Parental Involvement With College Students in Germany, Hong Kong, Korea, and the United States

Journal of Family Issues
2016, Vol. 37(10) 1384–1411
© The Author(s) 2014
Reprints and permissions:
sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav
DOI: 10.1177/0192513X14541444
jfi.sagepub.com

**Karen L. Fingerman¹, Yen-Pi Cheng¹,
Kyungmin Kim¹, Helene H. Fung²,
Gyounghae Han³, Frieder R. Lang⁴,
Wonkyung Lee⁵, and Jenny Wagner⁶**

Abstract

Rates of college attendance have increased throughout the world. This study asked whether students across nations experience high involvement with parents (frequent contact and support) and how satisfied they are with parental involvement. College students from four major Western and Asian economies participated—Germany ($n = 458$), Hong Kong ($n = 276$), Korea ($n = 257$), and the United States ($n = 310$). Consistent with solidarity theory, students across nations reported frequent contact with parents and receiving several forms of social support (e.g., practical, emotional, and advice) every month. Multilevel models revealed that Asian students received more frequent parental support than German or U.S. students but were less satisfied with that support. Students in Hong Kong resided with parents more often and gave more support to parents than students

¹The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX, USA

²The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR, China

³Seoul National University, Seoul, Korea

⁴University of Erlangen-Nuremberg, Nuremberg, Germany

⁵Yonsei University, Seoul, Korea

⁶Humboldt University, Berlin, Germany

Corresponding Author:

Karen L. Fingerman, Department of Human Development and Family Sciences, The University of Texas at Austin, 108 East Dean Keeton Street, Stop A2702, Austin, TX 78712-1248, USA.
Email: kfingerman@austin.utexas.edu

in other cultures. Discussion focuses on cultural (i.e., filial obligation) and structural (i.e., coresidence) factors explaining parental involvement.

Keywords

college student, parent child relationship, social support, solidarity theory, young adult, emerging adulthood, education

Increasing numbers of young adults are enrolling in universities worldwide (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009). This prolonged education leads to questions about intergenerational ties. Culture plays a key role in shaping family relationships (Antonucci & Birditt, 2011), but a shared status may elicit homogeneity in parent/child ties. Across nations, college students may be highly involved with parents. Student status involves continuation from adolescence in some respects, and dependency on parents may persist. The academic calendar typically provides longer vacations than in the work world, allowing students to spend time with parents. Finally, parents may invest in students because college is the path to a successful future.

Nonetheless, parents' relationships with young adult students may differ across countries. In Western cultures, emerging adulthood includes exploration of identity, dependency on parents, and delayed responsibilities (Arnett, 2000). In Asian cultures, individuals are less likely to experience a prolonged transition, and responsibilities toward others begin in early adulthood (Arnett, 2000). Likewise, structural differences in tuition and opportunity to attend university generate variability in students' ties to parents. Western cultures favor a flow of support from parent to child until the end of life (when support patterns may reverse), whereas Asian countries value support from grown child to parents starting in young adulthood (Fingerman et al., 2011; Grundy & Henretta, 2006). Norms of filial piety also render intergenerational households more common in Asia than in the United States or Germany (K. Kim, Cheng, Fingerman, & Zarit, 2015).

This study examined college students' ties to parents in two Western (i.e., Germany and the United States) and two Asian (i.e., Hong Kong and Korea) nations. We asked how higher education is associated with similarity and differences in parent-child ties across countries.

Similarity in Parental Involvement With College Students Across Nations

This study drew on intergenerational solidarity theory to consider similarities in students' ties to parents (Bengtson, 2001). According to this perspective,

positive features of intergenerational ties such as high contact and frequent support exchanges are reciprocally linked (Bengtson, 2001; Lowenstein, 2007). Thus, students' ties may involve frequent support from parents as well as frequent contact.

Moreover, intergenerational solidarity theory specifies the "developmental stake hypothesis," that is, parents are more heavily invested in the tie than children because they view their children as a legacy (Giarrusso, Feng, & Bengtson, 2005). This may be the case particularly for college students. Across cultures, parents may invest a great deal in young children to prepare them for college. Then, student status may evoke parental support due to the importance of a college degree for future success. Research in the United States and Europe has found parents offer tangible (e.g., financial) and nontangible support (e.g., advice) to children attending college (Attias-Donfut & Wolff, 2000; Fingerman et al., 2012); the same may be true in Asian countries.

Cross-National Differences in Parental Involvement With College Students

Although we expected parents to be highly involved, we also expected cross-national differences in level of involvement. Both cultural values and public policies may generate differences in parent-child relationships across nations (e.g., Kohli, 1999; Kohli, Albertini, & Künemund, 2010).

Cultural Values for Intergenerational Support. Cultural values regarding family support influence individuals' behaviors (Becker, Beyene, Newsom, & Mayen, 2003; Fuligni, 2007; Lowenstein, Katz, & Gur-Yaish, 2007). In Western cultures, norms of filial obligation require grown children to support aging parents who suffer physical or mental declines (Zarit & Eggebeen, 2002). Studies in the United States (Fingerman et al., 2011), the United Kingdom (Grundy & Henretta, 2006), and European nations find that parents provide more financial and intangible support to grown children than the reverse (Albertini, Kohli, & Vogel, 2007) when parents are healthy, however.

In contrast, rules of filial piety in Asia dictate respect and provision of support to parents even in young adulthood, and grown children avoid asking parents for support (K. Kim et al., 2015; Nelson, Badger, & Wu, 2004). There has been a loosening of filial piety values in Asia recently (Sung, 2004), and Asian students today may be less concerned with respect for older generations than their parents were. Nonetheless, these beliefs have a strong history in Asia.

Furthermore, differences may be evident in students' reciprocation of parental support due to filial beliefs. Research reveals that college students in

Asian countries may be concerned with reciprocating support in general due to norms of interdependence (Kitayama & Uchida, 2004; Sung, 2004). Thus, we expected German and American students to receive more frequent support than students in the Asian countries, but Asian students to give more support to their parents.

University Attendance and Tuition. Structural factors shape access to higher education and influence support patterns. The base level of higher education in a society may contribute to parents' views of whether offspring require support. If college attendance is rare, parental investment may be greater during college.

Attendance in higher education has risen worldwide but varies by nation. In 2011 (when data were collected), only 49% of German young adults passed the Abitur examination (a qualifying examination for college); 55.3 % of these young adults continued with university (i.e., 26% of German youth; Federal Statistical Office Germany, 2012). In the United States, 69% of young adults continue education following high school, but only 39% of young adults complete a 4-year degree (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009). Among Hong Kong students who finish high school (known as secondary school), 53% enter university. Many of these young adults study abroad (e.g., the United States, the United Kingdom, and Canada); 18% of young adults attend Hong Kong universities (Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, 2012). Currently, Korea has the highest rate of post-secondary education attendance in the world; 80% of Korean young adults who graduate high school enter college (Korean Education Development Institute, 2010). In countries where fewer young adults attend 4-year colleges (e.g., Germany and the United States), parents may be more involved with young adults who do so.

