Resilience as a determinant of receiving and providing care in later life in selected European countries

Anita Abramowska-Kmon, Wojciech Łątkowski, Wiktoria Bąchorek

Institute of Statistics and Demography, SGH Warsaw School of Economics

Contact: aabram@sgh.waw.pl

V Kongres Statystyki Polskiej
Sesja 13: Statystyka ludności

Warsaw, 1-3 July 2025

Theoretical background

- **Intra- and intergenerational relationships define the bonds between members of the same or different generations**
- **Types of relationships: care transfers, emotional support, instrumental or financial assistance.**
- **These transfers are important from the perspective of both parties involved in the support exchange and their subjective quality of life.**
  - **Family support and family cohesion determine the resilience (mental toughness) not only of individuals but also of the family.**
  - **Family cohesion – emotional bonds between family members and mutual support (shared engagement) contribute to the optimal use of various family resources and enhance the ability to solve common problems and overcome difficulties.**
  - **As a result, the mental resilience of individuals and families is strengthened.**

SGH

Theoretical background

- **Resilience (Mental Toughness)**
    - **In psychology: well-being in the face of adversity or positive adaptation, or the ability to maintain or regain mental health despite experiencing difficulties (=> process).**
    - **In social sciences, it can be viewed as an individual characteristic that develops through interaction with the social environment (=> integration of psychological and ecological perspectives)**
- **Intergenerational support and resilience:**
    - **Mutual exchange of caregiving duties between generations is a key element of mental resilience in individuals.**
    - **A sense of community and social engagement also strengthen individual resilience**
- **Resilience built throughout life can determine both the giving and receiving of support.**

Aim of the presentation & research hypotheses

Aim:

Analysis of receiving and providing care (to adults or grandchildren) considering resilience markers among individuals aged 50+.

Research hypotheses:

1. Individuals with lower levels of resilience are less likely to provide care to others (adults/grandchildren).
2. Less resilient individuals are more likely to receive care from others.

Data

- **Survey of Health, Ageing, and Retirement in Europe (SHARE) 50+**

- **Sample:** individuals 50+

- **Wave 9 (2021/2022)**

- **27 European countries**

- **Analytical sample:** 39 570 (non-missing observations)

Analytical approach

- **Logistic regression**
  - **Dependent variables:** the fact of receiving or giving informal care to other people (adults or grandchildren)
  - **Covariates:**
    - basic socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents (such as gender, age, presence of a cohabiting partner, level of education, employment status, presence of children in the social network, household size),
    - variables describing social connectedness and satisfaction with the social network
    - European region (Northern Europe, Western Europe, Southern Europe and Central-Eastern Europe)
  - **Key explanatory variable:** membership of a class describing resilience

SGH

Key explanatory variable: class of resilience

- **Latent class modelling** was used to group individuals into homogeneous classes describing resilience
- Variables in latent class modelling:
  - **psychological well-being** (CASP-12 measure, short version of the UCLA loneliness scale, and depression level based on the EURO-D scale),
  - **health status** (1+ ADL limitations, having at least two chronic diseases, having limitations in activities (GALI)),
  - **subjective financial situation** based on the household's ability to make ends meet

SGH

Results: Latent class analysis

	Latent Classes				
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Household Ability to Make Ends Meet					
Great Difficulty	0.01	0.01	0.17	0.17	0.26
Some Difficulty	0.11	0.13	0.51	0.41	0.36
Fairly Easily	0.36	0.39	0.30	0.31	0.25
Easily	0.52	0.46	0.03	0.11	0.14
Limitation with activities	0.14	0.79	0.34	0.93	0.79
2+ Chronic Diseases	0.29	0.78	0.48	0.87	0.75
1+ Activity of Daily Living Limitation	0.00	0.15	0.01	0.33	0.28
CASP index: Quality of Life and Well-Being	42.31	38.91	35.03	31.28	28.80
EURO Depression Scale	1.25	2.43	1.63	4.80	5.45
UCLA Loneliness Scale (Short Version)	3.36	3.72	3.89	4.12	7.09

Results: Latent class analysis -> 5 classes

- Class 1: Best overall health, well-being, and financial situation;

- Class 2: Second best overall, but worse physical health;

- Class 3: Good physical and mental health but worse financial situation;

- Class 4: Bad physical health, activity limitations and chronic diseases, combined with poorer financial situation and low quality of life;

- Class 5: Difficult financial situation, limitations in activities, the highest depression and loneliness scale and the lowest quality of life.

