, by Chang and Choi (1987).

There are several potential sources of income for the elderly; earnings, social security, retirement grants, asset income, public assistance, support from children, and in-kind income. Table 1.1 presents a comparison of income sources among Korea, Japan, and the United States. In Japan and the United States, the major source of income in old age is social security. But Korean elderly depend heavily on support from children.

The economic dependence of Korean elderly on their children is related to the fact that most of Korean elderly live with children regardless of the marital status of the child. They tend to hand over their property to their children and are taken care of by their children.

Thirty percent of elderly males and 9.6 percent of elderly females aged 60 and
Table 1.1: Sources of income in old age in Korea (%)\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Korea</th>
<th>Japan</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earning</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social security</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>82.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private pension</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saving</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset income</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from children</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)This is a multiple choice, therefore, the total will not be 100 percent.

Over 80 percent of elderly aged 60 and over are in the labor force. Only 9 percent of elderly aged 60 and over have asset income (Korea Survey Gallup, 1984).

The retirement age for the workers in the state sector is between 55 and 60 and the workers in the private sector retire around 55. Retirement is usually mandatory and retirement grants are given at the time of retirement. Only public service personnel, veterans, and private school teachers are covered by a social security after retirement. In 1984, 1.8\% of elderly aged 60 and over and 1.1\% of the elderly aged 65 and over had benefits from a social security. In 1988, social security was expanded to include most workers. After 2008, under a new social security law, more persons can have basic monthly benefits.

Public assistance is available for the elderly aged 65 and over who have no support or who are unable to live by themselves. About 6\% of elderly aged 65 and over receive benefits under this program.

There are two types of in-kind incomes available to the aged. One is a medical insurance program, and the other is a discount for senior citizens. In 1986, about 55\% of the elderly aged 60 or over were covered by the medical insurance.
Like elderly in other countries, Korean elderly have reduced income after retirement, and a greater probability of illness in old age makes the economic situation more insecure. Those who retire mandatorily between 55 and 60 years are likely to find jobs, but it is difficult.

In general, the Korean elderly spend so much money on the education and the marriages of their children so that they are less well prepared economically in their old age. It is a social norm that the children take care of their old parents, but the attitudes toward filial piety among younger generations may not reach the expectations of the older generations.

In summary, the problems of elderly related to the modernization process are considered as serious social issues in Korea, but there is no extensive research on modernization and Korean elderly. The major concern of this research is the status of the elderly in the family — how the modern environment and individuals' modern attitudes may affect their decision-making power. Moreover, as an exploratory study, it will address how the relative resources and exchange resources of the elderly determine the power relationship between the younger and the older generations.
CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Research on Modernization and Aging

The concept of modernization has been used frequently to explain the social changes in the Third World after the Second World War. In general, social scientists concerned about modernization seem to use developed, industrialized Western societies as a standard of reference to which developing societies are compared in an attempt to change the traditional systems and values into an approximation of the model of modernity.

Modernization has been defined in various ways, but the evolutionary perspective, which involves a multilinear transition of developing societies from tradition to modernity, is a basic assumption. Processes such as Westernization, urbanization, secularization, industrialization, development, and economic growth are included in the conceptual matrix of modernization. One, or a combination, of these processes is used as the framework for models of modernization. Thus, the concept tends to be a summarizing rather than a discriminating one (Tipps, 1973).

The consequences of modernization are complex and multi-dimensional, affecting every realm of human life positively and negatively. Abraham (1980) classified the major changes of modernization into five areas: systematic, functional, attitudinal, emergent, and universal changes. First, systematic changes - changes in
social, economic, political, and cultural systems - induce differentiation and interdependence among the subsystems. For example, as a society shifts from an agricultural system into a modern industrial system, the nuclear family substitutes for the extended family.

Second, modernization brings functional changes. Technological and economic development creates new jobs and leads to specialized division of labor. Automation and emancipation of women from the traditional role expectation are other examples of functional changes.

Third, modernization involves not only changes in the social system but also a progressive transformation in the attitudes of individuals. Inkeles and Smith (1974), who focus on individual modernity, pointed out that modernizing attitudes are measured by political activism, higher educational and occupational aspirations, emphasis on material values, openness to new experience, individualism, and less obligated extended kinship.

Fourth, emergent changes include the emergence of new institutional arrangements, nationalism, and rising expectations. Finally, the underlying processes of modernization are called universal changes, such as urbanization, industrialization, and the technical, educational, and communications revolutions. These processes have been discussed frequently in modernization research (Gino, 1981; Tipps, 1973). Although changes overlap considerably and are interconnected with one another, these classifications give us general ideas about how modernization affects different areas of human life.

On the other hand, we must consider the negative impact of modernization. Enlarged urban life spheres imply negative characteristics, such as impersonality,
instrumental social relationships, materialism, and disintegration of primary relationships, which may bring about anomie and alienation in modern society. Identity crises may come from the continuous disorganization of various social relationships which traditionally have provided a sense of belonging and security. Chronic social problems, such as increased gaps between the "haves" and the "have-nots," crime, unemployment, and environmental deterioration, may be by-products of modernization (Abraham, 1980).

As discussed above, the impact of modernization on human life has been an interesting and salient issue in social sciences. But what is the impact of modernization processes on the aged who may have great difficulty in adjusting to modern systems and new ideas? A review of the literature is informative.

A theory of modernization and aging

Employing data from fifteen different societies, Cowgill and Holmes (1972) used modernization theory to develop a theory of aging in a cross-cultural perspective. Questioning the general validity and adequacy of gerontological theories (i.e., disengagement theory, minority theory, and subcultural theory), which were developed within the framework of American society, they attempted to derive both universal behaviors of old people and those aspects of aging which are different depending on social and cultural systems.

As they mentioned, origins of these efforts can be traced to the pioneer work by Leo W. Simmons, in The Role of the Aged in Primitive Society (1945). Simmons tried to find out the general trends of the status of the aged from seventy-one primitive societies by correlating aspects of aging with a number of variables for the
physical, social, and cultural environments. The results, however, showed an overall lack of coherence.

Cowgill and Holmes sought to relate the systematic variations of aging to the degree of modernization within their widely divergent samples from primitive to highly industrialized Western societies. Their major hypothesis was that "the role and status of the aged varies systematically with the degree of modernization of society and that modernization tends to decrease the relative status of the aged and to undermine their security within the social system (Cowgill and Holmes, 1972:13)."

Later, Cowgill (1975) refined the theory and explained in detail how the modernization processes lead to the lowered status of the aged. He observed that modernization is the transformation of a "total" society and that the change is "unidirectional" from the rural traditional to the urban, highly differentiated form. But he agreed that, in reality, it is difficult to consider all aspects of transformation within a society when one examines the relationship between modernization and some specific phenomenon, here, the lowered status of the elderly. Thus, he limited the discussion to four salient aspects of modernization with reference to the elderly. They are 1) scientific technology as applied in economic production and distribution, 2) urbanization, 3) literacy and mass education, and 4) health technology.

He discussed how each of the major aspects of modernization initiates the causal sequences which tend to diminish the status of the aged (Fig 2.1). McPherson (1983:150) summarized these sequences as follows.

1. The introduction of modern technology increased longevity and led to
intergenerational competition and retirement.

2. The development of modern economic technology made the jobs of the aged obsolete and led to new occupations in urban environments.

3. The onset of urbanization led to migration, and to social segregation by age and socioeconomic status.

4. The increased level of educational attainment with each subsequent generation enabled children to be better educated than their parents and grandparents.

Finally, Cowgill expects that the future trend of the status of the aged "may bottom out in advanced stages of modernization and from that point on the relative status of the aged may begin to improve (Cowgill, 1975:144)". This expectation was based on the research findings of Palmore and Manton (1973) showing a curvilinear relationship between occupational and educational status of the aged and the degree of modernization.

Cowgill speculated on the possible reasons for this reverse trend. First, recently, work is no longer highly viewed as a virtue. Rather leisure and early retirement are preferable in American society. Second, it is possible to provide public support to unemployed people including retired elderly after a society attains a certain level of development. A third possibility is that the gradual disappearance of illiteracy, which is the one of handicaps of older people, with modernization will improve the conditions of the elderly. Finally, the increased numbers and proportion of the elderly may lead to heightened self-awareness and, therefore, to increased group power (Cowgill, 1975).
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Figure 2.1: Aging and Modernization
Studies on modernization and the elderly

The modernization hypothesis, that the status of the elderly is inversely related to the degree of modernization, has been tested and discussed by many researchers. Press and McKool (1980) attempted to derive general structural determinants of the status of the aged from an analysis of aging in Meso-American peasant society. Their six structural determinants of the status of the aged are almost identical to Cowgill's determinants of status which may change with the process of modernization. These are: 1) societal economic homogeneity, 2) roles entailing progressively higher responsibility, authority, or advisory capacity, 3) continuous life style role, 4) controlling important family or community resources, 5) engagement in valued activities, and 6) the extended family as a viable residential or economic unit. Press and McKool (1980) argued that status generates prestige and reorganized these six determinants as four basic prestige generating components: 1) advisory (the degree to which the advice or opinion of the aged is actually heeded), 2) contributory (the extent of older people’s active participation), 3) control (the degree of direct control of the aged over behavior or welfare of others), and 4) a residual (residual prestige from previous statuses) component. They concluded that these determinants of the status of the aged have universal validity based on their findings using an inductive method and Cowgill's findings from cross-cultural data.

Other cross-cultural studies (Bengtson et al. 1975; Cohn, 1982; Palmore and Whittington, 1971; Palmore and Manton, 1974) have supported the modernization theory. Palmore and Manton (1974) found that relative status of the aged, which was measured by an equality index for employment, occupation, and education, declines with modernization among developing countries. However, within the more
modernized countries which have already passed a transitional stage of rapid modernization, the occupational and educational status of the aged (65 or over) relative to the nonaged (25-64) seems to stabilize and may rise. Similarly, Cohn (1982) found a negative relationship between the occupational status of the elderly and both the level and the rate of economic development among males of thirty countries for the period 1962-1971.

On the other hand, the effect of modernization on the status of the aged has been tested within a particular society, too. Goldstein and his associates (1983), for example, demonstrated how the social and economic changes in urban Nepal have impacted on the family and the elderly, although extended family systems persist. Salaried employment has become an important source of the family economy and a major element in social status. Young people who are employed become economically independent from their parents and they tend to reject the traditional values of obedience, respect, and deference toward the aged. The elderly have no choice but to adjust to the changing situation and they become aware of the need for independent income in old age. Especially, female elderly have to give special consideration to their economic situations after the death of their spouse.

Goldstein and Beall (1982) argued that modernization of one area may indirectly affect nearby areas which have not yet begun modernization. They found that the modernization of India's economic structure induced out-migration to India for work among the young people in the remote Sherpa area of the Nepal Himalayas. Consequently, the family system was changed and many elderly had to live alone even though they did not want to.