Moreover, as Kohli (1999) has suggested, governmental programs may shape family support. When government programs are generous, families may give less support. In Germany, tuition for public university is covered by federal funding, and individuals who gain entry to public universities pay nominal fees between €300 and €1,000 (euro) per year. In the United States, federal loans, need-based scholarships, and student employment help pay tuition, but parents incur considerable financial burdens. The average cost for a public 4-year university in the United States was \$15,600 in 2010-2011 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2012). In Hong Kong, the government subsidizes tertiary education; tuition is around HK \$42,000 (\$5,385 U.S. dollar) per year. In most cases, parents cover tuition. In Korea, sources of tuition include public and private loans, students' part-time jobs, and a small percentage (5%) receive scholarships. More than 70% of Korean

students list their parents as the main source of their tuition (Kyunghyang News, 2009; Yonsei University, 2011). Thus, parents in all nations may provide financial support to cover tuition, but those costs are higher in the United States than in European or Asian nations.

Coresidence With Parents. Scholars argue that coresidence is a form of support due to the value of rent and household expenses (Schoeni & Ross, 2005). Individuals in shared households also have opportunities to exchange daily support (Becker et al., 2003).

Cultural beliefs also are associated with the likelihood of intergenerational coresidence (Newman & Aptekar, 2006). Asian adults view parent–child coresidence in adulthood as more desirable than do adults in the United States or Germany (K. Kim et al., 2015). In Hong Kong, housing is particularly expensive and unavailable, approximately half of college students reside with parents (Chinese University of Hong Kong, 2012). A majority of Korean college students (60%) reside with parents (Yonsei University, 2011). In contrast, in Germany, approximately 37% of adults aged 18 to 34 years reside with parents, and college students are likely to reside apart from parents (Choroszewicz & Wolff, 2010). In the United States, 80% of freshmen who attend public state universities reside in dormitories or apartments during the academic year, and only 13% reside with parents; these patterns are likely to persist throughout college (Pryor et al., 2012).

Evaluations of Support and Different Types of Support

Finally, students may feel more positively about parental support in some cultures. Young adults in the United States benefit from receiving tangible (e.g., financial) and nontangible (e.g., advice and emotional) support from parents (Fingerman et al., 2012; Umberson, 1992).

In Asian cultures, individuals rarely seek explicit social support in general and are likely to view explicit support from any party unfavorably (H. S. Kim, Sherman, & Taylor, 2008). Asian young adults may believe that it is not appropriate to upset other people by asking for support (H. S. Kim, Sherman, Ko, & Taylor, 2006; Taylor et al., 2004). Moreover, as mentioned previously, Asian students may view it as their duty to support their parents (rather than the reverse; K. Kim et al., 2015). Thus, students in Asian countries may evaluate parental support less favorably than students in Western countries.

Moreover, parents in different cultures may provide different types of support. Explicit support includes financial, practical support, advice, or discussing problems (e.g., emotional support). Implicit support may involve simply spending time and listening to the other person (H. S. Kim et al., 2008;

Uchida, Kitayama, Mesquita, Reyes, & Morling, 2008). Studies have shown that students from Asian countries typically respond well to implicit support, and students from the United States may be less likely to benefit from implicit support (Uchida et al., 2008), but these patterns have not been examined in relationships with parents. Although overall parental support may be lower for Asian students, Asian parents may offer implicit types of support (e.g., listening and companionship) as frequently as Western parents.

Other Factors Associated With Parental Support

We controlled for other factors associated with parental involvement, including gender of grown children. In Western countries, daughters receive more support than sons (Raley & Bianchi, 2006). In Asian countries, traditionally, parents favored sons over daughters and retained stronger ties with sons (Das Gupta et al., 2003). We also controlled for child's age. Parents provide more support to younger than to older grown children (Fingerman, Miller, Birditt, & Zarit, 2009; Hartnett, Furstenberg, Birditt, & Fingerman, 2013; Swartz, Kim, Uno, Mortimer, & O'Brien, 2011). Age of college attendance varies by country. In Hong Kong and the United States, young people go from high school to university around the age of 18 years. The Abitur in Germany (prior to 2011) required an additional year of high school. Korean students often take an extra year in high school to compete for entrance into universities, and men may complete 2 years of mandatory military service after freshmen or sophomore year in college.

Furthermore, well-educated parents provide more frequent support to grown children than less well-educated parents (Schoeni & Ross, 2005). We also included parental work status; individuals who are employed for pay may have fewer available hours to help family members (Bianchi & Milkie, 2010). We included parental marital status because parents who are married have a shared investment in their grown children and provide more support to grown children than are parents who are divorced, remarried, or single (Aquilino, 2005; Kalmijn, 2015).

In sum, this study considered many aspects of parental involvement, including frequency of contact, support from parents, and coresidence. We also examined the support students provided to parents and evaluations of support received from parents. We expected students across nations to report frequent contact and support from parents. Nonetheless, we expected students in Western countries (i.e., Germany, the United States) to receive explicit support (e.g., practical support, advice) more frequently than students from Asian nations (i.e., Hong Kong, Korea). We expected that parental implicit support (e.g., listening, companionship) would show no differences.

Furthermore, we expected students in the United States to receive the most financial support due to tuition costs.

We predicted that students in Asian nations would be more likely to reside with parents and thus have more frequent contact with parents. Asian students would provide more frequent support to their parents associated with coresidence and with cultural values of filial piety. Finally, we expected students in Asian countries to evaluate receipt of parental support less favorably than students in Western countries.

Method

Participants were recruited at high caliber universities providing a 4-year degree (or equivalent) in each nation. Each university was ranked within the top 500 universities according to reputable rating systems (Academic Rankings of World Universities, 2011; Center for Measuring University Performance, 2010). Recruitment occurred via psychology, social, or natural science classes for course credit or payment of \$10 (for students not eligible for credit).

Participants completed a web-based survey translated from English and back-translated into the appropriate language by native speakers of the language who were fluent in English. Participants received a link to the survey and password via their course instructor.

We further limited the sample. We did not include individuals who had immigrated to the host nation in the past 5 years, thus excluding students who immigrated to attend college. Seventeen participants older than 25 years were excluded. Finally, six participants who did not have living parents and eight participants with missing data on variables regarding parental support were eliminated from our analysis. We analyzed data from 1,301 college students.

Participants identified each of their parents ($N = 2,456$). They answered questions about each living parent, their mother and father, separately. Most students had two living parents. Of these parents, 99.1% of mothers were biological, with six stepmothers and four adoptive mothers (distributed across the four nations), and 98% of fathers were biological, with 9 stepfathers and 10 adoptive fathers (distributed across the four nations). Table 1 includes background information for the sample. More female than male students participated. On average, students were aged 18 to 22 years and were in their second or third year of college. We asked about each parent separately, but we have presented background information regarding mothers and fathers combined. On average, parents were in their 50s. Most parents were married and more than half of them worked full-time.

Table 1. Background Information for College Students and Their Parents From Each Nation.

	Germany (n = 458)	Hong Kong (n = 276)	Korea (n = 257)	United States (n = 310)
Offspring characteristics				
Age in years, <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	22.18 (1.88)	19.95 (1.33)	21.42 (2.22)	19.99 (1.38)
Male, %	27.3	49.8	42.6	47.6
Married, %	2.8	0.4	0.4	0.6
Year in college, <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	2.84 (1.43)	1.72 (0.82)	2.84 (1.27)	2.55 (1.20)
Number of siblings, <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	1.41 (1.02)	1.39 (0.72)	1.20 (0.58)	1.85 (1.25)
Geographically proximate, ^a %	45.4	82.8	33.7	11.3
Parent characteristics				
Age in years, <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	52.10 (5.65)	50.98 (5.66)	50.36 (3.73)	50.48 (5.06)
Father, %	46.6	48.9	48.0	48.9
Years of education, <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	12.98 (3.24)	10.74 (3.78)	15.12 (2.66)	15.87 (2.06)
Married, %	76.7	90.3	88.8	79.5
Working full-time, %	52.0	61.4	63.8	75.3

Note. Participants *N* = 1,301; parents *N* = 2,456.

a. For German, Korean, and U.S. samples, geographic proximity indicates parent lives within 50 miles or 80 kilometers; for Hong Kong sample, geographic proximity indicates parent resides within Hong Kong.

