

Absolute and Relative Relationships with Parents and Parents-In-Law and Their Associations with Marital closeness in Korea

Youngmi Shin

Seoul National University, South Korea

Jaerim Lee

Seoul National University, South Korea

Jaeon Yoo*

Gachon University, South Korea

Abstract

In this study, we examined how various reciprocal relationships between parents and parents-in-law were associated with marital closeness among adult daughters and sons by identifying how power dynamics were connected to gender in Korean families. Using the 2019 Seoul Family Report Survey data, we analyzed 692 people who had spouses, at least one parent and parent-in-law, and did not reside with either side of parents (335 women, 357 men). Using separate multiple regression analyses according to gender, we found that the absolute and relative levels of relationship with both sides of parents had different associations with marital closeness. Relative intergenerational relationships were more closely related to women's marital closeness than those of men. Additionally, the associations between intergenerational relationships and marital closeness were complex across the affectionate, functional, and instrumental dimensions of intergenerational relationships. These results suggest that Korean couples' marital life can be better understood when the power imbalance in the reciprocal relationships between both parents and parents-in-law is evaluated from the perspective of gender.

Key words

Couple relations, Gender perspective, Intergenerational relation, Korean family, Marriage

* Corresponding author

Introduction

In Korea, where marriage is considered a union of two families, rapid modernization over the past decades has been fast replacing the traditional married household structure with the nuclear family structure of couples married for love (Chang & Song, 2010). Additionally, the gradual transition from patrilineality—where the family's pedigree succeeds from father to son—to matrilineal kinship interaction centered on mother and daughter, or a bilateral system is remarkable (Sung, 2006; Yoo & Choi, 2019). Although the concept of traditional household structures is fading due to the emphasis on gender equality, interactive relationships with both parents can have a critical effect on the adult child's well-being and quality of life. However, few studies have focused on the diversity and complexities of intergenerational relations in modern Korea's extended family, including relations with one's own parents and parents-in-law (Choi & Choi, 2012). Furthermore, few studies have conducted empirical analyses from a gender perspective to explore whether a power imbalance still exists in the context of relationships with both sides of parents, as well as the association of various intergenerational relations with marital closeness between couples (Choi, Nam, Kim, & Park, 2019). Therefore, this study examines the relationship between balance of power and gender in contemporary Korean families.

Studies conducted in the Western society have accumulated the theory (Barnett, Scaramella, Neppl, Ontai, & Conger, 2010; Bengtson, 2001; Bengtson & Allen, 2009) and empirical results (Stepniak, Sutor, & Gilligan, 2022; Sutor, Gilligan, Peng, Jung, & Pillemer, 2017) showing that the couple relationship is affected by the generations and families around the husband and wife for several decades because the Western society has been steadily interested in marital closeness (Swartz, 2009). These contexts vary depending on countries, regions, races, religions, classes, etc. (Barnett et al., 2010; Johnston-Ataata, 2019; Stepniak et al., 2022). All of them were useful in understanding the structure of gender inequality between husbands and wives in the family and providing knowledge and practice to improve it. However, little is known about the complex dynamics when it reflects the relationship with parents-in-law as well as that with own parents even after many studies conducted in Western countries. Although studies emphasizing the importance of relationships with parents-in-law have been carried out in East Asian countries such as China and Japan, their main topics were cohabitation, geographical proximity, and provision of economic and physical help (Gruijters & Ermisch, 2019; Peng, Cheng, & Yip, 2022; Tan, 2018). If we examine only a portion of the absolute and relative relationships with parents and parents-in-law, it is challenging to fully understand the dynamics of relationships and power that cou-

ples experience. Therefore, it is necessary to conduct studies that consider the full spectrum of factors.

Previous studies on intergenerational and marital relations in Korean families conducted from a gender perspective have indicated that history, society, laws, and customs have been gender-unequal and oppressive, originating from a patriarchal system (Choi et al., 2019; Nam, Lee, & Choi, 2015). Several studies have been conducted on topics such as the eldest daughter-in-law's unwavering support for her older parents, the eldest son-centered property inheritance, traditional family rituals in which the husband's family takes precedence, conflicts between mother-in-law and daughter-in-law, and marital violence (Lee, 2017; Yoo, 2020). However, very few studies have identified the complexity of intergenerational relations in Korean society, including relations with parents and parents-in-law (Choi & Choi, 2012; Kim, Zarit, Fingerman, & Han, 2015). Furthermore, little is known about whether such intergenerational relationships are linked to adult children's marital relationships, and whether the link is gender specific (Choi et al., 2019; Jeon, 2020).

In this study, we broaden our understanding of the rapidly changing Korean family structure by investigating intergenerational and marital relations from a gender perspective. Specifically, using a multidimensional approach to intergenerational relations (Bengtson, 2001; Bengtson, Giarrusso, Mabry, & Silverstein, 2002) with both parents and parents-in-law, we examine whether the absolute and relative aspects of affectual, associational, and functional intergenerational relationships are separately associated with marital closeness among Korean couples.

Theories and Literature Review

The Balance of Power in Couple Relationships

Human relationships are explained in terms of power dynamics, even if it concerns an intimate family, such as a loving couple or a devoted parent-child equation. Balance of power facilitates strong and successful relationships (Sprecher & Felmlee, 1997). As power imbalances damage relationships, establishing healthy and successful marital relationships necessitates that power is not balanced to the detriment of either partner (Knudson-Martin, 2013). In the case of Korean heterosexual love couples, however, the balance of power is not limited to their relationship alone (Sprecher & Felmlee, 1997); it encompasses their relationship with their respective parents and parents-in-law, as well as the relationship between the two sides of parents. Modern-day couples are pressed for the time and resources need-

ed to care for their parents, and, therefore, their sexually equal relationship helps to keep intergenerational relations equitable (Choi et al., 2019; Sprecher & Felmlie, 1997). In other words, because one of their parents is inequitable, it is possible to assess the balance of power in a marital relationship by observing whether heterosexual love couples have a balanced or unbalanced relationship. It is necessary to closely examine the absolute and relative levels of the relationships with parents and parents-in-law and how differently these intergenerational relation characteristics are associated with marital relationships.