The study of the status of the aged in Japanese society by Palmore (1975) is
one of the exceptional cases of the modernization hypothesis. Even in a nation with an advanced level of industrialization, the Japanese elderly have maintained high status compared to the elderly in other modernized societies. The majority of the aged men over 65 are still in the labor force and most of the elderly live with their adult children, performing important roles within the family. Japanese elderly also maintain integration in the communities by participation in senior citizens’ clubs or through interaction with neighbors. Palmore argued that the high respect for the elderly in public and private practices came from the unique Japanese culture, a vertical social system, and their strong tradition of filial piety.

Discussion

Modernization theory assumed the dichotomy of tradition-modernity and implied that the attributes of modernity are preferable to those of tradition and that traditional values are obstacles to modernization. Gusfield (1967) presented seven fallacies in the assumptions of the traditional-modern polarity. To view traditional societies as static, normatively consistent, or socially homogeneous has been criticized. Also, the traditional and the modern are not always in conflict, displaceable, or mutually exclusive. Finally, modernizing processes do not necessarily weaken traditions.

These misleading assumptions also have been criticized elsewhere (Apter, 1967; Bendix, 1967; Portes, 1973 a,b). Modernity is a value-laden concept which implies the Western societies as an ideal of development. But neither tradition nor modernity exists in pure form. They may coexist within a society at the same time and even are not contradictory. Moreover, the traditional elements may support
changes (Gusfield, 1967; Portes, 1973 b). Accordingly, a point to consider is how
developing countries find ways of synthesizing and blending tradition and
modernity in the processes of modernization.

There is a tendency to idealize the conditions of and attitudes toward the
elderly in traditional society. Some studies (Harlan, 1964; Laslett, 1976; Lipman,
1970; Stearns, 1981) questioned the high status of the aged in the tradtional society.
It is not clear whether the status of the elderly comes from cultural traditions or
social class and economic resources which are usually controlled by the elderly in
traditional agricultural societies. Lee (1984) tested the possibility of the influence of
family and kinship systems on the status of the elderly independently of economic
factors. From cross-cultural data, it was concluded that the status of the elderly
was higher in agricultural, rather than exploitative, economies and higher in
unilocal, particularly partrilocal, rather than neolocal postmarital residence, but
lower in fully extended family systems. However, small extended family sytems and
customs involving the inheritance of real property were found to have no
independent effects on the status of the elderly (Lee, 1984).

Another criticism of the theory of modernization and aging has been directed
at the definitions of modernization and status. As discussed in the introduction, the
concept of modernization represents such various changes as urbanization,
Westernization, or industrialization that have occurred in developing countries. It is
commonly held that modernization is related to the changes in the structure of
social systems, whereas modernity is related to changes in individual attitudes or
orientations (Bengtson et al. 1975; Inkeles and Smith, 1974; Schnaiberg, 1970;
Portes, 1973b).
Bengtson et al. (1975) suggested that the impact of modernization (societal level) is different from that of modernity (individual level) and that, thus, both should be considered separately. Using cross-cultural data from six countries, they found that the higher the level of modernization, the more negative were the perceptions of aging, but there was no correlation between modernity and negative perceptions of the elderly.

Status is an essential concept in social sciences but it is difficult to conceptualize clearly and, thus, is often used intuitively. Generally, two ideas exist: 1) status as a relational and intersubjective situation, derived from Max Weber, and 2) status as a position within a social structure, employed by Ralph Linton (Kuper and Kuper, 1985). In addition, the terms of status and role are sometimes used without distinction.

Focusing on socioeconomic aspects, Palmore and Manton (1974) measured status of the aged with the Equality Index for employment, occupation, and education comparing aged (65 years or over) and nonaged (25-64) groups. Lee (1984) operationalized status by combining indices of prestige, power, and privilege.

It is true that only social aspects of status have been emphasized in studies of aging and modernization. Goldstein and Beall (1982) pointed out that the social status of the aged represents one aspect of the total condition of the aged and, therefore, has limited utility for the cross-cultural studies of the elderly. They suggested nine dimensions of status: 1) social status (prestige), 2) biological status (biological function), 3) health status (morbidity), 4) activity status (work performed), 5) authority status (power and authority exercised in community and family), 6) economic status, 7) household status, 8) psychological status
(satisfaction with personal situation), and 9) ritual status. They argued that this disaggregation is useful for comparing each dimension between societies as well as within a society.

Another view of modernization and aging was offered by Dowd (1975, 1981) and by Watson and Maxwell (1977). By developing a scale of informational control among the elderly of twenty-six societies from Human Relations Area Files, Watson and Maxwell (1977) found that the information controlled by the aged becomes obsolete with modernization and that this informational obsolescence leads to a decline in their social participation. This in turn causes loss of status of the aged.

Finally, Dowd (1975, 1980, 1981) proposed the exchange perspective as an alternative way of explaining the lowered status of the aged with modernization. His main concept was power as derived from imbalances in social exchange processes. Power resources are curvilinearly related to chronological age and it is a universal phenomenon that the aged have non-material rather than material power resources. Dowd argued that the degree of modernization is negatively related to the amount of power resources of the elderly (money, approval, esteem, compliance, and professional skills). In the case of the aged, decreased social interaction is the result of a series of exchange relations with other age groups in which the relative power of the aged gradually decreases. Retirement is an example of imbalanced exchange relations between individual and society.

More specifically, Dowd examined how an age-relevant exchange rate, which is established depending on the allocation of power resources to age strata, works both in agrarian and industrial societies. In agrarian societies, the elderly enjoy a favorable exchange rate because they control the land. In contrast, in industrial
societies, they have an unfavorable rate because they are excluded from labor force participation and, thereby, tend to have less status than the elderly in non-industrial societies. He argued that prestige and status are determined by the interaction between structural factors (e.g., the prevailing exchange rate within a specific period) and individual factors (e.g., physical strength, intelligence, personality, and wealth).

In conclusion, there is evidence that the relationship between modernization and aging has been of continuing interest to social gerontologists. Even though much research has supported the proposition that the status of the elderly declines with social modernization, some questions remain. The general validity of the theory is questionable because there exist exceptional societies in which the status of the elderly contradicts the predictions of the theory. In addition, the assumption of high status of the aged in the traditional society is debatable.

Another concern is the measurement of the concepts of modernization and status. In cross-cultural studies, status varies depending on specific value systems. Thus, it is difficult to control the extent of cultural differences. As Bengtson et al. (1975) pointed out, individual modernity and societal modernization may affect the situations of the aged differently. In this sense, the attempt to reformulate the modernization hypothesis in terms of individual and structural factors by Dowd (1981) is valuable, although longitudinal studies examining the effects of modernization on changes in status of the aged are needed to understand more fully the relationship between modernization and aging.

The next section reviews research on family power, including conceptualization, measures, and theories of family power. Investigation of the power relationship
between the generations may be another way of examining the status of the elderly in the family, which is the main focus of this research.

**Research on Family Power**

Family power has been one of the major areas in family research over the past three decades. Until the sixties, the concept of power was overlooked in sociological research because the dominant ideology at that time was functionalism which emphasized harmonious relationships in and among systems. Functionalists justified the superiority of men over women by focusing on their functional contribution to the family (Scanzoni, 1979).

After Blood and Wolfe's *Husbands and Wives* (1960), which focused on the relative resources of the husband and wife rather than the patriarchal notion, family power became a popular research topic among family sociologists. Subsequent research has tested resource theory, applied other theoretical perspectives, and advanced the concept and measurement of family power. However, most studies of family power examined it in the husband-wife dyad and primarily focused on decision-making outcomes.

**Conceptualization and measurement of family power**

There have been many efforts to clarify the concept of family power and to develop valid measures of this concept (Cromwell and Olson, 1975; McDonald, 1977; Safilio-Rothschild, 1970; Sprey, 1972; Szinovacz, 1987). In a decade review of family power theory and research, McDonald (1980) pointed out that the problems with conceptualization were related to the unit of analysis and dimensions of power.
As mentioned above, the majority of studies on family power have examined marital decision-making patterns. In other words, primary focus has been on the husband-wife relationship and outcomes of power.

A few attempts have been made to investigate other power relationships rather than marital power, such as parent-child relationship (McDonald, 1980; Smith, 1977) and sibling relationship (Sutton-Smith and Rosenberg, 1970). Until recently, most studies have measured decision-making as an index of the concept of power, but at least researchers have regarded power as a dynamic entity. Influential work on the conceptualization of family power was done by Cromwell and Olson (1975). They reviewed power as a multidimensional concept and identified three domains of power: bases, processes, and outcomes. Bases of power are the individual resources which include both economic and noneconomic sources. Power processes refer to interactions among family members during the process of decision-making or negotiation. Power outcomes are the results of power processes in which it is determined who finally has the control to make a decision. McDonald (1980) demonstrated the multidimensional concept of family power by combining different power relationships (units of analysis) and domains of power (Fig 2.2).

The major critique of measures of family power is in the use of wives' self-assessments of decision-making which may represent not the actual power but the perceived power (Brinkerhoff and Lupri, 1978; Cromwell and Olson, 1975; McDonald, 1977, 1980; Safilios-Rothschild, 1970). In addition, some studies (Booth and Welch, 1978; Olson and Rabunsky, 1972; Turk and Bell, 1972; Quarm, 1981) observed that the incongruence between responses of husbands and wives is possibly due to methodological inadequacies such as question ambiguity or social
Figure 2.2: The interrelatedness of the units of analysis and dimensions of power in family power research
desirability, as well as substantive reasons such as role ambiguity or conflict between the spouses (Szinovacz, 1987:657). As an alternative to self-report measures, various observational measures of family power have been developed, for example, Straus and Tallman's (1971) SIMFAM and Osmond's (1978) RECIPROCITY, a simulation game based on exchange theory. However, critics of observational techniques have argued that social desirability and artificial settings reduce the validity and that tasks in a laboratory setting cannot represent the dynamics of family power (Liu et al., 1974; O'Rourke, 1963; Szinovacz, 1987). Therefore, to capture the family power dynamics, both self-report and observational measures should be used (Cromwell and Olson, 1975; McDonald, 1977, 1980).

Theoretical developments

The most influential theory of family power, known as resource theory, was developed by Blood and Wolfe (1960). They argued that as family structure has changed from a patriarchal to an egalitarian one, family power has been determined by the relative resources of the husband and wife, such as education, occupation, income, and the adequate performance of family roles. Thus, the more resources a spouse has, the greater his or her power in decision-making.

This general hypothesis has received support from decision-making research in America and Europe (Blood and Wolfe, 1960; Kandel and Lesser, 1972; Lupri, 1969; Michel, 1967; Scanzoni, 1979). However, there have been some exceptions from Greek (Safilios-Rothschild, 1967), Yugoslavian (Buric and Zecevic, 1967), and some American (Scanzoni, 1970) samples. These studies suggested that the husband's socioeconomic resources did not increase his power, or even decreased it.
Rodman (1967, 1972) revised and extended resource theory to incorporate the discrepant findings of cross-cultural studies. This has come to be known as "the theory of resources in cultural context," which suggests that the effect of resources of husbands and wives on marital power may be different depending on cultural or normative orientations. Rodman tried to demonstrate that marital power was determined by the interaction of comparative resources of the husband and wife and the cultural and subcultural expectations about the distribution of marital power.