Measures

Coresidence. Students indicated whether they lived with a parent or parents year round, lived in a dormitory or lived in an apartment while attending university. In analyses, we compared students who resided with parents year round (coded 1) with students who resided in a dorm or apartment during the academic year or year round (coded 0).

Contact With Parents. Students indicated frequency of contact with their mother and their father separately: (a) in-person, (b) by telephone, and (c) by email, rated 1 (*less than once a year or not at all*), 2 (*once a year*), 3 (*a few times a year*), 4 (*monthly*), 5 (*a few times a month*), 6 (*weekly*), 7 (*a few times a week*), and 8 (*daily*). Email contact was infrequent and was not considered further.

Support Exchanges. Participants completed the *Intergenerational Support Index* (ISI; Fingerman et al., 2011). The ISI assesses six types of family support: emotional, practical, companionship, advice, financial assistance, and listening to others talk about daily events rated 1 (*less than once a year or not at all*), 2 (*once a year*), 3 (*a few times a year*), 4 (*monthly*), 5 (*a few times a month*), 6 (*weekly*), 7 (*a few times a week*), and 8 (*daily*). Some of these items

(e.g., financial, practical, and emotional support) have been used in cross-national studies in Europe and Israel (e.g., Albertini et al., 2007; Lowenstein et al., 2007). Participants completed the six items for how much support they received *from* and provided *to* each of their parents, their mother and father. Regarding reliability, α ranged from .82 to .84 for support received and from .81 to .86 for support provided across the four nations. We considered the ISI as a scale and also looked separately at each type of support with consideration of explicit types of support (e.g., financial, practical, advice, and emotional support) and implicit types of support (e.g., listening and companionship) participant received from their mother and their father.

We were interested in financial support via tuition or allowance. Participants answered items (1 = *yes*, 0 = *no*) regarding parental help with: (a) tuition or fees for college and (b) an allowance for expenses. Regarding reciprocal support, participants indicated whether they (a) provide money to the parent on a regular basis and (b) help parent pay for household expenses.

Evaluations of Support. Participants indicated the extent to which each parent gave support they wished to receive. This item was rated 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*a great deal*).

Filial Obligation. Participants completed a four-item measure of filial obligation used in Europe and Israel (Lowenstein et al., 2007). Sample items included "Adult children should live close to their older parents so that they can help if needed" and "Parents are entitled to some return for the sacrifices they have made for their children" rated from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 4 (*strongly agree*). Alphas were .67 Germany, .72 Hong Kong, .73 Korea, and .67 the United States.

Control Variables. Control variables included offspring demographic characteristics: gender (1 = *male*, 0 = *female*) and age. Year in college (e.g., freshmen and sophomore) highly correlated with offspring age ($r = .73$) and was not included in analyses. We controlled for each parent's characteristics: gender (1 = *father*, 0 = *mother*), years of education, marital status (1 = *married*, 0 = *not married*), and work status (1 = *works full-time*, 0 = *not working full-time*).

Analytic Strategy

We tested measurement equivalence for the scales across nations via confirmatory factor analysis. The ISI showed the same factor structure (i.e., one-factor)

and similar factor loadings across nations. Consistent with a study of 10 nations (Lowenstein et al., 2007), we also found one factor for the filial obligation scale across nations.

To account for the nested structure of the data, we used multilevel models. Students answered questions about their mother and their father separately (i.e., two parents nested within students). Predictor and control variables were grand-mean centered. We considered frequency of contact, support, and evaluations of support as continuous outcomes using the PROC MIXED procedure in SAS (Littell, Milliken, Stroup, & Wolfinger, 1996). We treated *nation* as a categorical predictor variable in alphabetical order (i.e., the United States as comparison category). Tukey–Kramer post hoc tests compared each of the four nations.

For coresidence, the majority of participants' parents (84%) were married and resided in the same household. Thus, we treated coresidence as one outcome per student (rather than two parents nested within student) via logistic regression (SAS PROC GLIMMIX) coding *coresidence with one or both parents* = 1 and *residing in a dorm or apartment* = 0.

Furthermore, we asked whether coresidence and cultural values (i.e., filial obligation) explained observed cross-national differences in support provided to parents. With a categorical predictor (i.e., nation) instead of traditional tests of mediation, comparisons of model fit statistics may explain whether additional variables account for more variance in a model (Iacobucci, 2012). In multilevel models, model fit comparisons use the -2 log-likelihood indicators with the difference in number of parameters as degrees of freedom in a chi-square (Singer & Willett, 2003).

Results

Descriptive Statistics

Contact With Parents and Coresidence. In Table 2, we present average contact with mothers and fathers combined for descriptive purposes. On average, students reported talking with each parent by phone once a week or a few times a month. In-person contact varied by nation, occurring monthly, a few times a month, weekly or daily, depending on the country. More than half of students in Hong Kong lived with parents, and more than a third lived with parents in Korea, but fewer than a fifth lived with parents in Germany or the United States.

Support From Parents. Averages of support exchanged with parents from the ISI are found in Table 2. The mean for each type of support is shown in Figure 1.

Table 2. Descriptive Information for Offspring Contact, Coresidence, and Support Exchanges With Parents.

	Germany (n = 458)	Hong Kong (n = 276)	Korea (n = 257)	United States (n = 310)	F or χ^2
Contact with parents					
Contact by phone ^a	5.51 (1.56)	6.18 (1.48)	5.96 (1.68)	5.94 (1.33)	24.01***
Contact in person ^a	5.02 (1.64)	6.58 (1.67)	5.57 (2.07)	4.84 (1.58)	117.92***
Coreside with parents					
Coreside, %	15.3	57.2	39.7	2.6	280.93***
Support exchanges with parents					
Received from parents ^a	4.40 (1.28)	4.94 (1.39)	4.78 (1.47)	4.77 (1.26)	19.62***
Provided to parents ^a	3.70 (1.15)	3.93 (1.38)	3.73 (1.45)	3.62 (1.14)	6.07***
Evaluations of support					
Receive support I want ^b	4.18 (1.00)	3.62 (1.03)	3.83 (1.09)	4.23 (0.92)	47.76***
Beliefs about support					
Filial obligation ^c	3.17 (0.65)	3.73 (0.63)	3.40 (0.66)	3.47 (0.66)	40.80***

Note. Participants $N = 1,301$; parents $N = 2,456$. Mean (SD) unless indicated.

a. Frequency of contact and each type of support: 1 = *less than once a year or never*, 2 = *once a year*, 3 = *a few times a year*, 4 = *monthly*, 5 = *a few times a month*, 6 = *weekly*, 7 = *a few times a week*, and 8 = *daily*.

b. 1 = *not at all* to 5 = *a great deal*.

c. 1 = *strongly disagree* to 4 = *strongly agree*.