Previously, the balance of power in intergenerational relations, reflected by both parents, was classified and judged as patrilineality, matrilineality, and bilateral. Patrilineality was the traditional Korean family system in which family power was passed down from men to men—to fathers, husbands, and sons (Han & Yoon, 2004). It was common for such families to maintain a stronger bond with the husband's parents than those of the wife. In contrast, matrilineal kinship is centered on the women—the mother, wife, and daughter. Recently, matrilineality has gained popularity among Korean families (Eun, 2006). The bilateral system, however, does not adhere to lineage; inheritance and relationship are possible in both the mother's and father's lines. In this system, individual families are not required to have a balanced relationship with both families (Choi, 2016; Kim et al., 2015). They may lean to one side or alter their preferences depending on the content, direction, and depth of the relationship. Therefore, this must be thoroughly investigated.

Bengtson's (2001) concept of intergenerational solidarity has been used to investigate intergenerational relations in modern society. Bengtson (2001) divided intergenerational solidarity into six subdomains (i.e., affectual, associational, consensual, functional, normative, and structural). According to Bengtson and Allen (2009), even if married children reside separately from their parents, their affectionate, associational, and functional intergenerational relations are mutually beneficial. An affectionate relationship can be defined as an intimate emotional exchange. Associational relationships indicate that parents and children frequently communicate with each other in person or through phone or text messages, even if they do not reside together (Choi & Choi, 2012; Yoo & Choi, 2019). Functional relationships can be defined as those involving financial support or caregiving. This study intends to follow the concept and scale of Bengtson's affectionate, associational, and functional intergenerational relations. These three aspects of intergenerational relations were included as independent variables in the analysis model of this study. However, Bengtson's concept of intergenerational solidarity, which was developed in Western countries' cultural

context, is limited to the parent-child relationship and excludes the relationship with parents-in-law (Choi et al., 2019). As seen in several East Asian countries, gender and power imbalances can be severe when a couple maintains close relationships with both their own parents and their in-laws (Jeon & Yoo, 2017). The scope of the intergenerational relationship is, therefore, extended by including parents-in-law in this study.

Historical Background of Intergenerational Relations in Korea

In the traditional Korean patriarchal system, family generations are linked from father to son (Eun, 2007; Yoo, 2020). As a mother, daughter, wife, and daughter-in-law, a woman was in an unequal position. The severity of gender difference is revealed by proverbs that state that the daughter-in-law must spend three years with ear leeches, three years blind, and three years dumb in her married life, whereas the son-in-law is treated like a hundred-year guest (NAVER Dictionary, 2022). After marriage, a woman devoted herself to caring for her parents-in-law and her relationship with her own parents grew increasingly distant. Contrastingly, men continued to maintain a close relationship with their parents—and a superficial relationship with their parents-in-law (Kim et al., 2015). Such relationship imbalances have often led to marital conflicts, and in some cases, divorce (Jeon, 2020).

With the rapid modernization of the Korean society, the exclusive emphasis on patrilineality has weakened (Chang & Song, 2010). It is now common for married children to maintain independent households regardless of gender and birth order—previously, per social norms, the eldest son and his wife were expected to support his parents. Moreover, claims abound that contrary to tradition, bilateralization or matrilineality is being promoted in order to benefit from a close relationship with the wife's parents during the child-rearing period (Choi & Min, 2015). However, from the perspective of the overall life process, or the life of the middle-aged in Korea, patrilineality still appears influential (Choi, 2016). Several studies have reported that intergenerational relations are now more equitable than they were previously (Choi et al., 2019; Yoo & Choi, 2019). However, academic interest in how diverse and complex relations with both sides of parents influence marital relations, and how they differ by gender, is insufficient (Choi et al., 2019; Kim et al., 2015). Therefore, this study examines the associations between adult children's relationships with their parents and parents-in-law and their marital closeness.

Gender Difference in Intergenerational Relation and Marital closeness

Although there are subtle differences between different cultural backgrounds, it has

been commonly argued in many countries that gender plays an important role in intergenerational relations and marital relationships. Barnett et al. (2010) analyzed the relationship between generations and genders in the United States with a path model and showed that giving and receiving care was more frequent with married daughters than married sons. Johnston-Ataata (2019) evaluated the partner relationships of eight Tongan-European Australian intercultural couples in depth and found that although they wanted to form a close relationship with both parents and parents-in-law, they had a hard time to find a balance due to the collision of values such as culture and gender, which affected their partner relationships. Many studies have commonly reported that Chinese couples are living close to husband's parents more often in rural areas where Confucian beliefs remain (Gruijters & Ermisch, 2019). However, in Hong Kong, where Western and Eastern cultures coexist, sons frequently have an obligatory and close relationship with their parents, whereas daughters are more often emotionally close to their parents even if they are less financially supportive or live with their parents less (Peng et al., 2022).

Numerous studies have reported that intergenerational relationship is closely linked to marital closeness, and that this link varies by gender in Korea (Choi et al., 2019; Jeon & Yoo, 2017; Jeon, 2020). Adults who receive parental support in any area, such as emotional and physical care or financial support, are usually more satisfied with their marriage because they have more resources (Jeon & Yoo, 2017). However, they may also be subjected to subordination or interference by their parents, which may have a negative impact on their marital closeness (Jeon, 2020). In terms of emotions, it is believed that if the relationship with the parents is too close and the parents' interference is severe, the child-in-law's satisfaction decreases (Jeon & Kim, 2012). A child's burden increases upon providing instrumental or functional support to their parents, and this may sometimes lead to reading the spouse's mind (Jeon & Kim, 2012). Marital closeness may diminish when a spouse prefers to have a relationship with his/her own parents rather than unilaterally supporting her/his parents-in-law (Jeon, 2020; Jeon & Yoo, 2017).

The conflict between mother-in-law and daughter-in-law has been a gender, family, and social issue (Jeon & Kim, 2012). However, with rapidly changing cultural norms in Korea, interest in the relationship between father-in-law and son-in-law has recently grown (Jeon & Jeon, 2014). Women and men may experience varying levels of marital closeness because of their spouse's relationships with their respective parents (Jeon & Yoo, 2017). However, studies analyzing marital closeness from children's perspective while simultaneously considering the relationship with both sides of parents in one model are uncommon in Korea (Choi et

al., 2019).