From his comparative studies of family power in the U.S., France, Greece, and Yugoslavia, Rodman formulated a typology of four different cultural systems depending upon four stages of social development: patriarchy, modified patriarchy, transitional egalitarianism, and egalitarianism. In the patriarchal stages, the patriarchal norms are strong and prescribed status controls the position of the individual in society (e.g., India). Marriages are male-dominated. Therefore, husbands have more power than wives regardless of either the husbands' or the wives' socioeconomic attributes.

In modified patriarchal societies (Greece, Yugoslavia), where modernization is in process, the patriarchal norms are still important but the egalitarian norms of marriage diffuse differentially through social systems. These ideas usually affect the middle and upper classes first. Thus, high-status men who adopt egalitarian norms tend to grant their wives more power. Consequently, there is a negative relationship between resources and power for husbands but a positive relationship for wives (Rodman, 1972).

On the other hand, in transitional egalitarian societies (e.g., United States of America, France), norms tend to favor an egalitarian ethic, but marriages are not
yet entirely egalitarian. Marital power is a process of negotiation and, therefore, socioeconomic resources became important and are positively related to decision-making power.

In the egalitarian stage (e.g., Denmark, Sweden), egalitarian norms are strong and pervasive. Socioeconomic achievements of men are irrelevant to decision-making patterns in the family because women also have high levels of resources (Rodman, 1972).

Overall, subsequent studies on marital power have found moderate support for the theories of resources and resources in cultural context. By replicating Blood and Wolfe's (1960) study, Centers et al. (1971) found the same results among a Los Angeles sample, although they added an aspect of personality (e.g., authoritarianism) as a determinant of marital power.

Cooney et al. (1982) utilized Rodman’s theory of resources in cultural context to understand decision making within ethnic groups in the United States. They examined decision-making patterns among spouses in intergenerational Puerto Rican families by comparing parental (born and raised in Puerto Rico) and child generations (born and raised in the United States). They found significant differences between generations in the assimilation of Puerto Ricans into American society. The parental generation had the norms of a modified patriarchal society (Puerto Rico), whereas the child generation had the norms of a transitional egalitarian society (United States). Husbands with greater socioeconomic resources in the parental generation had less decision-making power, whereas those in the child generation had more decision-making power. Their findings supported Rodman’s theory of resources in cultural context.
Wives' education and employment have been found to be important determinants of marital power (Gillespie, 1971; Jones and Rosenfeld, 1981; Kandel and Lesser, 1972). Recently, Shukla (1987) investigated decision-making power comparing single- with dual-career families in India. It was found that wives had more power and husbands had less power when wives were employed. In addition, marriages were more egalitarian in dual-career families than in single-career families. These findings strongly supported resource theory by demonstrating that wives' employment was an important resource that affected marital power.

There also have been studies which presented evidence against resource theory and Rodman's extension of resource theory. Contrary to the prediction of resource theory, some studies (Bokemeier et al., 1985; Brinkerhoff and Lupri, 1978; Safilios-Rothschild, 1969; Sawer, 1973) demonstrated that employment status and education of wives were not significantly related to their decision-making power. Similarly, Hoffman and Nye (1974) argued that wives' employment had no direct effect on marital power but only related to the ideology and personality of wives. Rodman's position, which predicted no effect of resources on marital power in patriarchal societies, was rejected by some studies (Bossen, 1975; Conklin, 1979; Lee and Peterson, 1983; Warner et al., 1986; Whyte, 1978). These studies showed that women's socioeconomic resources may influence marital power even in nonindustrial societies.

Some studies (Edward, 1969; Osmond, 1978; Richer, 1968; Scanzoni, 1979) have attempted to apply social exchange theory as an alternative theoretical framework for the study of family power, focusing on the role of resources in an exchange context. Power is viewed as derived from imbalances in social exchange.
processes. In exchange theory, it is assumed that individuals tend to maximize rewards and minimize costs. Resources which are used in exchange relations are not only material but also non-material. Also, cultural values and norms are important in controlling exchange relations. In power exchanges between husband and wife, for example, economic resources, emotional support (including love), and actual roles in family are the major bases of power. In addition, their attitudes toward an egalitarian marriage affect power relationships between spouses (Cromwell and Olson, 1975). In this sense, resource theory and Rodman's theory of resources in cultural context can be viewed as derivatives of exchange theory.

Repeated exchange processes lead to institutionalization or patterns of interaction. Routinized decision-making is an example of patterned behavior. Once established, the unbalanced exchange becomes institutionalized and thereby provides a normative basis for similar exchanges in the future.

Regarding power as a dynamic and ongoing process, Safilios-Rothschild (1976) used exchange theory, including other potentially exchangeable resources, such as love, sex, and companionship, as well as socioeconomic resources. From a sample of 100 Greek couples, she argued that love is an important resource among women with low socioeconomic status because they may exchange love for power. Using perceived importance and frequency as two indicators of decision-making, she distinguished "orchestration" (important and infrequent decision-making) power from "implementation" (unimportant and frequent decision-making) power. It was found that the spouse "more in love" had less orchestration (important and infrequent) power than the spouse "less in love", but that spouses who perceived themselves as equally in love shared the decision-making power equally.
Scanzoni (1979) mentioned that gender role norms should be considered as a key variable in the examination of marital power. He pointed out that the power relationship between spouses became an important issue when the gender role norms changed from traditional to modern. Under traditional gender role norms, there is consensus in society with the husband as chief breadwinner and the wife as homemaker. Wives' interests are subordinate to the interests of husbands. But under modern gender norms, the interests of women are equal to those of men. Therefore, women tend to be concerned with their individual interests and negotiate for power in the family. Moreover, Scanzoni viewed decision-making as an abstract construct which subsumes several measurable processes including attraction, exchange, exchange rules, distributive justice, negotiation, maximum joint profit, power (non-legitimate power vs. authority), trust, communication, conflict, hostility, and violence and showed how these several processes are interconnected.

From a feminist perspective, Gillespie (1971) argued that power relationships in the family are not determined by personal resources. Rather gender norms which were structurally established in favor of men and discriminate against women define the distribution of power. Therefore, husbands tend to have more power as members of a class (male sex) not as individuals, whereas wives are disadvantaged as members of a class (female sex).

Suggestions for future research

Since recognition of the importance of the concept of power in family research during the 1960s, significant efforts have been directed toward refining the concept and developing measures as well as the elaboration of divergent theoretical
frameworks. The majority of family power studies have focused on decision-making outcomes of husbands and wives, including decisions about savings and investments, spending money on food, vacations, or on clothes, wife's employment, life insurance, and inviting guests. McDonald (1980) argued that perhaps decision-making outcomes may reflect only normative expectations of gender norms rather than actual decision-making behavior. As Szinovacz (1987) speculated, however, improved measurement techniques (observational measures, multitrait-multimethod approaches) and awareness of the multidimensional and dynamic aspects of family power promise developments in family power research in the near future.

For example, the family power model proposed by Szinovacz (1987) demonstrated how the structural context, characteristics of family members, composition of the family, and situational conditions as well as individual resources were reflected in the negotiation and exercise of power in the family. She acknowledged that her complex model of family power was difficult to investigate in its entirety and, thus, only some portion of the model can be tested empirically. In addition, she suggested five directions for future research that were related to her theoretical model: 1) multivariate analyses of family power relations, 2) relationships among control outcomes, 3) cross-cultural or sub-cultural studies, 4) the effect of situational contingencies on family power processes, and 5) examination of relationships among specific influence factors such as family members' personalities and their attitude toward each other (Szinovacz, 1987:679 - 680).

More elaboration of exchange theory as it relates to family power is needed; concepts of commitment, trust, and reciprocity during exchange processes should be included. In addition, the potential of alternative theoretical frameworks, such as
conflict theory, systems theory, and symbolic interactionism, should be investigated (McDonald, 1980:121).

Finally, more studies need to investigate other power relationships, such as child-parent relationships, sibling relationships, and power relationships among the extended family members. To understand family power, involvement of all family members in the decision-making process must be examined (McDonald, 1980; Safilios-Rothschild, 1970; Szinovacz, 1987).

**Theoretical Frameworks and Hypotheses**

From the literature reviews of modernization and aging and family power, we learned one important lesson - - that these two different research areas can be incorporated into the study of power relationships between older and younger generations. Research on modernization and aging is largely based on macro analyses and cross-cultural comparisons, focusing on the impact of modernization processes on the status of the elderly, whereas the unit of analysis in studies on family power is the individual or spouses. Findings from marital power studies may provide some potential factors which affect power relationships between the generations in the extended family.

In this study, the status of the aged at the micro level is assessed by measuring their decision-making power. Family environment variables (residential area, family income, educational level of children) and individual modernity are used to measure the modern conditions of the elderly. The resources of the elderly, such as education, physical health, employment status, and role performances in the family, will be examined as factors affecting power relationships between the generations.
These will be interpreted in the light of resource and exchange theories drawn from family power research. Additionally, some demographic characteristics of the elderly (age, sex, and marital status) are used as independent variables. Most of the hypotheses are derived from the research on modernization and the elderly and from resource and exchange theories in family power research.

First, several hypotheses are developed to examine decision-making power of the elderly. From the modernization hypothesis of a negative relationship between modernization and the status of the elderly, it is posited that the modern circumstances of the family, such as living in urban areas, high family income, and/or having children who are highly educated, are likely to lower the decision-making power of the elderly. The assumption behind this is that there is an analogy between the modernization level of society and the modern environment of the family. How the elderly perceive modern ideas may differentially affect power relationships between the generations. Perhaps the elderly with modern attitudes expect the younger generations to have more power in family decisions, because the elderly realize that the modern ideology favors increased decision making on the part of youth.

Based on the above thinking, the following hypotheses are suggested:

**H1.1.** The more modern the family environment (urban residence, highly educated children, high family income), the less power the elderly have in decision-making.

**H1.2.** Elderly with more modern attitudes are likely to have less decision-making power than are those with traditional attitudes.
According to the resource and exchange theories used in studies of power in the family, employment, education, physical health, and role performances of the elderly can become resources that affect the decision-making processes. Taking into account resource and exchange theories, the following hypotheses are postulated.

**H1.3.** Higher education of the elderly is positively related to decision-making power.

**H1.4.** Good health of the elderly is positively related to decision-making power.

**H1.5.** Employed elderly are likely to have more decision-making power than are non-employed elderly.

**H1.6.** Elderly who are more involved in family roles are likely to have more decision-making power.

In addition, the following effects of demographic characteristics on decision-making power are examined.