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

On average, grown children reported receiving the six types of support monthly or a few times a month. In Germany, Korea, and the United States, the most frequent type of support was a mother or father listening to the student talk about daily life, occurring at least once a week. In Hong Kong, practical support occurred as frequently as talk about daily life.

Students in all four nations received assistance paying tuition: 68% in Germany, 74% in Hong Kong, 73% in Korea, and 75% in the United States received parental help with college fees (not shown in table). Moreover, 50% in Germany, 65% in Hong Kong, 66% in Korea, and 44% in the United States received an allowance.

Support Provided to Parents. In contrast, on average, students reported providing their parents support only several times a year (Table 2). Specifically, students listened to their parents talk about daily life every week or every few weeks (see Figure 1). Few gave financial support to parents: in Germany 4%, in Hong Kong 6%, in Korea 5%, and in the United States 6% of students reported ever providing money or paying for household expenses (not shown in table).

Figure 1. Each type of support received from and provided to parents.

Models for Cross-National Differences in Parental Support, Coresidence, and Contact

Support Received From Parents. Hypotheses regarding support from parents were as follows: (a) students in Western nations (i.e., Germany and the United States) would receive explicit support (e.g., practical support and advice) more frequently than students in Asian nations, (b) implicit support (e.g., listening and companionship) would show no cross-national differences, and (c) students in the United States would receive the most financial support.

As can be seen in Table 3, the overall model revealed a significant cross-national difference in parental support. Tukey post hoc tests showed that students in Hong Kong received more total support than students in Korea, the United States, or Germany. Also, students in Korea received more total parental support than students in the United States or Germany.

With regard to explicit support, Tukey post hoc tests revealed students in Asian countries (i.e., Hong Kong and Korea) received more frequent practical support than students in Germany or the United States (i.e., Hong Kong > Korea > United States = Germany). Students in Korea and Hong Kong also received more frequent financial support than students in Germany. Thus, we did not find support for the hypothesis that students in the United States would receive the most frequent financial support. We did not find significant cross-national differences for emotional support or advice.

With regard to implicit support, Tukey post hoc tests revealed that students from Hong Kong socialized with their parents more often than students in other nations. Students from Korea and the United States reported that their parents listened to them more frequently than students from Hong Kong.

As can be seen in Table 3, several control variables also were significantly associated with parental support. Daughters received more support than sons. Younger offspring received more support than older offspring (except emotional support). Mothers provided more support than fathers did (except financial support). Parents with more education provided more support (except practical support). Also, parents who were married provided more support. Working parents provided more financial support, but they provided less practical support or listening.

Coresidence and Contact. We predicted that students in Asian nations would be more likely to coreside with parents and have more frequent contact with parents (see Table 4). Tukey post hoc tests revealed that students in Hong Kong and Korea were more likely to coreside with parents than students in the United States or Germany. Moreover, students from Hong Kong were

Table 3. Multilevel Models for Offspring Support Received From Parents.

	Total B (SE)	Explicit support			Implicit support		
		Emotional support B (SE)	Practical support B (SE)	Advice B (SE)	Financial support B (SE)	Listening B (SE)	Companionship B (SE)
Fixed effects							
Intercept	4.86*** (0.10)	5.41*** (0.15)	4.08*** (0.14)	5.05*** (0.13)	4.09*** (0.16)	6.31*** (0.12)	4.18*** (0.11)
Nation							
Germany	-0.15 (0.09)	-0.33* (0.14)	-0.13 (0.13)	-0.02 (0.12)	-0.27 (0.15)	-0.05 (0.12)	-0.16 (0.11)
Hong Kong	0.32*** (0.10)	-0.05 (0.16)	1.46*** (0.14)	-0.05 (0.14)	0.28 (0.17)	-0.37*** (0.13)	0.57*** (0.12)
Korea	0.10 (0.10)	-0.08 (0.15)	0.50*** (0.13)	-0.18 (0.13)	0.33* (0.16)	0.03 (0.12)	-0.11 (0.11)
United States	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Controls							
Offspring	-0.42*** (0.07)	-0.68*** (0.10)	-0.29** (0.09)	-0.37*** (0.08)	-0.48*** (0.11)	-0.53*** (0.08)	-0.20** (0.08)
Gender ^a	-0.10*** (0.02)	-0.03 (0.03)	-0.14*** (0.02)	-0.12*** (0.02)	-0.17*** (0.03)	-0.56*** (0.02)	-0.08*** (0.02)
Age							

(continued)

Table 3. (continued)

	Total B (SE)	Explicit support			Implicit support		
		Emotional support B (SE)	Practical support B (SE)	Advice B (SE)	Financial support B (SE)	Listening B (SE)	Companionship B (SE)
Parent							
Gender ^a	-0.74*** (0.04)	-1.38*** (0.07)	-0.37*** (0.07)	-0.74*** (0.06)	-0.09 (0.06)	-1.38*** (0.06)	-0.47*** (0.05)
Education	0.04*** (0.01)	0.03* (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)	0.05*** (0.01)	0.06*** (0.01)	0.04** (0.01)	0.03** (0.01)
Marital status ^b	0.44*** (0.08)	0.33** (0.12)	0.66*** (0.11)	0.48*** (0.10)	0.60*** (0.12)	0.34*** (0.10)	0.34*** (0.09)
Work status ^c	-0.07 (0.05)	-0.06 (0.08)	-0.32*** (0.08)	-0.12 (0.07)	0.24*** (0.07)	-0.17* (0.07)	-0.01 (0.06)
Random effects							
Intercept VAR	0.80*** (0.05)	1.54*** (0.12)	0.98*** (0.10)	1.15*** (0.09)	2.40*** (0.13)	0.97*** (0.08)	1.09*** (0.07)
Residual VAR	0.72*** (0.03)	2.05*** (0.09)	2.19*** (0.09)	1.58*** (0.07)	1.33*** (0.06)	1.52*** (0.06)	0.94*** (0.04)
-2 log-likelihood	7268.8	9354.0	9217.6	8739.1	9090.5	8576.5	7937.2

a. Coded 1 = male and 0 = female.

b. Coded 1 = married and 0 = not married.

c. Coded 1 = working full-time and 0 = not working full-time.

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

Table 4. Multilevel Models for Coresidence and Parental Contact.

	Coresidence ^a		In-person contact		Phone contact	
	<i>B</i>	(<i>SE</i>)	<i>B</i>	(<i>SE</i>)	<i>B</i>	(<i>SE</i>)
Fixed effects						
Intercept	-3.68***	(0.37)	4.49***	(0.13)	6.46***	(0.11)
Nation						
Germany	2.05***	(0.39)	0.52***	(0.14)	-0.50***	(0.10)
Hong Kong	3.93***	(0.38)	1.64***	(0.15)	0.30**	(0.11)
Korea	3.30***	(0.39)	0.93***	(0.14)	-0.03	(0.10)
United States	—		—		—	
Controls						
Offspring						
Gender ^b	-0.02	(0.15)	-0.03	(0.09)	-0.24***	(0.07)
Age	-0.06	(0.04)	-0.19***	(0.03)	0.01	(0.02)
Parent						
Gender ^b	—		-0.24***	(0.04)	-1.16***	(0.05)
Years of education	—		-0.01	(0.01)	0.02	(0.01)
Marital status ^c	—		0.46***	(0.10)	0.22**	(0.08)
Work status ^d	—		-0.03	(0.05)	-0.04	(0.06)
Random effects						
Intercept VAR	—		2.24***	(0.10)	0.72***	(0.06)
Residual VAR	—		0.56***	(0.02)	1.20***	(0.05)
-2 log-likelihood	1182.7		8007.5		8029.9	

a. Coded 1 = *coreside with any parent* and 0 = *reside in dorm or apartment*. Because 84.2% of parents were married, we coded one coresidence status per participant (i.e., living with parents or not living with any parents).

b. Coded 1 = *male* and 0 = *female*.

c. Coded 1 = *married* and 0 = *not married*.

d. Coded 1 = *working full-time* and 0 = *not working full-time*.