Socio-demographic characteristics such as age, education, household income, the presence of grandchildren, and the survival of parents/parents-in-law may also be closely related to intergenerational relationships and marital closeness (Choi & Nam, 2016). The literature has documented that those who are older, less educated, have less household income (Yoo, 2017), and possess a traditional attitude toward gender and family tend to maintain closer relationships with their husbands' parents, resulting in lower marital closeness (Choi et al., 2019). However, those with a young child may occasionally receive more support from their parents and, therefore, become more affectionate toward them (Choi & Choi, 2012; Lee & Bauer, 2013); resultantly, this has a positive impact on marital relationships (Jeon & Kim, 2012). In contrast, when one of the parents or parents-in-law dies, adult children are likely to provide affectionate and functional support to the surviving parent (Choi & Bin, 2016; Yoo, 2020). The intensive support for one parent influences marital relationships (Jeon & Jeon, 2012) and may be positively linked to the marital closeness of the person or spouse. However, this imbalance may also create a burden of support, leading to stress (Jeon, 2020; Jeon & Jeon, 2014). Therefore, we use the adult child's age, education, household income, the presence of grandchildren, and the widowhood of each set of parents as control variables.

The Current Study

This study has four advantages compared to previous studies on these topics. First, the flow of the relationship is two-way—that is, it can be given and received. Previous studies on intergenerational relations have focused on one-way relationships in which parents support their children, and conversely, children support their parents (Choi & Nam, 2016). However, we include multiple dimensions of intergenerational relationships, including affectionate, associational, and functional ties because each dimension may be differently linked to adult children's marriage (Jeon, 2020; Knudson-Martin, 2013). Therefore, we comprehensively measure the bi-directionality and diversity of intergenerational relations.

Second, most earlier studies conducted in Western countries did not highlight spouses' relationships with their parents (Kim et al., 2015). However, decisions in a marriage are usually made as a couple, and the interaction quality toward one side of the parents may affect the interaction with the other side (Sprecher & Felmlee, 1997). In this regard, this study broadens our understanding of the relationship between parents and parents-in-law.

Third, the relationship between both sides of parents on marital closeness can vary not only with their absolute level but also with their relative level. In this study, the absolute aspect in this study refers to the participants' levels of affectionate, associational, and functional relationships with their own parents and their parents-in-law. The relative relationships refer to comparisons between parents and parents-in-law and were categorized into greater solidarity with one's own parents, greater solidarity with parents-in-law, and similar solidarity with both sides in terms of the three dimensions. For instance, even if the level of absolute relationship with parents is above average, if the relationship with the parents-in-law is overwhelmingly strong, his/her marital closeness may be lowered (Jeon & Jeon, 2012; Sprecher & Felmlee, 1997). It may not be detrimental to a couple's marital closeness if relationships with both sides of parents are balanced, even if the absolute level is below the average level (Jeon, 2020; Sprecher & Felmlee, 1997).

Lastly, marital closeness according to various intergenerational relations may vary by gender, but previous studies did not classify the analysis targets as women or gender (Choi & Bin, 2016; Yoo, 2017). We perform the multiple regression analysis with women and men separately and compared the gender-based result differences.

The specific research questions of this study are as follows.

- Question 1. What are the absolute and relative characteristics of affectual, associational, and functional relationships with parents and parents-in-law among married Korean women and men?
- Question 2. Are the absolute aspects of affectual, associational, and functional relationships with parents and parents-in-law associated with marital closeness? Do these associations differ according to gender?
- Question 3. Are the relative aspects of affectual, associational, and functional relationships with parents and parents-in-law associated with marital closeness? Do these associations differ according to gender?

Method

Data and Participants

This study employed data from the 2019 Seoul Family Report Survey (Chin, Lee, Kwon, Kim, & Oh, 2019): an annual online survey conducted by the Seoul Metropolitan Government to assess the overall family life of Seoul residents. The survey period was from May 13, 2019 to May 19, 2019. The survey invitation email was sent to the online panel members of the survey company, and panel members who voluntarily wanted to participate in the survey responded. Quota sampling based on gender, age, and residential areas in Seoul was used. When respondents participate in the survey up to the number of genders and age groups assigned to each region, it is designed to stop of survey automatically for people who belong to the region can no longer respond. The data collection process was approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB). This survey asked both men and women about the relationship as well as exchanges of support between married adults and their parents and parents-in-law—an advantage over other national surveys. Seoul is a metropolis inhabited by approximately 19% of Koreans and represents Korea as the capital of Korea, leading the development of other cities.

In this study, we analyzed a subset of the 2019 Seoul Family Report Survey. Among the 1,600 respondents, we selected married adults who had at least one surviving parent and one parent-in-law, did not reside with any parent. We did not include those who resided with parents or parents-in-law because this group would not have sufficient variations in associational and functional intergenerational ties. For example, co-residence with parents or parents-in-law would involve face-to-face interactions on a daily basis and active exchanges of instrumental support, such as housework and caregiving. Our sample included 562 married Koreans, with 269 women (47.9%) and 293 men (52.1%).

Table 1 presents participants' characteristics. In terms of age, 40s (39.9%) were included in the analysis, followed by 30s (29.2%), 50s (24.4%), 60s (3.7%), and 20s (2.9%). The average age of the subjects was 43.8. Their most common educational level was university graduate or lower (62.8%), followed by junior college graduate or lower (14.4%), graduate school or higher (13.0%), and high school graduate or lower (9.8%). The average household income was 6.45 on a 1–11 scale, which is between 5 million won or more and 6 million won or more. The average marital closeness was 4.4 on a 1–6 scale, which was slightly higher than the median. More than four-fifths of the subjects (82.6%) had at least one child. More than half the

Table 1
Participants' Descriptive Statistics

variables		Women (<i>n</i> = 269)		Men (<i>n</i> = 293)		χ^2/t
		<i>n/M</i>	%/ <i>SD</i>	<i>n/M</i>	%/ <i>SD</i>	
Age	20s	11	4.09	5	1.71	4.08
	30s	81	30.11	83	28.33	
	40s	108	40.15	116	39.59	
	50s	60	22.30	77	26.28	
	60s	9	3.35	12	4.10	
Education level	High school graduate or lower	38	14.13	17	5.80	30.87***
	Junior college graduate or lower	54	20.07	27	9.22	
	University graduate or lower	153	56.88	200	68.26	
	Graduate school or higher	24	8.92	49	16.72	
Household income		6.43	2.09	6.47	2.37	.19
Marital closeness		4.33	1.10	4.50	1.03	1.90
Having a child	Yes	215	79.93	249	84.98	2.49
	No	54	20.07	44	15.02	
Whether own parents alive	Both father and mother alive	176	65.43	195	66.55	.46
	Only father alive	14	5.20	18	6.14	
	Only mother alive	79	29.37	80	27.30	
Whether parents-in-law alive	Both father and mother alive	145	53.90	183	62.46	5.90
	Only father alive	16	5.95	21	7.17	
	Only mother alive	108	40.15	89	30.38	

*** $p < .001$.

participants' parents (66.0%) were alive, followed by participants survived solely by their mothers (28.3%) and those survived solely by their fathers (5.7%). Similarly, more than half of the participants' parents (58.4%) were alive, followed by only mothers alive (35.1%) and a few cases (6.6%) of only the fathers alive.