**H1.7.** Age is negatively related to decision-making power of the elderly.

**H1.8.** Male elderly are likely to have more decision-making power than are female elderly.

**H1.9.** Married elderly are likely to have more decision-making power than are widowed elderly.

According to literature on family power, role performance in the family is determined by gender role norms in society and other demographic variables such as wives' employment status. Because the focus is on the elderly, age and health are
included as factors affecting decision-making power and the following hypotheses are considered.

**H2.1.** Age is negatively related to family role involvement.

**H2.2.** Female elderly are likely to be involved in more family roles than are male elderly.

**H2.3.** Good health is positively related to family role involvement.

**H2.4.** Nonemployed elderly are likely to be involved in more family roles than are employed elderly.

During the 1960s and 1970s, the measurement of individual modernity was investigated in cross-cultural studies (Inkeles and Smith, 1974; Kahl, 1968; Portes, 1973 a, b). Individual modernity is the set of individual values and beliefs that are related to modernization. Most studies in this area assumed that societies have a certain level of modernization, that societies at comparable levels share social and cultural patterns, and that these patterns determine the individual's beliefs and behaviors (Armer and Schnaiberg, 1972). Urban experience and modern education have been found to be important factors that influence the individual modernity (Inkeles and Smith, 1974; Kahl, 1968; Portes, 1973 a, b; Schnaiberg, 1970). Age and sex are frequently used as control variables. The following hypotheses about modernity are considered.

**H3.1.** Elderly in urban areas are likely to have more modern beliefs and behaviors than are those in rural areas.
H3.2. Higher education is positively related to modern beliefs and behaviors of the elderly.

H3.3. Age is negatively related to modern beliefs and behaviors.

H3.4. Male elderly have more modern beliefs and behaviors than do female elderly.
CHAPTER 3. METHODS

Sample and Data Collection

The respondents were 252 Korean members of senior citizen centers aged 60 years or older who were living with one of their married children and family. The data were collected by face-to-face interviews during June and July of 1988. Five female graduate students in Sociology and two young women who had interviewing experience were trained to conduct interviews under the supervision of the author. The interview was pretested with ten Korean elderly. The questionnaire was revised considering the result of pretest and some suggestions from experts in research on Korean elderly (see Appendix).

The sample was stratified by residential area (rural and urban), types of senior citizen centers (men's, women's, and mixed), and sex. In Seoul, nineteen centers (ten mixed centers, five men's centers, four women's centers) were randomly selected from a senior citizen center list. In rural areas, senior citizen centers are less active than those in urban areas, and rural elderly tend to participate in the center during the winter time. Due to limitations of time and money, only eight centers within three hours' travel from Seoul, which were actively operated, were selected.

Unfortunately, the respondents in each center were not randomly selected. In Seoul, I first called the directors of centers to inform them about the survey and to
obtain their cooperation. They were very cooperative and sometimes gathered more
people to arrange the interviews. The list of centers was given to the interviewers.
Two interviewers as a team visited the centers, and identified and interviewed the
respondents who were in the center at that time. In three different rural areas, I
visited each area beforehand and selected centers after discussions with directors
who were in charge of each area. All interviewers visited the centers on an arranged
date and interviewed the respondents individually after a general introduction to
the survey.

Operationalization of Variables

Decision-making power

The dependent variable, decision-making power, was measured by asking who
made the final decisions about thirteen family matters. For this study,
decision-making areas were constructed from previous studies on decision-making
power (Douglas and Wind, 1978; Safilios-Rothschild, 1969; Shukla, 1987) and some
decisions related to Korean family life were added. Decisions were divided into four
dimensions: 1) financial decisions — budget allocations, buy or sell something
valuable, financial support to the relatives; 2) education of grandchildren —
discipline for grandchildren, formal education for grandchildren; 3) family event
decisions — party/inviting friends, ancestor worship, picnic/family vacation trip,
and 4) environmental decisions — residential relocation, household repairs, children’s
religion, children’s job change, and membership in formal organizations such as
senior citizen centers.

Respondents were asked to answer who made the final decision about thirteen
family matters - - - whether it is made by you, your spouse, married child, his/her spouse, or both generations after discussion. Respondents could indicate more than one response. Finally, the responses were recoded as 1) decisions of the younger generation, by combining married child and/or his/her spouse; 2) decisions by both generations after discussion; and 3) decisions of the older generation, by combining you and/or your spouse. Decisions made by the older generation were thought to imply that the elderly had more power in decision-making in the family. The data were coded so that a higher score indicated that the elderly had more decision-making power.

A confirmatory factor analysis was employed to select the multiple indicators of decision-making power. First, six items which had many missing cases (not applicable or missing data) were dropped. These were financial support to the relatives, ancestor worship, picnic/family vacation trip, residential relocation, children’s religion, and children’s job change. Four items of decision-making were selected after the analysis: budget allocations, buy or sell something valuable, party/inviting friends, and household repairs. The factor loadings were all .60 or higher, and a standardized item alpha coefficient of these four items was .78.

Individual modernity

The measure of individual modernity consisted of an index of thirteen items assessing attitudes toward several different areas of life. These items were selected from some studies of individual modernity (Armer and Youtz, 1971; Inkeles and Smith, 1974; Kahl, 1968; Portes, 1973 a, b; Schnaiberg, 1970) and a study of Korean elderly (Choi, 1984). Only those items were used which were relevant and
significant in the Korean cultural context. This individual modernity scale was pretested with 40 Korean graduate students in the United States. Cronbach's reliability alpha of this student group was .78.

The following statements were read to respondents:

1. A person should always be loyal to his/her family even at the expense of himself/herself.

2. Older people should be given priority on all matters in the family.

3. Older people's opinions and experiences may not always need to be respected by everybody.

4. Children should always take care of their parents whatever difficulties they have themselves.

5. Children should not live near parents, if they have a better opportunity elsewhere.

6. Children should always obey their parents.

7. Women should always obey their husbands.

8. Women should stay at home and not work outside the home.

9. Men should not do housework.

10. Both daughters and sons should have the same educational opportunities.

11. People should be content with the present way of life and should not want changes.
12. The eldest son should live with his parents.

13. A person's success should depend on ability rather than on family background.

Respondents were asked to indicate their degree of agreement on each statement, ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The responses were coded so that a higher score indicated more modern attitudes. A factor analysis was done on the 13 statements to identify underlying dimensions for individual modernity. The criteria for being included as a factor were a relatively high factor loading of each item and theoretical justification for the selected items to fit together as one concept. Two different factors were found: attitude toward gender role norms (statements 7, 8, 9) and attitude toward parental care (statements 4, 5, 12). The factor concerning parental care, however, was highly related to family role involvement. Therefore, only three items (statements 7, 8, 9) were actually used as indicators of individual modernity. Factor loadings of these three items were .65 or higher and the standardized alpha coefficient was .56.

Family role involvement

To measure respondents' role involvement in the family, they were asked, "How often do you perform the following tasks at home?" There were ten familial tasks: 1) cleaning; 2) grocery shopping; 3) preparing meals; 4) washing dishes/doing laundry; 5) household repairs; 6) pickling vegetables for winter/making sauce, bean paste, and hot pepper paste; 7) care of grandchildren (supervise, affectional support, bathe and sleep, or storytelling); 8) help in family business; 9) taking care of routine bill paying; and 10) caretaker to prevent burglary. The ten items related to role performances of the elderly were developed from a previous study of
Japanese elderly (Palmore, 1975) and some studies of Korean family (Choi, 1975; Gu, 1986; Hong, 1983).

Responses to these ten items were classified into five categories and recoded 1 - "never," 2 - "seldom," 3 - "sometimes," 4 - "frequently," and 5 - "always." From an exploratory factor analysis, four items (2, 3, 4, 6) appeared to be one common factor, but grocery shopping (item 2) was dropped because it appeared to be confounded with decision-making power. Finally, three indicators, preparing meals, washing dishes/doing laundry, and making preservative foods, were chosen to represent family role involvement. The factor loadings were .70 or higher. The reliability for these three items was .78 (alpha).

Family environment variables

Family environment variables included residential area, family income, and the educational levels of the children. Family environment variables indirectly measured the modernization level of the family, reflecting modern vs. less modern characteristics.

Residential area was a dichotomous variable (1=rural, 2=urban), which was determined by the current residence of the respondents. The respondents also reported the length of their residence, ranging from one to 85 years, with mean of 37 years. Only seven respondents had moved within a year. Of the 252 respondents, 135 (54%) lived in urban area (Seoul) and 117 (46%) lived in three different rural areas (Kang-Wha, I-Cheon, Jang-Ho-Won).

Family income was assessed by the total family income per month. It ranged from W30,000 ($43) to W1,700,000 ($2,429), with a mean of W520,000 ($743). This
variable was excluded from the analysis because approximately 40 percent of the respondents did not know or answer the question about family income.

Childrens' education was measured by the average educational level of all of the respondents' children, regardless of residence. The education of each child was classified into nine categories, ranging from "no formal education" to "college graduate or more." On average, twenty-two percent of the respondents' children had college education, 43 percent had high school education, 25 percent had junior-high school education, nine percent had elementary school education, and only one percent had no formal education.

**Demographic variables**

The six demographic variables used in the study were age, sex, marital status, health status, education, and employment status. Age was measured by the number of years of age that a respondent was on his/her last birthday.

Sex was coded as a dichotomous variable (1=male, 2=female). Marital status was classified into four categories (1=married, 2=widowed, 3=divorced, and 4=separated). The "divorced" and "separated" categories were excluded from the analysis because of no and a few cases, respectively.

Health status was assessed by the question, "How is your health status in general?" Response categories ranged from very poor (1) to very good (5). To measure educational attainment, respondents were asked, "What was the highest grade of school that you completed?" It was coded into nine categories, with high scores indicating a higher level of education.

Respondents were asked to indicate their current employment status.
Responses were classified into five categories: employed full-time (1), employed part-time (2), unemployed (3), retired (4), and never employed (5). For the purpose of this study, the original five categories were collapsed into two categories (1=nonemployed, 2=employed). "Employed full-time" and "employed part-time" were considered as "employed," whereas "unemployed," "retired," and "never employed" were condensed into "nonemployed," indicating no exchange resource in the family. Means, standard deviations, and correlations for all variables used in the analysis were shown in Table 3.1.

Statistical Procedures

The hypotheses outlined in the previous chapter were tested using a series of linear structural equations, represented by the path model in Figure 4.3. The coefficients for the path model were estimated using LISREL (LIinear Structural RELationships) (Jöreskog and Sörbom, 1986). Using methods of maximum likelihood under assumptions of multivariate normality, LISREL minimizes the difference between the sample covariances and the covariances predicted by the model (Bollen, 1989b:1).