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

more likely to coreside with parents than students in Korea, and students from Germany were more likely to coreside than students in the United States (i.e., Hong Kong > Korea > Germany > United States).

Regarding contact, students in Hong Kong had more frequent contact in person with parents than students from the other nations. Students from Korea also had more frequent in-person contact than students from Germany or the United States (i.e., Hong Kong > Korea > Germany > United States). Students in Hong Kong had more frequent phone contact with parents than students from other countries; students in Korea and the United States had

Table 5. Multilevel Models for Support Provided to Parents and Evaluations of Support.

	Support provided		Evaluations of support	
	B	(SE)	B	(SE)
Fixed effects				
Intercept	4.16***	(0.09)	3.83***	(0.08)
Nation				
Germany	0.03	(0.09)	0.12	(0.07)
Hong Kong	0.31**	(0.10)	-0.39***	(0.08)
Korea	0.08	(0.09)	-0.39***	(0.07)
United States	—	—	—	—
Controls				
Offspring				
Gender ^a	-0.24***	(0.06)	-0.03	(0.05)
Age	-0.02	(0.02)	-0.00	(0.01)
Parent				
Gender ^a	-0.94***	(0.04)	-0.31***	(0.04)
Years of education	0.01	(0.01)	0.04***	(0.01)
Marital status ^b	0.16*	(0.07)	0.38***	(0.06)
Work status ^c	-0.14**	(0.05)	0.24***	(0.04)
Random effects				
Intercept VAR	0.72***	(0.05)	0.38***	(0.03)
Residual VAR	0.61***	(0.03)	0.56***	(0.02)
-2 log-likelihood	6939.8		6256.5	

a. Coded 1 = male and 0 = female.

b. Coded 1 = married and 0 = not married.

c. Coded 1 = working full-time and 0 = not working full-time.

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

more frequent phone contact than students from Germany (i.e., Hong Kong > Korea = United States > Germany).

Support Provided to Parents and Evaluations of Support Received. We expected Asian students to provide more frequent support to their parents. The multi-level model for support students provide to parents is found in Table 5. In Tukey post hoc tests, students from Hong Kong provided more support to parents than students from the United States or Germany.

We also expected students in Asian countries to evaluate receipt of parental support less favorably than students in Western countries. The multilevel

model for evaluations of whether parents gave desired support revealed cross-national differences (see Table 5). Consistent with predictions, Tukey post hoc tests indicated students from Korea and Hong Kong were less satisfied with parental support than students in Germany or the United States.

Coresidence and Filial Obligation as Predictors. We examined whether coresidence accounts for differences in support exchanges. When coresidence was included in the model for support received from parents, cross-national differences (i.e., Asian vs. Western countries) disappeared. With regard to the -2 log-likelihood difference between the original model (Table 3) and the model with coresidence (Table 6) for receipt of parental support, $\chi^2 = 78.8, p < .001$; inclusion of coresidence improved the model fit. In findings not shown in the table, coresidence partially accounted for cross-national differences in practical support, financial support, listening to talk about daily life, and companionship.

Coresidence also explained the cross-national differences in support offspring provide to parents. When coresidence was included in the model, previous cross-national differences (i.e., Hong Kong vs. Western countries) disappeared. The -2 log-likelihood difference between the original model (Table 5) and the model with coresidence (Table 6) for provision of support to parents, $\chi^2 = 96.3, p < .001$, again indicated a better fit for the model.

When we entered coresidence in the model for in-person contact, differences between Korea and Western countries disappeared, though differences between Hong Kong and other countries remained (Table 6). The -2 log-likelihood difference between the original model (Table 4) and the model with coresidence (Table 6) for in-person contact was significant, $\chi^2 = 784.4, p < .001$. However, in the model for phone contact, coresidence was not significant.

To examine whether differences in support reflected cultural values, we reran the model, entering filial obligation. Cross-national differences in support provided to parents disappeared with filial obligation in the equation. The -2 log-likelihood difference between the original model (Table 5) and the model with filial obligation (Table 6) was significant, $\chi^2 = 186.2, p < .001$. Thus, inclusion of filial obligation improved the model for support provided to parents.

Discussion

This study examined college students' relationships with their parents in two Western and two Asian countries. College attendance is becoming a normative facet of young adulthood around the world, and we asked whether educational

Table 6. Effects of Coreidence and Filial Obligation on Parental Involvement.

	In-person contact by coreidence		Phone contact by coreidence		Support received by coreidence		Support provided by coreidence		Support provided by filial obligation	
	B	(SE)	B	(SE)	B	(SE)	B	(SE)	B	(SE)
Fixed effects										
Intercept	4.45***	(0.11)	6.46	(0.11)	4.85***	(0.10)	4.14***	(0.09)	4.16***	(0.09)
Nation										
Germany	0.21	(0.11)	-0.51***	(0.10)	-0.23*	(0.09)	-0.04	(0.09)	0.15	(0.09)
Hong Kong	0.42***	(0.12)	0.26*	(0.12)	-0.01	(0.11)	-0.02	(0.10)	0.23*	(0.10)
Korea	0.06	(0.12)	-0.07	(0.11)	-0.13	(0.10)	-0.16	(0.09)	0.11	(0.09)
United States	—		—		—		—		—	
Predictors										
Coreidence ^a	2.45***	(0.08)	0.09	(0.08)	0.67***	(0.07)	0.69***	(0.07)	—	
Filial obligation	—		—		—		—		0.34***	(0.04)
Controls										
Offspring										
Gender ^b	-0.04	(0.08)	-0.24***	(0.07)	-0.43***	(0.06)	-0.24***	(0.06)	-0.23***	(0.06)
Age	-0.16***	(0.02)	0.01	(0.02)	-0.09***	(0.02)	-0.02	(0.02)	-0.02	(0.02)
Parent										
Gender ^b	-0.19***	(0.03)	-1.15***	(0.05)	-0.73***	(0.04)	-0.93***	(0.04)	-0.95***	(0.04)
Years of education	-0.00	(0.01)	0.02	(0.01)	0.04***	(0.01)	0.01	(0.01)	0.01	(0.01)
Marital status ^c	0.40***	(0.08)	0.21*	(0.08)	0.42***	(0.07)	0.13	(0.07)	0.13	(0.07)
Work status ^d	-0.00	(0.04)	-0.04	(0.06)	-0.06	(0.05)	-0.12**	(0.05)	-0.14**	(0.05)
Random effects										
Intercept VAR	1.36***	(0.07)	0.72***	(0.06)	0.75***	(0.05)	0.67***	(0.04)	0.68***	(0.04)
Residual VAR	0.46***	(0.02)	1.20***	(0.05)	0.71***	(0.03)	0.60***	(0.03)	0.62***	(0.03)
-2 log-likelihood	7223.1		8028.8		7190.0		6843.5		6753.6	

a. Coded 1 = coreidence and 0 = reside in dorm or apartment.
b. Coded 1 = male and 0 = female.
c. Coded 1 = married and 0 = not married.
d. Coded 1 = works full-time and 0 = not working full-time.
*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

experiences are associated with similarity in parental involvement in different nations. Indeed, we found that certain aspects of parent–child relationships were similar, but we also identified differences associated with cultural and structural factors.