Measures

Dependent Variables: Marital closeness

Two items adapted from the Perceived Parent-Child Affection Scale were used

to measure marital closeness (Roberts & Bengtson, 1993). The items included: “Taking everything into consideration, how close do you feel is the relationship between you and your partner at this point in your life?” and “Overall, how well do you and your partner get along together at this point in your life?” A 6-point Likert scale ranging from “not at all (1)” to “very much (6)” was used. A higher score represents a higher level of closeness with the spouse. The average score of the two items was used, and Cronbach’s alpha was .94.

Independent Variables

Respondents (married adult children) were asked about their own parents and parents-in-law for all intergenerational relationship items.

1) Absolute intergenerational relationships

Absolute intergenerational relationships included the affectual (closeness), associational (frequencies of face-to-face, phone, and text interaction), and functional (financial assistance, housework, and care assistance provided to and received from parents and parents-in-law) aspects of intergenerational ties.

Closeness with own parents and parents-in-law was measured using two selected items of the Perceived Parent-Child Affection Scale (Roberts & Bengtson, 1993): “Taking everything into consideration, how close do you feel is the relationship between you and your parents (or parents-in-law) at this point in your life?” and “Overall, how well do you and your parents (or parents-in-law) get along together at this point in your life?” A 6-point Likert scale ranging from “not at all (1)” to “very much (6)” was employed. The average score of the two items was used, with a higher score indicating a higher level of closeness with each parent. Cronbach’s alpha for closeness with own parents was .91, and Cronbach’s alpha for parents-in-law was .90.

Frequency of meeting with own parents and parents-in-law was measured using one item: “How often do you meet with your parents (or parents-in-law) face-to-face?” on a 5-point scale (1 = nearly every day, 2 = once or twice a week, 3 = once or twice a month, 4 = once or twice a year, 5 = rarely or never). All responses were reverse-recorded so that a higher score meant more meetings with parents from either side.

Frequency of phone contact with own parents and parents-in-law was measured using one item: “How often do you contact your parents (or parents-in-law) by phone (landline, cell phone, Kakao-call)?” on a 5-point scale (1 = nearly every day, 2 = once or twice a week, 3 = once or twice a month, 4 = once or twice a year, 5 = rarely or never, 9 = no phone). All responses were reverse-recorded, with a higher score indicating more contact by phone with parents from either side. The re-

sponse “no phone” (9) was replaced with a missing value, and they were excluded from the regression analysis.

Frequency of text contact with own parents and parents-in-law was measured using one item: “How often do you contact your parents (or parents-in-law) by text or messengers such as Kakao Talk?” with a 5-point scale (1 = nearly every day, 2 = once or twice a week, 3 = once or twice a month, 4 = once or twice a year, 5 = rarely not, 9 = no phone). All responses were reverse-recorded so that a higher score indicated more contact through text or messengers with parents from either side. The response “no phone” (9) was replaced with a missing value.

Financial assistance or housework help and care provided to own parents and parents-in-law were coded as 1 (yes) and 0 (no). Each was measured using the following question: “Have you provided your parents (or parents-in-law) with the following help?: (a) financial assistance (costs of living, pocket money, etc.), and (b) housework help and care (chore, nursing care, etc).”

Financial assistance or housework help and care received from own parents and parents-in-law were coded as 1 (yes) and 0 (no). Each was measured using the following question: “Have you received the following help from your parents (or parents-in-law)?: (a) financial assistance (costs of living, pocket money, etc.), and (b) housework and care (household chores, nursing care, etc).”

2) Relative intergenerational relationships

Relative intergenerational relationships were defined as who felt closer, who met more frequently, who contacted more often via phone and text, who provided more financial assistance/housework help and care, and who received financial assistance/housework help and care from one’s own parents and parents-in-law. When the value was 0, it was coded as “similar (1);” when the value was greater than 0, it was coded as “own parents (2);” and when the value was lesser than 0, it was coded as “parents-in-law (3).”

Who felt closer between their own parents and parents-in-law was calculated by subtracting the average closeness with parents-in-law from the average closeness with their own parents. *Whom meetings more often between own parents and parents-in-law* was created through a comparison between the responses of the questions about the frequency of meeting with their own parents and parents-in-law. *Whom contacting more often by phone between own parents and parents-in-law* was created through a comparison between the responses of the questions about phone contact with their own parents and parents-in-law. *Whom contacting more often by text between own parents and parents-in-law* was created by a comparison between the responses of the questions

about text contacts with their own parents and parents-in-law. *To/From whom providing/receiving financial assistance/housework help and care between own parents and parents-in-law* were all categorized as “both (1),” “only to own parents (2),” “only to parents of spouse” (3), and “none (4).” In response to all the questions on providing/receiving financial assistance or housework help and care to own parents and parents-in-law, participants answered “yes” to “both (1)” and “no” to “none (4).” When they chose “yes” for providing or receiving financial assistance or housework help and care to own parents but “no” to parents-in-law, it was coded “only to own parents (2),” whereas “no” to own parents but “yes” to parents-in-law was coded as “only to parents of spouse (3).”

Control Variables

Age was analyzed using five dummy variables: 20s, 30s, 40s (reference group), 50s, and 60s. Education level was included using four dummy variables: high school graduate or lower, junior college graduate or lower, university graduate or lower (reference group), and graduate school or higher. Household income—that is, the total monthly income of all the family members residing together—was a continuous variable measured in units of one million Korean won, from “less than 1 million won (1)” to “10 million won or more (11).” Having a child was coded as 1 (yes) or 0 (no). Whether parents/parents-in-law alive, was analyzed using “both father and mother alive,” “only father alive,” and “only mother alive (a reference group).”