One of the advantages of using LISREL in this study is that it has the capability of combining measurement and structural equation models. The measurement model specifies how the latent, unobserved variables are related to the observed set of items. Included as output are estimates of measurement errors and, if appropriate, correlations among measurement errors. The structural portion of the model estimates the strength of the relationships among the latent variables as ordered in the path figure.
Table 3.1: Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations for Variables in the Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$X_1$</th>
<th>$X_2$</th>
<th>$X_3$</th>
<th>$X_4$</th>
<th>$X_5$</th>
<th>$X_6$</th>
<th>$X_7$</th>
<th>$X_8$</th>
<th>$Y_1$</th>
<th>$Y_2$</th>
<th>$Y_3$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age ($X_1$)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex ($X_2$)</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status ($X_3$)</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>0.55**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health ($X_4$)</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.18*</td>
<td>-0.16*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education ($X_5$)</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.31**</td>
<td>-0.21**</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence ($X_6$)</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child's education ($X_7$)</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status ($X_8$)</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.22**</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's obedience ($Y_1$)</td>
<td>-0.23**</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's employment ($Y_2$)</td>
<td>-0.17*</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's housework ($Y_3$)</td>
<td>-0.19*</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>-0.23**</td>
<td>0.17**</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing meals ($Y_4$)</td>
<td>-0.19**</td>
<td>0.37**</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washing dishes/doing laundry ($Y_5$)</td>
<td>-0.22**</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td>0.16**</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal foods ($Y_6$)</td>
<td>-0.23**</td>
<td>0.68**</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.24**</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget allocations ($Y_7$)</td>
<td>-0.33**</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.27**</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.22**</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>0.18**</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy/sell something</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuable ($Y_8$)</td>
<td>-0.23**</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.28**</td>
<td>0.15**</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.17*</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party/inviting friends ($Y_9$)</td>
<td>-0.32**</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.30**</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.17**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household repairs ($Y_{10}$)</td>
<td>-0.35**</td>
<td>-0.27**</td>
<td>-0.36**</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>-0.17**</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>72.67</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviations</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .01 level.
** Significant at the .001 level.
for Variables in the Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$X_6$</th>
<th>$X_7$</th>
<th>$X_8$</th>
<th>$Y_1$</th>
<th>$Y_2$</th>
<th>$Y_3$</th>
<th>$Y_4$</th>
<th>$Y_5$</th>
<th>$Y_6$</th>
<th>$Y_7$</th>
<th>$Y_8$</th>
<th>$Y_9$</th>
<th>$Y_{10}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4**</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>-.64</td>
<td>-.64</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For this study, three models are analyzed: Model 1, testing the modernization hypothesis (Figure 4.1); Model 2, testing resource and exchange theory in family power (Figure 4.2); and Model 3, the combined model of decision-making power (Figure 4.3). In the combined model, the eight exogenous variables (\( \xi (x_i) \) in LISREL terminology) and the three endogenous variables (\( \eta (\text{eta}) \) in LISREL), which were measured by ten observed variables (\( Y_i^2 \)), were used.

The measurement model shows the relationships between latent variables (\( \eta_i \)) and observed variables (\( Y_i^2 \)). It can be written as:

\[
Y = \Lambda y \eta + \epsilon
\]

where \( Y \) is a vector of the observed variables; \( \Lambda (\text{lambda}) \) is the loadings of \( Y \) on the latent variables (\( \eta \)); and \( \epsilon (\text{epsilon}) \) is a vector of measurement errors associated with the \( Y \)'s.

The structural model is focused on the causal relationships among eight exogenous (\( \xi \)) and three endogenous variables (\( \eta \)). It is statistically represented by the following equation:

\[
\eta = \beta \eta + \Gamma \xi + \zeta
\]

where \( \eta (\text{eta}) \) is a vector of latent variables; \( \beta (\text{beta}) \) is a matrix of coefficients relating the endogenous variables to one another; \( \Gamma (\text{gamma}) \) is a matrix of coefficients relating the exogenous variables to the endogenous variables; and \( \zeta (\text{zeta}) \) is a vector of errors in equations.

LISREL estimates linear structural relationships using maximum likelihood estimation. The hypotheses of causal relationships between latent variables, as well as the relationships between latent and observed variables, can be tested by
assessing the significance of each parameter. If parameter coefficients are twice as large as their respective standard errors (t ≥ 2.0), they are considered to be statistically significant. In order to assess the fit of the model as a whole, LISREL provides several measures of overall fit, such as the chi-square statistic, goodness-of-fit index (GFI), adjusted-goodness-of-fit index (AGFI), and root mean square residual (RMR).

In addition, LISREL gives a set of modification indices which are useful when the model is testable but does not fit the data well enough. A modification index — the expected decrease in the chi-square with one degree of freedom loss — larger than 5.0 suggests that the fit of the model will improve significantly if the constraint of the fixed parameter is freed (Lavee, 1988:942-944). Modification indices, however, should be used only if they make sense. All of the statistics discussed above were used to test hypotheses and to evaluate the models for this study.
CHAPTER 4. FINDINGS

This chapter is divided into three parts. First, the general characteristics of the respondents focusing on the variables used in this research will be described. In the second section, the proposed hypotheses will be examined. Finally, the third section is devoted to the evaluation of three models which test modernization hypotheses (Model 1), resource and exchange theory in family power (Model 2), and both modernization and resource and exchange theory (Model 3).

Descriptive Analysis

Demographic characteristics

The demographic characteristics of the respondents are reported in Table 4.1. The sample consisted of 154 males (61%) and 98 females (39%). The sex ratio of this sample does not represent that of all Korean elderly. In 1985, 40 percent of the elderly aged 60 years and over were males and 60 percent were females (Economic Planning Board, 1988). The age range of the respondents was from 59 to 88 years, with a mean age of 73. About 46 percent were between 65 and 74 years of age, 43 percent 75 years of age and over, and only 12 percent were under 64 years of age.

Half of the respondents (50%) were widowed, 48 percent were married, two percent were separated, and none was divorced. About half of the respondents
Table 4.1: Demographic characteristics of the sample (N=252)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 - 64</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 - 74</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 and over</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rural</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>urban</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no formal education</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elementary school</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>junior high school</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high school</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some college</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>married</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>widowed</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>divorced</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>separated</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very good</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very poor</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full-time employed</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part-time employed</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unemployed</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>retired</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>never-employed</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(49%) had no formal education, 37 percent had attended elementary school, nine percent had attended junior-high school, three percent had attended high school, and two percent had some college education or more.

With regard to self-reported health, thirty-nine percent rated their health as "good" (31%) or "very good" (8%), 27 percent as "fair," and 35 percent as "poor" (28%) or "very poor" (7%). Among 252 respondents, only 19 percent were employed full-time (12%) or part-time (7%). A majority (63%) were retired, 6 percent were unemployed, and 12 percent were never-employed.

Individual modernity

In this research, family role involvement and modern attitudes of the elderly were expected to be influential factors affecting the power relationships between the generations. Table 4.2 and Table 4.3 present frequencies of individual modernity and family role involvement, respectively.

Table 4.2 reports how the respondents agree with traditional beliefs and modern ideas. In general, the respondents show inconsistent responses to these statements. With regard to attitudes concerning relationships between the younger and older generations (statements 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 12), they express strong traditional filial piety (84% agreed on care of the elderly by their children, 76% on the eldest son's responsibility of parent care, and 68% on children's obedience to their parents), but show somewhat liberal attitudes toward the dominance of the elderly in family and society (statements 2 and 3).

The respondents have traditional gender role norms (70% agreed on a wife's obedience to her husband and 74% on women's traditional roles as homemakers).
Table 4.2: Percentage distribution of responses to items measuring individual modernity (N=252)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A person should always be loyal to his/her family even at the expense of himself/herself.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Older people should be given priority on all matters in the family.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Older people’s opinions and experiences may not always need to be respected by everybody.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Children should always take care of their parents whatever difficulties they have themselves.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Children should not live near parents, if they have a better opportunity elsewhere.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Children should always obey their parents.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Women should always obey their husbands.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Women should stay at home and not work outside the home.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Men should not do housework.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Both daughters and sons should have the same educational opportunities.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. People should be content with the present way of life and should not want changes.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The eldest son should live with his parents.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. A person’s success should depend on ability rather than on family background.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The respondents, however, indicate balanced responses to men's involvement in housework (47% agreement, versus 45% disagreement).

The responses to the remaining statements indicate strong familism (70% on loyalty to family), but modern attitudes (92% on equal educational opportunity for son and daughter and 87% on success depending upon individual's ability rather than upon family background).

These findings imply that older people's attitudes toward some modern ideas have changed (become modern) along with the modernization process despite their strong beliefs about filial piety and traditional gender role norms. Of course, it is possible that the items used in this research were not the best measures of individual modernity for the elderly in modern Korean society. Items measuring individual modernity may have different meanings for each society.

Family role involvement

Table 4.3 shows how often the elderly are involved in ten different familial tasks. The majority are never involved in the following roles: grocery shopping (87%), preparing meals (87%), washing dishes/doing laundry (87%), household repairs (74%), and help in the family business (82%). The respondents, however, do clean the house, help to make seasonal foods, take care of grandchildren, pay routine bills, and watch the house to prevent burglary.

There are a couple of reasons why the level of involvement in family roles is so low. Obviously, health limitations may prevent them from active involvement. Another explanation is based on Korean culture. The parents live with their children in their old age not to share family roles with the younger generations but
Table 4.3: Percentage distribution of responses to items measuring family role involvement (N=252)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Cleaning</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Grocery shopping</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Preparing meals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Washing dishes/drying</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Household repairs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Pickling vegetables for winter/making sauce, bean paste, and hot pepper paste</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Care of grandchildren (supervise, affectional support, bathe and sleep, or storytelling)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Help in family business</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Asking care of routine bill paying</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Caretaker to prevent burglary</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

to be taken care of. Therefore, they have reduced or few roles in old age. In so far as status follows from role performance, it can be argued that low role involvement of the elderly itself implies low status of the elderly in the family.

Decision-making power

Table 4.4 presents dominant decision-making patterns between generations. Not surprisingly, the elderly have distinctly less decision-making power in most family matters than does the younger generation. A majority of the following five decisions are made by the younger generation: budget allocation (78%), buy or sell something valuable (76%), discipline for grandchildren (68%), formal education for
grandchildren (82%), and children's job change (85%). This implies that the elderly are rarely involved in economic and personal matters of their children even though they lived together.

Table 4.4: Dominant decision-making patterns between generations (N=252)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision areas</th>
<th>% older generation dominant</th>
<th>% younger generation dominant</th>
<th>% joint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial decisions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget allocations</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy/sell something valuable</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial support to relatives</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grandchild education decisions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline for grandchildren</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal education for grandchildren</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family event decisions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party/inviting friends</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancestor worship</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic/family vacation trip</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental decision</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential relocation</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household repairs</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s religion</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s job change</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly’s membership in formal organizations</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Decisions about a party/inviting your friends, picnic/family vacation trip, residential relocation, and household repairs involve the younger generation or joint decisions. But the older generation has relatively more power in decision-making about financial support to the relatives, ancestor worship, and children's religion suggesting that the traditional cultural norm (Confucianism) is still influential in
some areas of family life. Decisions about membership of the elderly in formal organizations is the only area that is clearly older generation dominant.