Similarities in Student Involvement With Parents

Findings suggest a degree of homogeneity in relationships between parents and students cross-nationally. College students in four nations reported frequent contact and receiving many types of support from parents fairly often.

Thus, we found support for intergenerational solidarity theory regarding associations between contact and intergenerational support (Bengtson, 2001; Fingerman et al., 2012) and also regarding the generational stake (Bengtson & Kuypers, 1971; Giarrusso et al., 2005). Completion of college is associated with future economic benefits (Furstenberg, 2010; Schoeni & Ross, 2005). Parents may be highly involved with students as an investment in their future success (Fingerman et al., 2009). Parental involvement also may reflect continuity of patterns established in childhood that facilitated the child's entrance into university.

We also found similarities in demographic characteristics associated with parental involvement. Despite cultural differences, age and gender were associated with parental involvement across countries. Consistent with studies in Western countries, younger grown children engaged in more frequent contact and received more support than did older grown children (Hartnett et al., 2013; Swartz et al., 2011). Mothers were in more frequent contact and provided more support than fathers (Raley & Bianchi, 2006). In addition, young women were more likely to engage in contact and to receive more frequent support from parents than were young men. In Asian countries, traditionally, sons cared for parents in late life, and even in early adulthood, sons were more involved with parents than daughters (K. Kim et al., 2015; Lin & Yi, 2013; Yeh, 2009). Thus, greater involvement of daughters may reflect a trend toward less traditional family support patterns in Asia (Sung, 2004).

In all four countries, married parents provided more support than parents who were not married. These findings may partially reflect a skew in the sample of parents (most parents were married), but are consistent with studies of parental marital status in the United States (Aquilino, 2005). Similarly, as in prior research conducted in the United States and the United Kingdom (e.g., Henretta, Wolf, van Voorhis, & Soldo, 2012; Johnson, 2013), parents with higher education provided more support to grown children. Thus, although parental education differed across nations, parental education mattered for support of offspring in all four countries.

Cross-National Differences in Relationships With Parents

Findings also revealed unexpected differences with regard to support. Based on norms of filial piety (K. Kim et al., 2015) and preferences regarding the flow of intergenerational support (e.g., Fingerman et al., 2012; Grundy & Henretta, 2006), we had expected students in Western nations to receive more frequent parental support than students in Asian nations. Unexpectedly, Asian students reported more frequent support from parents, particularly: advice, financial support, and companionship. The findings were surprising because H. S. Kim et al. (2008) had found that in general, Asian college students demonstrate an aversion toward explicit types of support (e.g., advice, practical support, and financial support). But in this study, students in Asia received more advice and finances from parents than students in the United States, and students in Hong Kong received the most practical support. These findings suggest that parents may provide students with the support they deem necessary or helpful, even in cultures that may typically value implicit over explicit support.

We also observed differences between students in the two Asian countries, however, with students from Hong Kong receiving more practical support and more companionship than students from Korea, and students from Korea receiving more listening. Structural factors (e.g., housing arrangements) and cultural factors (e.g., obligation beliefs) contributed to the observed cultural differences.

Coresidence. As expected, rates of coresidence were higher in Asian countries than in Western countries (e.g., K. Kim et al., 2015), but rates of coresidence differed across all four countries. Indeed, Newman and Aptekar (2006) also found large national differences in intergenerational coresidence in Europe. For adults aged 18 to 35 years, 10% resided with parents in Scandinavian countries, compared with 60% in Southern European countries (e.g., Spain). Public policies such as government subsidies and public housing for students accounted for these cross-national differences. Similarly, in the present study, coresidence may reflect structural factors, such as population density, availability of dormitories, rental apartments, and subsidies.

Values for coresidence also may vary by culture. A qualitative study in the United States found ethnic differences in coresidence associated with differences in beliefs about family (Becker et al., 2003). Thus, students and parents in countries with high rates of coresidence also may share beliefs that such coresidence is a desired norm.

Coresidence also played a role in parental contact and support. Students reported the most frequent in-person contact in Hong Kong, where they also

were more likely to coreside with parents. Clearly, coresidence facilitates in-person contact. Coresidence also may facilitate support. Offspring who coreside with parents can easily turn to them for advice and practical help (e.g., parents do the student's laundry when she/he has an exam). Alternately, relationship factors that encourage coresidence (e.g., filial obligation) may encourage other forms of support.

Support Provided to Parents and Filial Piety. College students reported providing little support to their parents, regardless of the nation, although they provided more frequent implicit forms of support (e.g., listening) than explicit forms of support (e.g., financial). Students in Hong Kong provided their parents with more frequent support than students in other nations, and students from Korea provided similar levels of support. The observed cross-national differences were consistent with filial piety (K. Kim et al., 2015; Sung, 2004). Cultural values, in the form of filial obligation, helped account for these differences in support provided to parents.

This study considered young adults, but findings were consistent with literature regarding aging parents. Studies in the United States, Europe, and Israel found associations between individuals' beliefs about obligation and actual support of parents in late life (Lowenstein & Daatland, 2006; Silverstein, Gans, & Yang, 2006). Similarly, this study found that beliefs about obligation to parents were associated with college students' provision of support to parents.

Evaluations of Support. As expected, Asian students were less satisfied with parental support than students from Western countries. In general, young adults in Asian cultures view social support less favorably than young adults in the United States (H. S. Kim et al., 2008). We had initially anticipated a distinction between implicit and explicit support that did not bear out, however. Prior studies suggested that Asian students might receive less explicit support and be less satisfied with explicit support they did receive (H. S. Kim et al., 2006; H. S. Kim et al., 2008; Uchida et al., 2008). Here, we found that Asian students were less satisfied with parental support overall, but they received as much or more explicit support than students in Western countries.

It is not clear whether students in Asian countries benefit from parental support. Studies in the United States have found that college students benefit from receiving parental support (Fingerman et al., 2012; Umberson, 1992). A recent study of support in the Middle East also found that college students reported benefits of receiving support from family (though not from receiving support from friends; Brannan, Biswas-Diener, Mohr, Mortazavi, & Stein, 2012). Similar patterns may be evident in East Asia and warrant research attention.

Furthermore, Asian students may experience ambivalence regarding parental support. Ambivalence theory suggests that parents and grown children experience mixed feelings about providing support and receiving support from the other party (Fingerman, Chen, Hay, Cichy, & Lefkowitz, 2006; Levitzki, 2009). In this case, Asian students were less satisfied with the support they received. Some Asian students may view parental support as an investment they are obligated to return to the parents. Norms of filial piety are changing throughout Asia, however (Sung, 2004). Thus, it is possible that these students desired more support from parents. In Chinese, there is a saying, "If you give a small cup of rice, I am eternally grateful. But if you give a large bag of rice . . . I think why didn't you give me more as you have so much?" Future research should address Asian students' dissatisfaction in greater detail.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

Limitations are inherent to cross-national research (Cohen, 2007). It was not possible to assure comparable samples across nations. Students in the Asian countries may have differed from students in Western countries in ways that elicit greater parental support. Also, although many of the measures had been used in Europe or Asia (e.g., Lowenstein et al., 2007; Lowenstein & Daatland, 2006), there may be other important dimensions of relationships with parents in some cultures.