Analysis Strategy

Using STATA 16.1, we conducted multiple linear regression analyses for women and men separately to answer research questions 2 and 3. The dependent variable was the level of marital closeness, and the independent variables were affectionate, associational, and functional characteristics of absolute and relative intergenerational relationships, respectively. We confirmed that multicollinearity was not an issue because all correction coefficients among the study variables were under .66 (See in Appendix Table 1) factors (VIFs) were lower than 3.39 for regression models.

Results

Descriptive Statistics of Intergenerational Relationships

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics of Relationships with Own Parents and Parents-in-law

variables	Women (<i>n</i> = 269)		Men (<i>n</i> = 293)		χ^2/t	
	<i>n</i> / <i>M</i>	% / <i>SD</i>	<i>n</i> / <i>M</i>	% / <i>SD</i>		
Closeness with own parents	4.40	.91	4.32	.90	-1.03	
Closeness with parents-in-law	3.64	1.03	3.81	.88	2.14*	
Feeling closer	Similar	59	21.93	84	28.67	4.55
	Own parents	181	67.29	172	58.70	
	Parents-in-law	29	10.78	37	12.63	
Frequency of meeting with own parents	2.90	.93	2.83	.83	-1.00	
Frequency of meeting with parents-in-law	2.57	.86	2.66	.82	1.17	
Meeting more often	Similar	122	45.35	137	46.76	1.30
	Own parents	102	37.92	99	33.79	
	Parents-in-law	45	16.73	57	19.45	
Frequency of phone contact to own parents	4.09	1.23	3.62	1.11	-4.76***	
Frequency of phone contact to parents-in-law	2.81	1.12	2.60	1.02	-2.28*	
Contacting more often by phone	Similar	78	29.00	93	31.74	2.54
	Own parents	177	65.80	192	65.53	
	Parents-in-law	14	5.20	8	2.73	
Frequency of text contact to own parents	3.17	1.79	2.78	1.54	-2.81**	
Frequency of text contact to parents-in-law	2.10	1.28	2.22	1.25	1.07	
Contacting more often by text	Similar	125	46.47	165	56.31	5.46
	Own parents	129	47.96	114	38.91	
	Parents-in-law	15	5.58	14	4.78	
Providing financial assistance to own parents	Yes	113	42.01	163	55.63	10.42**
	No	156	57.99	130	44.37	
Providing financial assistance to parents-in-law	Yes	123	45.72	127	43.34	.32
	No	146	54.28	166	56.66	
	Both	81	30.11	104	35.49	
Providing financial assistance to	Only own parents	32	11.90	59	20.14	15.65**
	Only parents-in-law	42	15.61	23	7.85	
	Nobody	114	42.38	107	36.52	
Providing housework help and care to own parents	Yes	48	17.84	62	21.16	.98
	No	221	82.16	231	78.84	
Providing housework help and care to parents-in-law	Yes	46	17.10	38	12.97	1.88
	No	223	82.90	255	87.03	
	Both	23	8.55	21	7.17	
Providing housework help and care to	Only own parents	25	9.29	41	13.99	4.47
	Only parents-in-law	23	8.55	17	5.80	
	Nobody	198	73.61	214	73.04	

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics of Relationships with Own Parents and Parents-in-law (Continued)

variables		Women (n = 269)		Men (n = 293)		χ^2/t
		n / M	% / SD	n / M	% / SD	
Receiving financial assistance from own parents	Yes	30	11.15	40	13.65	.80
	No	239	88.85	253	86.35	
Receiving financial assistance from parents-in-law	Yes	24	8.92	19	6.48	1.18
	No	245	91.08	274	93.52	
	Both	8	2.97	9	3.07	
Receiving financial assistance from	Only own parents	22	8.18	31	10.58	2.81
	Only parents-in-law	16	5.95	10	3.41	
	Nobody	223	82.90	243	82.94	
Receiving housework help and care from own parents	Yes	40	14.87	31	10.58	2.34
	No	229	85.13	262	89.42	
Receiving housework help and care from parents-in-law	Yes	17	6.32	40	13.65	8.27**
	No	252	93.68	253	86.35	
	Both	5	1.86	10	3.41	
Receiving housework help and care from	Only own parents	35	13.01	21	7.17	12.38**
	Only parents-in-law	12	4.46	30	10.24	
	Nobody	217	80.67	232	79.18	

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

Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics of absolute and relative relationships with parents and parents-in-law. On a 1–6 scale, the average relationship with own parents was 4.36, whereas the relationship with parents-in-law was 3.7. Numerous participants felt closer to their own parents than to their parents-in-law (62.8%) or reported similar levels of closeness with both sides of parents (25.4%), but some reported that they were closer to parents-in-law (11.7%). On a 1–5 scale, the average frequency of meeting with own parents and parents-in-law was 2.9 and 2.6, respectively, indicating that meetings occurred more than once or twice a year but less than once or twice a month. A little less than half (46.1%) reported meeting both sides of parents equally; 35.8% reported meeting more often with their own parents; and 18.2% met more often with their parents-in-law. On a 1–5 scale, the average frequency of contact via phone was 3.8 with own parents—quite close to 4, which meant once or twice a week; it was higher than the 2.7 for parents-in-law, which indicated more than once or twice a year but less than once or twice a month. Two-thirds of the participants (65.7%) contacted their parents more often via phone, and only 3.9% contacted their parents-in-law through phone—one-third maintained similar levels of phone contact with both sides of parents.

On a 1–5 scale, the average frequency of text contact with own parents was almost 3 (2.97), corresponding to once or twice a month, and that with parents-in-law was almost 2 (2.2), corresponding to once or twice a year. The maximum number of respondents (51.6%) maintained similar text contact with both sides of parents (51.6%); 43.2% contacted their own parents more often—significantly more than the 5.2% that contacted their parents-in-law more often.