**Hypothesis Testing**

Table 4.5 summarizes maximum likelihood estimates of the structural equations for Models 1, 2, and 3. Table 4.6 shows the measurement structure of three latent variables. Hypothesis testing is based on the path coefficients of Model 3 (Figure 4.3), because Model 3 includes all of the hypotheses derived at the end of Chapter 2. The magnitudes of parameter estimates in Model 1 (Figure 4.1) and Model 2 (Figure 4.2) are similar to those in Model 3 (Table 4.5). The t-value larger than two is used as a criterion to determine the statistical significance of each parameter.

**Factors affecting decision-making power (H1.1 - H1.9)**

It was anticipated that the elderly who lived in an urban area, had highly educated children, modern attitudes, and low education, and who were in bad health, nonemployed, less involved in family roles, older, widowed, and female would have less decision-making power. The third column under Model 3 in Table 4.5 indicates how eight independent variables and two intervening variables are related to the main dependent variable, decision-making power.
Figure 4.1: Model testing modernization theory (Model 1)
Figure 4.2: Model testing resource and exchange theory (Model 2)
Figure 4.3: Combined model of decision-making power (Model 3)
Table 4.5: Standardized coefficients for Models 1, 2, 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1 Decision making power</th>
<th>Model 2 Decision making power</th>
<th>Model 3 Decision making power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual modernity</td>
<td>Family role involvement</td>
<td>Individual modernity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>-.220**</td>
<td>-.209**</td>
<td>-.212**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's education</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>-.056</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential area</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.164**</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.166**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.150**</td>
<td>-.169**</td>
<td>-.151**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>-.142*</td>
<td>.445*</td>
<td>-.142*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>.001*</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>-.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual modernity</td>
<td>.441*</td>
<td>.118*</td>
<td>.118*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family role involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.416*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* t-value is between 2 and 3.
** t-value is 3 and over.
Table 4.6: Measurement model with correlated errors (Model 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual modernity</th>
<th>Family role involvement</th>
<th>Decision-making power</th>
<th>Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$Y_1$</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>.735**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y_2$</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.032**</td>
<td>.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y_3$</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.084**</td>
<td>.689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y_4$</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y_5$</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.003**</td>
<td>.579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y_6$</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.251**</td>
<td>.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y_7$</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y_8$</td>
<td></td>
<td>.972**</td>
<td>.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y_9$</td>
<td></td>
<td>.814**</td>
<td>.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y_{10}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>.979**</td>
<td>.472</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** $t \geq 3$.

Among eight independent variables, marital status (H1.9), age (H1.7), and employment status (H1.5) are significantly related to decision-making power. Those who are relatively young, married, and employed are more likely to have decision-making power. On the other hand, five variables are insignificant: children’s education, residential area, education, sex, and health. Children’s education, education, and health are positively related to decision-making power, while sex and residential area are inversely related, indicating that the elderly who are male, in good health, live in rural areas, have more education, and have highly
educated children tend to have more decision-making power.

Seven out of eight independent variables are in the hypothesized direction. Contrary to the expectation, children's education is positively related to decision-making power of the elderly, although the effect is weak. In addition, there are indirect effects of residence, education, age, sex, health, and employment status via individual modernity and/or family role involvement (Table 4.7), although the magnitudes of these indirect effects are not great. Among the indirect effects, sex has the greatest indirect effect via family role involvement on decision-making power (.10).

There are two intervening variables, individual modernity and family role involvement. Contrary to the prediction of a negative relationship between individual modernity and decision-making power (H1.2), a significant positive effect is found. This implies that individual modernity of the elderly may become a kind of resource, which aids them in negotiating with the younger generation to obtain more involvement in decision-making within the extended family. On the other hand, family role involvement, though not statistically significant, is positively related to decision-making power, indicating that the elderly who are more involved in family roles tend to have more power in decision-making.
Table 4.7: Decomposition of total effects in Model 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variables</th>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Total effect</th>
<th>Direct effect</th>
<th>Indirect effect via IM</th>
<th>FRI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual modernity (IM)</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.151</td>
<td>-.151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>-.142</td>
<td>-.142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family role involvement (FRI)</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.170</td>
<td>-.170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>.447</td>
<td>.447</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making power (DMP)</td>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>-.212</td>
<td>-.212</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children’s education</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.235</td>
<td>-.134</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>-.086</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual modernity</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family role involvement</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factors affecting family role involvement (H2.1 - H2.4)

The estimates of four variables affecting family role involvement are reported in the second column under Model 3 (Table 4.5). Age and sex are significantly related to family role involvement. Elderly who are relatively young and female tend to be more involved in family roles. These relationships support hypotheses H2.1 and H2.2.

On the other hand, hypotheses H2.3 and H2.4, which state that those who are in good health and nonemployed are more involved in family roles, are not supported. The hypothesized effects of health and employment status are not significant and the directions of the effects are even the opposite from what we expected.

These inverse relationships can be explained as follows. Note that the respondents are all senior citizens. About three-quarters come to the center every day. This suggests that either they do not want to or do not need to do routine tasks at home because the younger generation takes care of housework, perhaps leaving the elderly free to participate in other activities.

Factors affecting individual modernity (H3.1 - H3.4)

The effects of four variables on individual modernity are in the first column under Model 3 in Table 4.5. Education (H3.2), age (H3.3), and sex (H3.4) are significantly related to individual modernity in the hypothesized direction. Though not significant, the effect of residence tends to support H3.1, indicating that urban elderly tend to have modern attitudes. Those who are male, relatively young, and have high education are more likely to have modern attitudes.
Model Evaluation

There are several steps researchers can take to assess how well the model fits the data. First of all, parameter estimates should be within acceptable ranges. Negative variances, correlations that are larger than 1.0 in magnitude, extremely large standard errors, and covariance or correlation matrices that are not positive definite are symptoms of serious misspecification (Jöreskog and Sörbom, 1986). Models 1, 2, and 3 do have reasonable parameter estimates.

Chi-square, the Goodness of Fit Index (GFI), and Root Mean Square Residual (RMSR) often are used to examine the overall fit of a model. Chi-square indicates whether the discrepancy between the data and the model is greater than would be expected by chance. Large chi-square values indicate a bad fit, whereas small values correspond to a good fit. The degrees of freedom are used as a criterion to determine whether a chi-square value is statistically large or small. However, it is difficult in practice to assume a normal distribution of the observed variables and to have a fairly large sample size.

Alternatively, the ratio of chi-square to degrees of freedom \( \chi^2/df \) is used as a measure of overall model fit (Wheaton et al., 1977) but there is no agreed-upon standard for an adequate chi-square relative fit. Carmines and McIver (1981) argue that two or three should be acceptable scores, whereas Wheaton et al. (1977) suggest five as a reasonable score.

Another measure of fit using chi-square, which adjusts for sample size, Critical N (CN), was suggested by Hoelter (1983). CN, however, is recommended for use in evaluating models with sample sizes of 200 or larger. It is calculated by the following...
formula:
\[ CN = \frac{(Z_c + \sqrt{2df - 1})^2}{2\chi^2/N - G} + G \]

where \( Z_c \) is the critical value for the normal distribution at a certain probability level; \( df \) is the degrees of freedom; \( \chi^2 \) is the chi-square value for the model; \( N \) is the sample size; and \( G \) refers to the number of groups being analyzed. A value of 200 or more is used as a good fit of the model to the data.

GFI (Goodness of Fit Index) is a measure of the relative amount of variance and covariance jointly accounted for by the model, whereas RMSR is a measure of the average of the residual variance and covariance (Jöreskog and Sörbom, 1986:1.15). These measures can range from zero to one. GFI is not affected by sample size and is robust against departure from normality. A large value of GFI or Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI) implies good model fit, but a large value of RMSR indicates a bad fit.

In addition, other overall fit measures, such as normed and nonnormed indices (Rentier and Bonnett, 1980) and Bollen’s (1989a) incremental fit index, have been proposed. These are useful to compare a model or set of models to a nested null model in the same sample. These indices indicate the incremental improvement of one substantive model over another in comparison with a null model. Bentler and Bonnett (1980) suggested the most restrictive model (model of independence) as a criterion to compare against less restrictive substantive models, whereas Sobel and Bohnstedt (1985) argued that the baseline model should be based on prior theory and knowledge.

A model \( M_k \) is nested in another model of \( M_h \), if the unknown parameters of \( M_k \) are a special subset of the unknown parameters of \( M_h \). Bentler and Bonnett’s
(1980) nonnormed index is

\[ \rho_{k,h} = \frac{\chi^2_k/df_k - \chi^2_n/df_n}{\chi^2_n/df_n - 1} \]

where \( \chi^2_n \) is the value of chi-square for the null model and \( df \) refers to the degrees of freedom. The numerator is the difference in the \( \chi^2/df \)'s for \( M_k \) and \( M_h \).

Another index proposed by Bentler and Bonett (1980) is a normed index \( (\Delta_1(k,h)) \) which varies from zero to one. It is given as

\[ \Delta_1(k,h) = \frac{\chi^2_k - \chi^2_n}{\chi^2_n} \]

A value of .90 or more is suggestive of a good incremental fit.

Bollen's (1989a) incremental fit index \( (\Delta_2(k,h)) \) provides an adjustment to the normed index for sample size and degrees of freedom. It is defined as

\[ \Delta_2(k,h) = \frac{\chi^2_k - \chi^2_n}{\chi^2_n - df_n} \]

With Bollen's index, it is possible to fall outside the zero-to-one boundary. \( \Delta_2 \) (Bollen's index) is greater than \( \Delta_1 \) (normed index) when the numerator and denominator of \( \Delta_2 \) are positive (Bollen, 1989a:306). Various measures of overall model fit have been discussed, but there is no single acceptable criterion to evaluate the overall goodness of model fit. Multiple measures are always necessary.

Statistics to measure an overall model fit are summarized in Table 4.8 and Table 4.9. GFI, AGFI, and RMSR indicate that the combined model (Model 3) has a better overall fit when compared to Model 1 and Model 2. Also, \( \chi^2/df \) values for all three models show adequate overall fit. However, \( \chi^2 \) and CN indicate weak fits of the model to the data for all three models. The chi-square values for Models 1, 2,
and 3 are larger than the critical values and the values of Critical N are less than 200.