This study focused on two Asian and two Western countries. In general, we found differences between students in these two geographic regions. Nonetheless, findings were nuanced. Inclusion of students from a greater number of nations might allow comparisons of government programs (Kohli, 1999) and housing arrangements (Newman & Aptekar, 2006) that shape parent/child ties. But there are few cross-national studies regarding students' ties to parents, and this study expands extant knowledge by considering four nations.

The study is further limited by a focus on universities of high reputation (Academic Rankings of World Universities, 2011; Center for Measuring University Performance, 2010). Parental investment may be unique for students attending elite universities. Future studies should involve samples from multiple universities in each country.

In sum, given increasing rates of higher education throughout the world, student status may be accompanied by similarities in family ties. This study of students in four nations found high rates of parental contact and support for students. Despite cultural differences in the transition to adulthood (Nelson et al., 2004), students' relationships with parents appeared somewhat

homogeneous. Nonetheless, cultural differences were evident. Students in Asian cultures received more parental support, but they felt less satisfied with that support. Consistent with norms of filial piety and structural factors such as coresidence, students in Hong Kong provided more to their parents than students in other nations did. Thus, cross-national differences in intergenerational relationships reflected beliefs (e.g., filial obligation) and structural factors (e.g., coresidence). Student status is associated with high parental investment, but culture and structural factors shape the parameters of those ties.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: This study was supported by Grant No. R01AG027769, "The Family Exchanges Study II," awarded by the National Institute on Aging (NIA) as well as by Grant No. 5 R24 HD042849, "Population Research Center," and by Grant No. 5 T32 HD007081, "Training Program in Population Studies," awarded to the Population Research Center at The University of Texas at Austin by the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

References

- Academic ranking of world universities*. (2011). Retrieved from <http://www.arwu.org/ARWU2010.jsp>
- Albertini, M., Kohli, M., & Vogel, C. (2007). Intergenerational transfers of time and money in European families: Common patterns-different regimes? *Journal of European Social Policy*, 17, 319-334. doi:10.1177/0958928707081068
- Antonucci, T. C., & Birditt, K. S. (2011). Convoys of social relations: Past, present, and future. In K. L. Fingerman, C. A. Berg, J. Smith, & T. C. Antonucci (Eds.), *Handbook of lifespan development* (pp. 161-182). New York, NY: Springer.
- Aquilino, W. S. (2005). Impact of family structure on parental attitudes toward the economic support of adult children over transition to adulthood. *Journal of Family Issues*, 26, 143-167. doi:10.1177/0192513X04265950
- Arnett, J. J. (2000). Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American Psychologist*, 55, 469-480. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.55.5.469
- Attias-Donfut, C., & Wolff, F. C. (2000). The redistributive effects of generational transfers. In S. Arbur & C. Attias-Donfut (Eds.), *The myth of generational conflict: The family and state in ageing societies* (pp. 22-46). New York, NY: Routledge.

- Becker, G., Beyene, Y., Newsom, E., & Mayen, N. (2003). Creating continuity through mutual assistance: Intergenerational reciprocity in four ethnic groups. *Journal of Gerontology: Social Sciences*, 58, S151-S159. doi:10.1093/geronb/58.3.S151
- Bengtson, V. L. (2001). Beyond the nuclear family: The increasing importance of multigenerational bonds. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 63, 1-16. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2001.00001.x
- Bengtson, V. L., & Kuypers, J. A. (1971). Generational difference and the developmental stake. *International Journal of Aging and Human Development*, 2, 249-260.
- Bianchi, S. M., & Milkie, M. A. (2010). Work and family research in the first decade of the 21st century. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72, 705-725. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00726.x
- Brannan, D., Biswas-Diener, R., Mohr, C. D., Mortazavi, S., & Stein, N. (2012). Friends and family: A cross-cultural investigation of social support and subjective well-being. *Journal of Positive Psychology*, 8, 65-75. doi:10.1080/17439760.2012.743573
- Center for Measuring University Performance. (2010). *Top American research universities 2010 annual report*. Phoenix, AZ: Arizona State University. Retrieved from <http://mup.asu.edu/research.html>
- Chinese University of Hong Kong. (September, 2012). *Residential accommodations of college students*. Retrieved from <http://www.cuhk.edu.hk/english/facilities/accommodation.html>
- Choroszewicz, M., & Wolff, P. (2010). *Population and social conditions* (Eurostat: Statistics in focus). European Commission. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_OFFPUB/KS-SF-10-050/EN/KS-SF-10-050-EN.PDF
- Cohen, D. (2007). Methods in cultural psychology. In S. Kitayama & D. Cohen (Eds.), *Handbook of cultural psychology* (pp. 196-236). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Das Gupta, M., Zhenghua, J., Bohua, L., Zhenming, X., Chung, W., & Hwa-Ok, B. (2003). Why is son preference so persistent in East and South Asia? A cross-country study of China, India, and Republic of Korea. *Journal of Development Studies*, 40, 152-187. doi:10.1080/00220380412331293807
- Federal Statistical Office Germany. (2012). *Bildung und kultur* [Education and culture] (Vol. 11, 4.3.1). Wiesbaden, Germany: Author.
- Fingerman, K. L., Chen, P. C., Hay, E. L., Cichy, K. E., & Lefkowitz, E. S. (2006). Ambivalent reactions in the parent and offspring relationship. *Journals of Gerontology: Psychological Sciences*, 61B, 152-160. doi:10.1093/geronb/61.3.P152
- Fingerman, K. L., Cheng, Y.-P., Wesselmann, E. D., Zarit, S. H., Furstenberg, F. F., & Birditt, K. S. (2012). Helicopter parents and landing pad kids: Intense parental support of grown children. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 74, 880-896. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2012.00987.x
- Fingerman, K. L., Miller, L. M., Birditt, K. S., & Zarit, S. H. (2009). Giving to the good and the needy: Parental support of grown children. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 71, 1220-1233. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2009.00665.x