Results: logistic regression

	Model 1 **Receiving care from someone**	Model 2 **Giving care to adults**	Model 3 **Providing care to grandchildren**
Class of resilience (ref. Class 1)			
Class 2	**0.893*****	-0.011	**-0.259*****
	(0.036)	(0.034)	(0.036)
Class 3	**0.802*****	**-0.131*****	**-0.126*****
	(0.033)	(0.030)	(0.030)
Class 4	**1.563*****	-0.097	**-0.461*****
	(0.053)	(0.059)	(0.061)
Class 5	**1.488*****	**-0.172*****	**-0.654*****
	(0.055)	(0.063)	(0.071)

Results: logistic regression

	Model 1 **Receiving care from someone**	Model 2 **Giving care to adults**	Model 3 **Providing care to grandchildren**
Age	0.048***	-0.047***	-0.081***
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)
Sex (ref. men)			
women	-0.106***	0.108***	-0.197***
	(0.028)	(0.025)	(0.026)
Has Coresident Partner (ref. no)			
yes	-0.220***	-0.032	0.279***
	(0.040)	(0.040)	(0.041)
Employment status (ref. not employed)			
employed	0.129***	-0.125***	-0.679***
	(0.049)	(0.037)	(0.040)

SGH

Results: logistic regression

	Model 1 **Receiving care from someone**	Model 2 **Giving care to adults**	Model 3 **Providing care to grandchildren**
Educational level (ref. Primary or Lower)			
Lower secondary	-0.108**	0.035	-0.074
	(0.045)	(0.048)	(0.048)
Upper-post secondary	-0.149***	0.128***	0.049
	(0.040)	(0.043)	(0.043)
Tertiary	-0.178***	0.302***	0.217***
	(0.044)	(0.045)	(0.046)

Results: logistic regression

	Model 1 **Receiving care from someone**	Model 2 **Giving care to adults**	Model 3 **Providing care to grandchildren**
Household size (ref. 1 person)			
2 people	-0.408***	0.025	0.269***
	(0.043)	(0.043)	(0.045)
3+ people	-0.566***	-0.074	-0.234***
	(0.054)	(0.052)	(0.057)
Scale of Social Connectedness	0.299***	0.448***	0.258***
	(0.017)	(0.016)	(0.017)
Social Network Satisfaction	0.067***	0.015	0.076***
	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.012)

Results: logistic regression

	Model 1 **Receiving care from someone**	Model 2 **Giving care to adults**	Model 3 **Providing care to grandchildren**
Children in Social Network (ref. No Children)			
Has Children in Social Network	0.104**	0.024	4.328***
	(0.047)	(0.046)	(0.226)
Has Children, not in Social Network	-0.061	0.164***	4.268***
	(0.053)	(0.049)	(0.228)

Results: logistic regression

	Model 1 **Receiving care from someone**	Model 2 **Giving care to adults**	Model 3 **Providing care to grandchildren**
European regions (ref. CEE countries)			
Northern European countries	0.330***	0.741***	0.442***
	(0.037)	(0.035)	(0.036)
Southern European countries	-0.440***	-0.067	0.188***
	(0.042)	(0.041)	(0.040)
Western European countries	0.353***	0.768***	0.440***
	(0.034)	(0.032)	(0.033)

Conclusions

- **Individuals belonging to classes characterised by lower resilience were more dependent on support from others and were less likely to support others (both adults and grandchildren).**

- **In order to improve inter- and intra-generational support, resilience and its components, as well as factors influencing it (e.g., education level, employment), should be a priority for social policy.**

Thank you for your attention!

REPORT

Inter- and intra-generational relations in the light of building resilience in the life course

October 2024

Anita Abramowska-Kmon
Agnieszka Chłoń-Domińczak
Michał Taracha
Wojciech Łątkowski
Wiktoria Bąchorek

futu-res.eu/sites/default/files/media/attach/FutuRes_report 07_Inter- and intra-generational relations d3-7.pdf

SGH