For this research, two models, Model O, which assumes that the variables are all independent, and Model B, which assumes the eight exogenous variables are all independent but measures the three endogenous variables by ten observed variables and assumes independence among these three variables, are used as standards to compare against the nested models (Model 1, Model 2, and Model 3). Among these five models, the most restrictive model is Model O, followed by Model B, Model 1 or Model 2, and Model 3. In Model O is nested in Model B, Model 1, Model 2, and Model 3. Model B is nested in Model 1, Model 2, and Model 3. Model 1 and Model 2 are nested in Model 3. This can be presented as follows.

\[
\text{Model}3 \supset \text{Model}2 \supset \text{Model}B \supset \text{Model}O
\]

\[
\text{Model}3 \supset \text{Model}1 \supset \text{Model}B \supset \text{Model}O
\]

We can compare Model B, Model 1, and Model 3 to Model O, or Model 1 and Model 3 to Model B. In Table 4.8, three indices - - - nonnormed, normed, and Bollen's index - - - measure the improvement of one model over the previous model. For example, Bollen's index of .076 for Model 3 indicates the proportionate improvement in fit by moving from Model 1 to Model 3, relative to Model O. Bollen's index of .145 indicates improvement of Model 3 over Model 1, relative to Model B.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model O</th>
<th>Model B</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model B</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Df</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>1094.49</td>
<td>621.68</td>
<td>258.00</td>
<td>182.17</td>
<td>621.68</td>
<td>258.00</td>
<td>182.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$/df</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>35.20</td>
<td>57.59</td>
<td>101.35</td>
<td>136.83</td>
<td>57.59</td>
<td>101.35</td>
<td>136.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonnormed</td>
<td>.456</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.543</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normed</td>
<td>.432</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bollen's</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>.366</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.700</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFI</td>
<td>.554</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td>.898</td>
<td>.913</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td>.898</td>
<td>.913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGFI</td>
<td>-3.241</td>
<td>-.620</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>-.620</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td>.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSR</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition, these indices are additive. For example, in Table 4.8, Bollen's indices of Model 3 over Model 0 and Model B are summed up as follows.

$$\Delta_2(O,3) = \Delta_2(O,B) + \Delta_2(B,1) + \Delta_2(1,3) = .497 + .366 + .076 = .939$$

$$\Delta_2(B,3) = \Delta_2(B,1) + \Delta_2(1,3) = .700 + .145 = .845$$

These two different values of Bollen's indices show that the improvement of one model over another model may be different depending upon which model is used as a baseline model. The value of .939 indicates that a 94% reduction in the chi-square value occurs by going from Model 0 to Model 3, whereas the value of .85 means that an 85% reduction in the chi-square occurs upon moving from Model B to Model 3.

On the other hand, Model 0, Model B, Model 2, and Model 3 can be compared. Similar to Table 4.8, Table 4.9 includes three indices to measure the improvement of one model over another model. With regard to Bollen's index for Model 3, the values of .041 and .078 imply that Model 3 improves over Model 1 by .041 and .078 in comparison with Model 0 and Model B, respectively. Both Table 4.8 and Table 4.9 showed that the overall improvements in the fit of Model 3 are .94 and .85 by using either Model 0 and Model B as a standard, respectively.

Although Model 1 and Model 2 are not nested in each other, we can compare the incremental fit of these models over Model 0 and Model B. Bollen's incremental fit indices of Model 1 over Model 0 and Model B are .863 (.497 + .366) and .700, respectively (Table 4.8). This means that Model 1 improves in overall model fit by an 86% reduction in the chi-square value from Model O to Model 1 or a 70% reduction from Model B to Model 1. Bollen's indices of Model 2 over Model 0 and Model B are .899 (.497 + .402) and .767, respectively (Table 4.9). In other words,
Model 2 shows improvement over Model O by a 90% reduction in the chi-square value, or over Model B by a 77% reduction. Nonnormed and normed indices also show the same results. Based on these measures, we can conclude that Model 2, examining resource variables from family power studies, is better than Model 1, testing the modernization hypothesis at the micro level, in terms of overall model fit.
Table 4.9: Overall goodness of fit measures among Models O, B, 2, 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model O</th>
<th>Model B</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model B</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Df</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>1094.49</td>
<td>621.68</td>
<td>223.11</td>
<td>182.17</td>
<td>621.68</td>
<td>223.11</td>
<td>182.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$/df</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>35.20</td>
<td>57.59</td>
<td>117.3</td>
<td>136.83</td>
<td>57.59</td>
<td>117.3</td>
<td>136.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonnormed</td>
<td>.456</td>
<td>.351</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
<td>.645</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normed</td>
<td>.432</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td></td>
<td>.641</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bollen's</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>.402</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td></td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFI</td>
<td>.554</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td>.900</td>
<td>.913</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td>.900</td>
<td>.913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGFI</td>
<td>-3.241</td>
<td>-6.20</td>
<td>.751</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>-6.20</td>
<td>.751</td>
<td>.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSR</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 5. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

Summary

The impact of modernization on the life of the elderly has been an important research area in social gerontology. Cross-cultural studies have supported that the elderly in modern society are likely to have a lowered status in society and in the family.

The major focus of this research was on the decision-making power of the elderly in the extended family. Two different approaches were combined to examine the power relationships between the older and the younger generations. First, a theory of modernization and aging, suggesting a negative relationship between modernization and status of the elderly, was applied at the micro level. Second, several possible resource variables were adopted from resource and exchange theories in family power research to examine how these variables explained the power relationships between the generations in the extended family.

To determine factors affecting decision-making power of the elderly in the extended family, three groups of variables were examined: 1) modern environment of the aged - - - individual modernity, current residence of the elderly (rural vs. urban areas), and average educational level of their children; 2) exchange resource variables - - - education, health, employment status, and family role involvement of
the aged; and 3) demographic characteristics - age, sex, and marital status. Data were collected from interviews with 252 Korean elderly aged 60 years and older living with a married child.

Overall, the elderly had distinctly less decision-making power than the younger generation in most family matters, but their greater power was in decisions about financial support for relatives, ancestor worship, and children’s religion. Concerning questions about individual modernity, the respondents showed mixed attitudes: traditional gender role norms and strong filial piety but modern attitudes toward educational opportunity, success, and position of the elderly in society and in the family. Elderly were not actively involved in the family roles; the majority were never involved in grocery shopping, preparing meals, washing dishes/doing laundry, household repairs, or helping in a family business.

A LISREL analysis was used for hypotheses testing. For family role involvement, it was hypothesized that those who were younger, nonemployed, in good health, and women would be more involved in family roles. Of these variables, age and sex were found to be significant and in the expected direction, but health and employment status had insignificant opposite effects on decision-making power.

For individual modernity, it was anticipated that those who were younger, male, had high education, and lived in an urban area would have more modern attitudes. The effects of all four variables on individual modernity were in the hypothesized direction, though the effect of residence was not significant.

The effects of three groups of variables on decision-making power of the elderly were examined. With respect to the modern environment of the aged, it was hypothesized that those who had modern attitudes, lived in urban areas, and had
highly educated children would have less power in decision-making. Contrary to the hypothesis, there was a significant positive relationship between individual modernity and decision-making power.

Concerning the exchange resource variables, it was expected that those who were highly educated, employed, were in good health, and more involved in family roles were likely to have more decision-making power. Only employment status was found to have a statistically significant effect on decision-making power.

Regrading the effect of demographic characteristics, it was found that the effects of marital status and age were statistically significant. Younger married male elderly had more power in decision-making.

Discussion

As an exploratory study, this research examined how decision-making power was exercised between generations in the extended family. The fact that the younger generation generally made decisions about budget allocations, buy/sell something valuable, grandchildren's education, and children's job change indicates that the elderly were rarely involved in the economic and personal decision making of their children. But the older generation's opinion was a factor in decisions related to other aspects of family life, such as inviting friends, vacation trip, moving the house, and household repairs. Decision-making power of the aged was relatively greater in decisions related to cultural norms (financial support to the relatives, ancestor worship, and children's religion).

Cowgill (1986) suggests in his refinement of the theory of aging in cross-cultural perspective that the extended family system, ancestor worship, filial piety, and
familism are important factors to maintain the high status of the aged. Elderly in this study had less power in decision-making than did the younger generation in most family matters, even though they lived in the extended family system and familism and filial piety are still strong norms in modern Korean society. This finding provides some indirect support for the modernization theory, predicting an inverse relationship between the status of the aged and the level of modernization. This study, however, did not compare various stages of modernization.

Following from the modernization hypothesis, it was predicted that, at the micro level, individual modernity would be negatively related to decision-making power. The significant positive effect of individual modernity on decision-making power, however, suggests that modern attitudes may enhance the decision-making power of the elderly in the family. Bengtson et al. (1975) argued that societal modernization and individual modernity may differently affect the status of the elderly and that, therefore, both should be differentiated in the analyses.

In addition, the positive relationship between children's education and decision-making power of the aged gave additional evidence that modern conditions of the elderly could aid in obtaining more power in the family. But the elderly who lived in an urban area had less power in decision-making than did those in rural areas. Rural-urban differences in decision-making power may have reflected continued employment of those in rural areas. A correlation between employment status and residential area (r = -.22, p < .001) indicates that rural elderly tend to work more than urban elderly in their old age. Employment of the elderly may contribute to power because they can be income providers in the family. Also, more traditional ways of living in rural areas than in urban areas may help the elderly
maintain their power in the family.

Among the potential resource variables, only employment status was significantly related to decision-making power, indicating that employed elderly were more likely to have power in decision-making than were nonemployed elderly. Other remaining variables - - - family role involvement, education, and health - - - did not account significantly for decision-making power of the aged. Of these insignificant variables, family role involvement had a relatively stronger coefficient, while health had the weakest effect on decision-making power.

This result partially supported resource theory in marital power research, predicting positive effects of education, employment status, and role performance on marital power. Education was found to be an insignificant factor. Notice that the majority of Korean elderly in this cohort have no formal education. Hence, it may be the case that their educational level did not make any difference in exercising power in the family.

It is suggested that other resource variables for the aged population, such as the symbolic roles of transmitting tradition, and as advisors or intermediates for the extended family members, should be investigated. These roles may be invisible, but important to run the family smoothly. Successful performances of these symbolic roles may indirectly affect the status of the elderly in the family. In addition, property and assets of the aged which can be inherited by their children will be sources of power. Therefore, whether the elderly have these economic resources or not may determine their decision-making power.

Since employment status is an important factor, more opportunity to work should be provided for the elderly. As McPherson (1983) pointed out, it was
important to consider the variation in norms by class, education, sex, and race among the elderly. Status characteristics, such as male, upper class, high education, or white, can be resources so that the elderly may garner power in social interactions.

With respect to demographic variables, it was found that married and younger elderly had significantly more decision-making power. Even though sex was not statistically significant, there were considerable indirect effects of sex through individual modernity and family role involvement on decision-making power. Sex was significantly related to individual modernity and family role involvement, indicating that female elderly tended to be more involved in family roles and to have less modern attitudes.

Moreover, a high correlation between sex and marital status (r = .55) indicated that widowed female elderly had greater disadvantages in obtaining power in decision-making. Korea remains a male-dominant society. Therefore, female elderly without spouses are in a marginal position in the family unless they have economic resources.

This study of decision-making power of the elderly has important implications for social gerontologists and public policy makers. From this research, marital status, age, employment status, and individual modernity were found to be significant predictors of decision-making power of the aged, indicating that those who were married, younger, employed, and had modern attitudes had more power in decision-making. The positive relationship between individual modernity and decision-making power implies that having modern attitudes become a resource and play important roles when the elderly deal with power distributions in the family.
Based on these interpretations, it is suggested that resource theory may be a useful theoretical framework to explain the power relationship between the older and younger generations if other resource variables of the aged were identified. In addition, other factors which were not included in this study, such as personality, characteristics of family members, or household composition, may affect the decision-making power of the elderly.