The proportion of participants providing financial assistance to their own parents (49.1%) was identical to those not providing it (50.9%). Those who did not provide financial assistance to parents-in-law (55.5%) numbered slightly more than those who did provide it (44.5%). In the case of providing financial assistance, “none” was the highest at 39.3%, followed by “both” (32.9%), “only to own parents” (16.2%), and “only to parents of spouse” (11.6%). This means that approximately 70% provided similar levels of financial assistance to both sides of parents. The proportion of participants who did not provide housework help and care to their own parents and parents-in-law was 80.4% and 85.1%, respectively. Regarding housework help and care, “none” (73.3%) was the most common response, followed by “only to own parents” (11.7%), “both” (7.8%), and “only to parents of spouse” (7.1%). The proportion of participants who received financial assistance from their own parents (12.5%) was higher than those who received it from their parents-in-law (7.7%). In the case of receiving financial assistance, most of the participants responded “none” (82.9%), followed by “only from own parents” (9.4%), “only from parents of spouse” (4.6%), and “both” (3.0%). Similar to receiving financial assistance from parents, the proportion of participants who received housework help and care from their own parents (12.6%) was higher than those who received it from their parents-in-law (10.1%). In the field of housework help and care, four-fifth of the total respondents responded “nobody” (79.9%), followed by “only from own parents” (10.0%), “only from parents of spouse” (7.5), and “both” (2.7%).

Associations between Absolute Intergenerational Relationships and Marital closeness

Table 3 shows the results of the multiple linear regression analysis of the absolute intergenerational relationships after controlling for the control variables. The independent and control variables explained about 36% of the variance in women’s marital closeness and about 33.7% in men’s marital closeness. For women, their marital intimacy improved as the relationship with their in-laws improved ($\beta = .43, p < .001$). When providing housework help and care such as chores and nursing care to their own

Table 3
Results of the Multiple Linear Regression Model on the Associations between Absolute Intergenerational Relationships and Marital closeness

Variables	Women (<i>n</i> = 269)			Men (<i>n</i> = 293)			
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β	
Constant	2.51	.45***		2.54	.44***		
Closeness with	Own parents	.08	.09	.07	.08	.06	
	Parents-in-law	.47	.07***	.43	.50	.08***	.42
Frequency of meeting with	Own parents	.01	.08	.01	.06	.05	
	Parents-in-law	-.10	.08	-.08	.03	.02	
Frequency of phone contact to	Own parents	-.02	.07	-.02	.03	.03	
	Parents-in-law	.06	.08	.06	-.11	-.11	
Frequency of text contact to	Own parents	.01	.05	.01	.08	.11	
	Parents-in-law	-.03	.07	-.03	-.05	-.06	
Providing financial assistance to	Own parents	-.27	.14*	-.12	.20	.10	
	Parents-in-law	.19	.14	.09	.12	.06	
Providing housework help and care to	Own parents	.56	.19**	.19	-.04	-.02	
	Parents-in-law	-.20	.19	-.07	-.06	-.02	
Receiving financial assistance from	Own parents	-.07	.20	-.02	.18	-.07	
	Parents-in-law	.03	.23	.01	-.30	-.07	
Receiving housework help and care from	Own parents	-.14	.20	-.04	.20*	-.14	
	Parents-in-law	.07	.28	.02	.03	.01	
R^2 (Adjusted R^2)		.36 (.28)			.34 (.26)		
<i>F</i>		4.63***			4.61***		

Note. *B* = Coefficient. *SE* = Standard Error. Control variables were included in the analyses.

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

parents, their marital closeness was significantly greater than when they did not ($\beta = .19, p < .01$). Similarly, providing financial assistance to own parents was associated with lower levels of marital closeness ($\beta = -.12, p < .05$). For men, as in Model 1 for women, the closer the relationship with the parents-in-law, the greater their marital closeness ($\beta = .42, p < .001$). When receiving housework help and care from their own parents, their marital closeness was significantly lower than when they did not ($\beta = -.14, p < .05$). It is interesting to note that in the case of women, providing support to parents was related to marital closeness, whereas in the case of men, receiving support from parents was related to marital closeness.

Associations between Relative Intergenerational Relationship and Marital closeness

Table 4 shows the results of the multiple linear regression analysis of the relative

Table 4
Results of the Multiple Linear Regression Model on the Associations between Relative Intergenerational Relationships and Marital closeness

Variables (Ref.)		Women (<i>n</i> = 269)			Men (<i>n</i> = 293)		
		<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β
Constant		3.99	.47***		4.23	.44***	
Feeling closer (Ref. Own parents)	Similar	.53	.17**	.20	-.03	.14	-.01
	Parents-in-law	.56	.24*	.16	-.14	.21	-.05
Meeting more often (Ref. Own parents)	Similar	-.07	.16	-.03	.11	.14	.05
	Parents-in-law	-.12	.21	-.04	.20	.20	.08
Contacting more often by phone (Ref. Own parents)	Similar	.04	.17	.02	.12	.15	.05
	Parents-in-law	-.13	.33	-.03	-.47	.42	-.07
Contacting more often by text (Ref. Own parents)	Similar	-.07	.16	-.03	-.18	.14	-.08
	Parents-in-law	-.64	.31*	-.13	-.40	.29	-.08
Providing financial assistance (Ref. Only to own parents)	Both	.59	.23*	.25	-.02	.17	-.01
	Only from parents-in-law	.44	.25	.15	.06	.25	.02
	Nobody	.68	.21**	.31	-.19	.17	-.09
Providing housework help and care (Ref. Only to own parents)	Both	.39	.32	.10	.47	.28	.12
	Only from parents-in-law	-.95	.33**	-.24	.12	.31	.03
	Nobody	-.36	.24	-.14	.00	.18	.00
Receiving financial assistance (Ref. Only from own parents)	Both	-.58	.45	-.09	.32	.40	.05
	Only from parents-in-law	.08	.37	.02	-.33	.38	-.06
	Nobody	-.21	.24	-.07	.44	.20*	.16
Receiving housework help and care (Ref. Only from own parents)	Both	-.26	.55	-.03	-.59	.42	-.10
	Only from parents-in-law	.59	.41	.11	.30	.33	.09
	Nobody	.17	.22	.06	.18	.26	.07
<i>R</i> ² (Adjusted <i>R</i> ²)		.26 (.16)			.22 (.12)		
<i>F</i>		2.53***			2.23**		

Note. *B* = Coefficient. Ref. = Reference. *SE* = Standard Error. Control variables were included in the analyses. **p* < .05. ***p* < .01. ****p* < .001.

intergenerational relationships after controlling for the control variables. The independent and control variables together explained about 26.2% of the variance in women's marital closeness and about 22.2% in men's marital closeness.