- Fingerman, K. L., Pitzer, L. M., Chan, W., Birditt, K. S., Franks, M. M., & Zarit, S. H. (2011). Who gets what and why: Help middle-aged adults provide to parents and grown children. *Journals of Gerontology: Social Sciences*, 66B, 87-98. doi:10.1093/geronb/gbq009
- Fuligni, A. J. (2007). Family obligation, college enrollment, and emerging adulthood in Asian and Latin American families. *Child Development Perspectives*, 1, 96-100. doi:10.1111/j.1750-8606.2007.00022.x
- Furstenberg, F. F., Jr. (2010). On a new schedule: Transitions to adulthood and family change. *Future of the Child*, 20, 67-87. doi:10.1353/foc.0.0038
- Giarrusso, R., Feng, D., & Bengtson, V. L. (2005). The intergenerational stake over 20 years. In M. Silverstein (Ed.), *Annual review of gerontology and geriatrics* (pp. 55-76). New York, NY: Springer.
- Grundy, E., & Henretta, J. C. (2006). Between elderly parents and adult children: A new look at the "sandwich generation." *Aging and Society*, 26, 707-722. doi:10.1017/S0144686X06004934
- Hartnett, C. S., Furstenberg, F. F., Birditt, K. S., & Fingerman, K. L. (2013). Parental support during young adulthood: Why does assistance decline with age? *Journal of Family Issues*, 34, 975-1007. doi:10.1177/0192513X12454657
- Henretta, J., Wolf, D. A., van Voorhis, M. F., & Soldo, B. (2012). Family structure and the reproduction of inequality: Parents' contribution to children's college costs. *Social Science Research*, 41, 876-887.
- Hong Kong Special Administrative Region. (2012). *Hong Kong in figures*. Hong Kong SAR, People's Republic of China: Census and Statistics Department. Retrieved from <http://www.censtatd.gov.hk/hkstat/sub/sp140.jsp?productCode=B1010006>
- Iacobucci, D. (2012). Mediation analysis and categorical variables: The final frontier. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 22, 582-594. doi:10.1016/j.jcps.2012.03.006
- Johnson, M. K. (2013). Parental financial assistance and young adults' relationships with parents and well-being. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 75, 713-733. doi:10.1111/jomf.12029
- Kalmijn, M. (2015). Relationships between fathers and adult children: The cumulative effects of divorce and repartnering. *Journal of Family Issues*, 36, 737-759. doi:10.1177/0192513X13495398
- Kim, H. S., Sherman, D. K., Ko, D., & Taylor, S. E. (2006). Pursuit of happiness and pursuit of harmony: Culture, relationships, and social support seeking. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32, 1595-1607. doi:10.1177/0146167206291991
- Kim, H. S., Sherman, D. K., & Taylor, S. E. (2008). Culture and social support. *American Psychologist*, 63, 518-526. doi:10.1037/0003-066X
- Kim, K., Cheng, Y.-P., Fingerman, K. L., & Zarit, S. H. (2015). Relationships between adults and parents in Asia. In S.-T. Cheng, I. Chi, H. H. Fung, L. Li, & J. Woo (Eds.), *Successful aging: Asian perspectives* (pp. 101-123). New York, NY: Springer.
- Kitayama, S., & Uchida, Y. (2004). Interdependent agency: An alternative system for action. In R. Sorrentino, D. Cohen, J. M. Ison, & M. P. Zanna (Eds.), *Culture and social behavior: The Ontario symposium* (Vol. 10, pp. 137-164). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Kohli, M. (1999). Private and public transfers between generations: Linking the family and the state. *European Societies*, 1, 81-104.
- Kohli, M., Albertini, M., & Künemund, H. (2010). Linkages among adult family generations: Evidence from comparative survey research. In P. Heady & M. Kohli (Eds.), *Family, kinship and state in contemporary Europe: Perspectives on theory and policy* (pp. 225-248). Frankfurt, Germany: Campus Verlag.
- Korean Education Development Institute. (2010). *Center for Education Statistics: Statistics publication*. Retrieved from <http://cesi.kedi.re.kr>
- Kyunghyang News. (2009, March 18). *Korean sources of college tuition payments*. Retrieved from http://news.khan.co.kr/kh_news
- Levitzki, N. (2009). Parenting of adult children in an Israeli sample: Parents are always parents. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 23, 226-235. doi:10.1037/a0015218
- Lin, J.-P., & Yi, C.-C. (2013). A comparative analysis of intergenerational relations in East Asia. *International Sociology*, 28, 297-315. doi:10.1177/0268580913485261
- Littell, R. C., Milliken, G. A., Stroup, W. W., & Wolfinger, R. D. (1996). *SAS system for mixed models*. Cary, NC: SAS Institute.
- Lowenstein, A. (2007). Solidarity-conflict and ambivalence: Testing two conceptual frameworks and their impact on quality of life for older family members. *Journal of Gerontology: Social Sciences*, 62, S100-S107. doi:10.1093/geronb/62.2.S100
- Lowenstein, A., & Daatland, S. O. (2006). Filial norms and family support in a comparative cross-national context: Evidence from the OASIS study. *Ageing and Society*, 26, 203-223. doi:10.1017/S0144686X05004502
- Lowenstein, A., Katz, R., & Gur-Yaish, N. (2007). Reciprocity in parent-child exchange and life satisfaction among the elderly: A cross-national perspective. *Journal of Social Issues*, 63, 865-883. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.2007.00541.x
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2009). *Digest of education statistics: 2009* (Table 200). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d09/tables/dt09_200.asp?referrer=list
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2012). *Tuition costs of colleges and universities 2010-2011. Digest of education statistics, 2011* (NCES 2012-001). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=76>
- Nelson, L. J., Badger, S., & Wu, B. (2004). The influence of culture in emerging adulthood: Perspectives of Chinese college students. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 28, 26-36. doi:10.1080/01650250344000244
- Newman, K., & Aptekar, S. (2006, August). *Sticking around: Delayed departure from the parental nest—Western Europe* (MacArthur Foundation Research Network on Transitions to Adulthood policy brief). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.
- Pryor, J. H., Eagan, K., Palucki Blake, L., Hurtado, S., Berdan, J., & Case, M. H. (2012). *The American freshman: National norms fall 2012*. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, University of California Los Angeles.
- Raley, S., & Bianchi, S. (2006). Sons, daughters, and family processes: Does gender of children matter? *Annual Review of Sociology*, 32, 401-421. doi:10.1146/annurev.soc.32.061604.123106

- Schoeni, R. F., & Ross, K. E. (2005). Material assistance from families during the transition to adulthood. In R. A. Settersten Jr., F. F. Furstenberg Jr., & R. G. Rumbaut (Eds.), *On the frontier of adulthood: Theory, research, and public policy* (pp. 396-417). Chicago, IL: The Chicago University Press.
- Silverstein, M., Gans, D., & Yang, F. M. (2006). Intergenerational support to aging parents: The role of norms and needs. *Journal of Family Issues*, 27, 1068-1084. doi:10.1177/0192513X06288120
- Singer, J. D., & Willett, J. B. (2003). *Applied longitudinal data analysis: Modeling change and event occurrence*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Sung, K.-T. (2004). Elder respect among young adults: A cross-cultural study of Americans and Koreans. *Journal of Aging Studies*, 18, 215-230. doi:10.1016/j.jaging.2004.01.002
- Swartz, T. T., Kim, M., Uno, M., Mortimer, J., & O'Brien, K. B. (2011). Safety nets and scaffolds: Parental support in the transition to adulthood. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 73, 414-429. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00815.x
- Taylor, S. E., Sherman, D. K., Kim, H. S., Jarcho, J., Takagi, K., & Dunagan, M. S. (2004). Culture and social support: Who seeks it and why? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87, 354-362. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.87.3.354
- Uchida, Y., Kitayama, S., Mesquita, B., Reyes, J. A. S., & Morling, B. (2008). Is perceived emotional support beneficial? Well-being and health in independent and interdependent. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 34, 741-754. doi:10.1177/0146167208315157
- Umberson, D. (1992). Relationships between adult children and their parents: Psychological consequences for both generations. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 544, 664-674. doi:10.2307/353252
- Yeh, K. (2009). Intergenerational exchange behaviors in Taiwan: The filial piety perspective. *Indigenous Psychological Research in Chinese Societies*, 31, 97-141.
- Yonsei University. (2011). *First year experience assessment: The annual report of freshman*. Seoul, Korea: Yonsei University.
- Zarit, S. H., & Eggebeen, D. J. (2002). Parent-child relationships in adulthood and later years. In M. H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting: Vol. 1. Children and parenting* (2nd ed., pp. 135-161). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.