Why do the elderly continue to live with their married children without having greater power in the family? The answer is not clear from the findings of this study. The respondents lived with their married child to get care from child (55%) and to have financial aid from child (56%). The majority (66%) also considered that it was natural to live with children. Therefore, it may be either because the elderly are economically dependent or because it is cultural custom to live with a married child. Others have suggested that economic dependency of the elderly was the main reason for living with a married child (Hyeon, 1976). Being employed is important to the aged. It may permit them to maintain a social position, independence, and provide resources to promote their integration in the family.

Three policies were suggested by ILO (International Labor Organization) to promote employment among the elderly: 1) create suitable work environments such as simplifying work procedures, mechanizing manual tasks, and alternating tasks and postures; 2) introduce flexible work schedules, including reductions in work hours, part-time work, and reorganization of the work schedule; 3) encourage vocational counselling and training to know how to make the best use of their abilities to develop their skills, to catch up with rapid changes in technology, and to find suitable jobs (U.N., 1985:90-91).
On the other hand, familism and filial piety are still strong cultural norms in modern Korean society, although the value orientation and the way of thinking of the younger generation are Westernized. Moreover, government encourages the maintenance of family care for the elderly by giving a monthly parental support allowance for the public service personnel who live with their parents and by giving some tax reduction benefits since 1987.

However, lower fertility and extended life expectancy result in a limited capacity of the potential filial caregivers (Brody, 1985). Moreover, women's labor force participation has been increased steadily. These demographic changes suggest that the family cannot provide all of the parental care that is needed and, therefore, sooner or later formal support systems and social welfare programs will become essential for the elderly, especially for marginal groups, such as lower-class, female, and widowed elderly. According to a U.N. publication (U.N., 1985), too much support from outside the family may result in weakening family roles and responsibilities and, hence, it is important to find a balance between family care and social support. In addition, social programs will need to be made available to the elderly who have time to allocate to them as they confront their reduced roles in society and in the family.

Suggestions for Future Research

This research considered only decision-making power in the extended family as described by the aged. The elderly might either give desirable answers or exaggerate their reduced power in decision-making. Therefore, it will be the task of future research to present a more complete view of family power structure in the
extended family by using both the younger and older generations and by including other potential determinants of power relationships.

Only members of senior citizen centers were interviewed in this study. They may be a special group among the Korean elderly. The respondents indicated that they came to the center because they wanted to have companionship (91%), to utilize leisure time (73%), had nothing else to do (69%), and to get out of the home (34%). One study of Korean senior citizen centers indicated that participants tended to be married, less educated, not-employed, live in their own or children's houses with married children, have more informal support, have lived longer in their neighborhood, and have a higher level of community attachment (Kim, 1988).

In addition, this study has oversampled male elderly (61%) and undersampled female elderly (39%), compared with the sex ratio of Korean elderly (60% female, vs. 40% male elderly). Thus, the findings of this study cannot be generalized to the elderly population in Korea.

Better measures of decision-making power, individual modernity, and family role involvement to enhance reliability are needed. Maybe components of individual modernity have different meanings for each country. Measures of individual modernity have been developed in early '70s. Since then, Third World countries have been modernized with an effort to maintain a part of their own culture as well as integrating it into the modernization process. Therefore, the unique situation of each culture should be considered when individual modernity is measured. As discussed earlier, the majority of the elderly were not involved in most of the family roles in this study. This means that other roles may be more important.

As suggested in the family power research, further study focusing on the
process of family power is needed to understand fully the dynamics of power relationships in the family. In addition, it would be valuable to compare decision-making power of the elderly living with unmarried children only, with unmarried and married children, and with married children only. Also, it is important to examine how the patterns of decision-making power of the elderly change with the length of marriage of the child with whom they live.

It would be interesting to examine the gender differences in decision-making power in more detail using a larger sample, because Korea is still a male-dominant society, at least among the older population. Growing old in urban and rural areas is so different that more studies should investigate differences between urban and rural elderly. Finally, longitudinal research is highly recommended to examine the effect of changing levels of modernization on the status of the aged.
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APPENDIX QUESTIONNAIRE
Hello!

My name is ____________. I am an interviewer for Seon-Hee Hong, who is a graduate student working toward a Ph.D. degree in sociology at Iowa State University in the United States. We are interviewing elderly about how modernization in Korea affects the status of the elderly within the family. The questions ask you opinions about several familial matters and your involvement in familial decisions.

You were selected at random from the senior citizen center membership list. I would appreciate it if you will agree to be interviewed. The interview will take about 35-40 minutes. Your answers will be kept confidential and no individual responses will be identified. You may refuse to answer any questions or stop participation at any point in the interview. Your cooperation will assist me in understanding the situation of Korean elderly after modernization. It may provide useful information for public policies in the future. We will give you a little gift to express our appreciation for your cooperation.

Thank you.
Q1. Respondent's sex: Male_______ Female ______

Q2. May I ask your age on your last birthday? ______ years

Q3. Are you living with your spouse, or are you widowed, divorced, or separated?
   1) living with spouse
   2) widowed
   3) divorced
   4) separated

Q4. How is your health status in general?
   1) very good
   2) good
   3) fair
   4) poor
   5) very poor

Q5. How satisfied are you with your life in general?
   1) very satisfied
   2) somewhat satisfied
   3) satisfied
   4) somewhat dissatisfied
   5) very dissatisfied

Q6. What was the highest grade of school that you completed?
    ______ grades
Relationships with your children

Q7. I would like to ask about your children. How many children do you have? Would you tell me about their relationship to you (whether they are sons or daughters), their age, education, whether they are living with you or not, how often you interact with them, and what kinds of support are exchanged between you and your children?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Living with you (yes/no)</th>
<th>Freq. of interaction</th>
<th>Type of support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[^a\] Frequency of interaction:

(1) everyday
(2) 2 to 3 times a week
(3) once a week
(4) every other week
(5) once a month
(6) 2 to 3 times a year
(7) never

\[^b\] Type of support:

(1) material support (money, gifts)
(2) instrumental support (help on special occasions such as childbirth, sickness, or a big party/babysitting)
(3) counseling (advice on running a home, bringing up children, job or business matters)
(4) counseling on personal problems in life

Q8. How long have you lived with your married child?

______ years
Q9. Why do you live with your married child? (Check all that apply)

1) Get care from children
2) It is natural to live with children
3) Companionship with children
4) Financial aid from children
5) Financial aid from you or/and your spouse
6) Enjoyment of caring for children and grandchildren
7) Convenience
8) Other reason (specify)

Q10. Now, I'll ask about your familial work. Please indicate how often you perform the following tasks at home: always, frequently, sometimes, seldom, or never.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocery shopping</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing meals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washing dishes/doing laundry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household repairs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickling vegetables for winter/making sauce, bean paste, and hot pepper paste</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care of grandchildren (supervise, affectional support, bathe and sleep, or storytelling)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help in family business</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking care of routine bill paying</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caretaker to prevent burglary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(To be completed, in rural areas, ask open-ended question about farm-related familial work)
Q11. I would like to know what you think about traditional cultural beliefs and modern ideas. Please indicate whether you strongly agree, agree, are neutral, disagree, or strongly disagree with these statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A person should always be loyal to his/her family even at the expense of himself/herself.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Older people should be given priority on all matters in the family.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Older people's opinions and experiences may not always need to be respected by everybody.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Children should always take care of their parents whatever difficulties they have themselves.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Children should not live near parents, if they have a better opportunity elsewhere.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Children should always obey their parents.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Women should always obey their husbands.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Women should stay at home and not work outside the home.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Men should not do housework.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Both daughters and sons should have the same educational opportunities.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statement | SA | A | N | D | SD
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
11. People should be content with the present way of life and should not want changes. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1
12. The eldest son should live with his parents. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1
13. A person's success should depend on ability rather than on family background. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1

Ten years ago, how did you think about?

14. The eldest son should live with his parents. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1
15. Both daughters and sons should have the same educational opportunities. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1
Q12. Which of the following should be of greatest concern to you?
   1) Past
   2) Present
   3) Future

Q13. Suppose you could get along well enough where you are now, earning enough to provide food and other necessities for yourself and your family. Would you be willing to immigrate to other country far from here, if you could live twice as well there?
   1) Yes
   2) No

Q14. Suppose a stranger, who seems quite different from you (for example, in age, occupation, religion) but friendly, is next to you when travel. Would you get acquainted with that person?
   1) Yes
   2) No

Q15. How often do you read a newspaper?
   1) Everyday
   2) A few times a week
   3) A few times a month
   4) Almost never

Q16. How many hours do you watch TV per day? _____ hours
Q17. Here are some concerns about the family life. Sometimes conflict occurs when a decision is made about these family matters.

A. Please indicate who makes the final decision. Is it made by you, your spouse, your married child, his/her spouse, or both generations after discussion? (indicate if more than one person are involved in the final decision)

B. How often does conflict occur when the following decisions are made in your family?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decisions</th>
<th>You spouse</th>
<th>Your married child</th>
<th>His/her spouse</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget allocations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy/sell something valuable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial support to relatives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandchild education decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline for grandchildren</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal education for grandchildren</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family event decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party/inviting friends</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancestor worship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic/family vacation trip</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential relocation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household repairs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's religion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's job change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly's membership in formal organizations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q18. How many people are living in your household, including yourself? ______

Q19. Who is working in this household? (indicate if more than two persons are involved in each category)
   1) Respondent
   2) Spouse
   3) Married child
   4) Married child's spouse
   5) Other unmarried child
   6) Grandchild

Q20. Are you currently employed full-time, part-time, unemployed, retired, or never-employed? If applicable, is your spouse currently employed full-time, part-time, unemployed, retired, or never-employed?

   Self  Spouse
   1) Full-time  1) Full-time
   2) Part-time  2) Part-time
   3) Unemployed 3) Unemployed
   4) Retired  4) Retired
   5) Never-employed  5) Never-employed

Q21. What is the approximate total monthly family income? ______ won

Q22. How much do (you, your spouse, or you and your spouse) contribute to the total family income?
   Respondent ______ won
   Spouse ______ won
Q23. How adequate is your total income now?
   1) Not enough to live on
   2) Just enough to barely get by on
   3) Just enough to meet all your needs comfortably
   4) More than enough to meet all you needs comfortably

Q24. How long have you lived in here? _______ years

Q25. If respondent has moved within a year, ask:
   Where did you live before moving to here? _______

Q26. How often do you come to senior citizen center?
   1) Everyday
   2) Every other day
   3) Once a week
   4) A few times a month
   5) A few times a year

Q27. Why do you come to senior citizen center?
   (Check all that apply)
   1) Have companionship/make friends
   2) Participate in activities
   3) Invitation or urging from friends/others
   4) Utilize leisure time
   5) Nothing else to do
   6) Get out of home