For women, marital closeness was greater when relationships with both sides of parents were similar ($\beta = .20, p < .01$) or when the relationship with parents-in-law was better ($\beta = .16, p < .05$) than that with own parents. The level of marital closeness was lower when the frequency of text contact with parents-in-law was higher than with

own parents ($\beta = -.13, p < .05$). Similarly, marital closeness was greater when providing financial support to both parents ($\beta = .25, p < .05$) or to neither sides of parents ($\beta = .31, p < .01$), rather than only to the wife's parents. However, when providing housework help and care to the husband's parents, the relationship with the husband was less intimate than when only providing it to the wife's parents ($\beta = -.24, p < .01$). The relative characteristics of receiving financial assistance or housework help and care were not significantly associated with marital closeness for women.

Men's level of marital closeness was higher when they received no financial assistance than when they received financial assistance from their own parents ($\beta = .16, p < .05$). For men, the comparison of providing financial assistance or housework help and care to both parents was not significantly associated with marital closeness. In summary, the comparison of contact and support exchanges for both sides of parents had stronger associations with marital closeness for women than for men.

Discussion

This study aimed to examine whether the absolute and relative aspects of affectionate, associational, and functional relationships with parents and parents-in-law were associated with marital intimacy among married women and men in Korea. From a gender perspective, we investigated whether the associations between intergenerational relationships and marital intimacy differed between women and men. In this study, the absolute relationships included the levels of closeness (affectionate) with parents and parents-in-law, the frequency of face-to-face, phone, and text interactions (associational) with parents and parents-in-law, and providing and receiving financial and instrumental support (functional) from/to parents and parents-in-law. For the relative aspect, we compared the absolute relationships between parents and parents-in-law in terms of the affectionate, associational, and functional ties and categorized them into (a) greater ties with parents, (b) greater ties with parents-in-law, and (c) similar ties with both sides. This study contributes to the literature by considering the multiple dimensions and types of intergenerational ties with both one's own parents and parents-in-law and by assessing both the absolute and relative aspects of these ties. This culturally-attuned approach expands well-established theoretical models of intergenerational relationships such as the intergenerational solidarity model (Bengtson, 2001), which does not explicitly include daughters-in-law and sons-in-law.

In terms of absolute relationships, on average, both women and men were emo-

tionally closer to and interacted more frequently with their parents than their parents-in-law. Several studies conducted by South Korean researchers indicated that intergenerational relationships had been strengthened mainly around women (Yoo & Choi, 2019; Jeon & Yoo, 2017), and this result was similar to the results of recent studies, which argued that the traditional family values had been changed and that men and women were becoming similar in terms of the intergenerational relationship (Choi et al., 2019). However, greater closeness with parents-in-law but not with one's own parents, was positively associated with marital intimacy for both women and men. This finding can be interpreted from both traditional and contemporary perspectives in Korea, where both traditional and egalitarian family norms coexist (Sung & Lee, 2013). Husbands may acknowledge their wife's efforts to become a filial daughter-in-law because filial piety, an important traditional norm, is no longer taken for granted for daughters-in-law in contemporary Korea. Likewise, a wife may appreciate it if her husband is close to her parents because affectionate sons-in-law are exceptional in traditional patrilineal families, and because relationships with the wife's family of origin have become important in couple relationships today. It is worth mentioning that the opposite direction may also be plausible because of the cross-sectional design of this study. That is, marital intimacy may lead couples to develop a close relationship with their parents-in-laws (Kim et al., 2015) because Koreans tend to consider intergenerational relationships as part of their marital life. Regardless of the direction, our results suggest that affectual ties with both spouses' parents are significant in couple relationships in Korea today, unlike the past when only husbands' parents were prioritized.

It is interesting that an affective relationship with one's own parents was not significantly related to marital intimacy for both women and men. This finding is different from the literature documenting that the affectionate dimension is a central part of intergenerational relationships (Choi & Choi, 2012). Although closeness with one's own parents may contribute to individual adjustment (Lee, Park, Kim, Oh, & Kwon, 2020), this affectionate relationship may play an ambivalent role in marital adjustment. Married individuals who are emotionally close to their own parents may be easily controlled by their parents, which would not be beneficial for a healthy couple relationship among Koreans.

We also found gender differences in the link between absolute functional ties with parents, parents-in-law, and marital intimacy. When a woman provided financial support to her own parents, it was negatively associated with marital intimacy, whereas providing instrumental support to her parents was positively related to marital intimacy. This result may be due to the cultural transition from patrilineal

to bilateral kinship interaction in Korea (Lee, 2003; Ok, 2011; Sung, 2006). Although it has become more common that married daughters to provide instrumental support for their own parents, our results imply that providing financial support to the wife's parents may play a negative role in her marriage because financial assistance from married daughters is still less normative. This result is similar to Choi & Yoo (2022), which shows that the debt burden caused by covering the medical expenses of a wife's parents is perceived greater. Particularly for women who were not in the labor force, the source of financial support for their own parents was likely the husband's income, which could pose a challenge in their marriage.

For men, receiving instrumental support, such as childcare and housework from their parents was negatively related to marital intimacy. The other functional support variables were not statistically significant. This result may be because instrumental support from the husband's parents also invites greater parental involvement in the marriage, and the wife may not appreciate such involvement. Another interpretation is that men may be dissatisfied with the situation in which his parents provide instrumental support because instrumental assistance from the wife's parents has increased in Korea, making it more expected (Lee & Bauer, 2013).

Regarding relative intergenerational relationships, women were more likely to report greater marital intimacy in three situations: (a) when the levels of intergenerational closeness were similar between the wife's parents and the husband's parents or higher with the husband's parents, compared to those who were closer to their own parents; (b) when the wife provided financial support for both sides or neither side, compared to those who helped her own parents only; and (3) when the woman provided instrumental support only for her parents, compared to those who provided support only to her parents-in-law. However, a higher frequency of text messages sent to her parents-in-law was negatively linked to marital intimacy compared to the frequency of text messages sent to her own parents.

Overall, the findings of this study indicate that the relative characteristics of intergenerational relationships are important in predicting marital intimacy for women. The results agree with the results of many studies conducted in many other regions including the United States, China, Taiwan, and Hong Kong, and the background can be interpreted using the results of previous studies (Gruijters & Ermisch, 2019; Peng et al., 2022; Stepniak et al., 2022) on the complex and ambivalent love triangle between a mother-in-law, a daughter, and a son-in-law in Korea (Jeon & Jeon, 2014; Jeon, 2020). Although married daughters' affectionate, associational, and functional ties with their own parents are prevalent in Korea today,

our findings reveal that these ties need to be similar to or weaker than their ties to the husband's parents to experience better marital adjustment. From a comparative perspective, we conclude that stronger couple relationships tend to be based on balanced relationships with both sides of parents (bilateral solidarity) or a priority accorded to the husband's parents (patrilineal solidarity) for Koreans. In contrast, an imbalance toward the wife's parents (matrilineal solidarity) is not beneficial for the couple's relationship because sufficient solidarity with the paternal parents is still a symbolic element of marriage in Korea.

The findings of this study have implications for education and therapy for couples in countries such as Korea that are transitioning from patrilineal to bilateral kinship relationships. Our results suggest that intergenerational relationships should be a core theme for professionals working with couples in these countries. In particular, couples may benefit from a gender-based understanding of their relationships with parents and parents-in-law. Given that patrilineal to bilateral norms coexist in Korean families, wives and husbands may have different expectations about affectual, associational, and functional interactions with their parents and parents-in-law. We suggest that professionals help couples explicitly communicate about what each of the affectual, associational, and functional dimensions of intergenerational ties mean to them and how much they expect their spouse and themselves to interact with parents and parents-in-law in these dimensions. Couples may need to negotiate their expectations about intergenerational relationships and reach a consensus as a couple for better marital intimacy and adjustment.

It is worth noting that for women, a higher frequency of text messages sent to her parents-in-law was negatively associated with marital intimacy even though technology-based intergenerational communication has increased in Korea. This result may be because unlike face-to-face meetings and phone conversations, text messages are used to deliver simple messages without longer personal interactions. The daughters-in-law in our study may have preferred text messages because they did not prefer longer, more intense interactions with their parents-in-law even when their in-laws did not prefer text messages. In this regard, the wife's frequent text messages to her parents-in-law may represent a superficial in-law relationship, which creates a negative link to the couple's relationship.

For men, those who had not received financial support from either side of parents tended to report greater marital intimacy compared to those who received financial support from their parents, after controlling for household income. Other relative intergenerational characteristics were not significant for men. The negative role of financial support from the husband's parents suggests that financial in-

dependence is important for men's marital adjustment and that financial support from the husband's parents may cause unwanted parental involvement and control over the couple.

Despite the unique contributions of this study, the limitations are noteworthy. First, our analysis of a cross-sectional dataset restricted the examination of the causality between intergenerational relationships and marital intimacy. Greater marital intimacy could lead to higher levels of intergenerational closeness, interactions, and functional support (Kim et al., 2015), which is the reverse directional approach of this study. A longitudinal design is required for future research. Second, we could not conduct dyadic analyses because of the absence of couples in our secondary data. As intergenerational relationships and marital intimacy may be intertwined with the partner's intergenerational and marital relationships, a couple-level analysis is warranted. Third, our categorization of relative intergenerational relationships was somewhat simplistic, and we did not consider the absolute and relative aspects in the same model. Future research needs to develop an advanced analytic plan to delineate both absolute and relative relationships simultaneously. Finally, some measures of our secondary data were limited. Specifically, we lacked information regarding the levels of financial and instrumental support. Variables such as intergenerational conflict were also not measured even though both solidarity and conflict are crucial domains of intergenerational relationships (Bengtson et al., 2002). Our intergenerational measures did not ask about relationships with mothers/mothers-in-law and fathers/fathers-in-law separately. Parents' gender may play an important role in affectual and associational dimensions of intergenerational relationships (Lee et al., 2020) along with the adult child's gender, which was the focus of this study. Another limitation is that we assessed associational and functional intergenerational relationships using single items with ordered or dichotomous response categories rather than multiple item scales.

Despite these limitations, this study contributes to the literature by distinguishing between absolute and relative intergenerational relationships. The current study is also meaningful from a culturally relevant approach that considers both parents and parents-in-law in the context of changing Korean families. Adopting a gender perspective provides a deeper understanding of the link between intergenerational ties with parents and parents-in-law and marital quality based on gender.

References

- Barnett, M. A., Scaramella, L. V., Neppl, T. K., Ontai, L., & Conger, R. D. (2010). Intergenerational relationship quality, gender, and grandparent involvement. *Family relations, 59*(1), 28-44. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3729.2009.00584.x
- Bengtson, V. L. (2001). Beyond the nuclear family: The increasing importance of multi-generational bonds. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 63*(1), 1-16. doi: 10.1111/j.17413737.2001.00001.x
- Bengtson, V. L., & Allen, K. R. (2009). *The life course perspective applied to families over time*. In Sourcebook of family theories and methods (pp. 469-504). Springer US.
- Bengtson, V., Giarrusso, R., Mabry, J. B., & Silverstein, M. (2002). Solidarity, conflict, and ambivalence: Complementary or competing perspectives on intergenerational relationships? *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 64*(3), 568-576.
- Chang, K., & Song, M. (2010). The stranded individualizer under compressed modernity: South Korean women in individualization without individualism. *The British Journal of Sociology, 61*(3), 539-564. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-4446.2010.01325.x
- Chin, M., Lee, J., Kwon, S., Kim, & Oh, S. (2019). *2019 Seoul family report survey*. Seoul-si, & Seoul Family Center.
- Choi, H. (2016). Effects of siblings characteristics on living arrangements between married children and their parents. *Journal of Family Relations, 21*(2), 129-147. doi: 10.21321/jfr.21.2.129
- Choi, H., & Bin, B. (2016). Intergenerational contact and financial support between parents and married children: Children's gender and birth order as correlates. *Journal of Families and Better Life, 34*(2), 15-27. doi: 10.7466/JKHMA.2016.34.2.15
- Choi, H., & Min, J. (2015). Structural and associational solidarity between adult children and older parents: Impact on older parents' cognitive functioning. *Journal of Families and Better Life, 33*(4), 105-118. doi: 10.7466/JKHMA.2015.33.4.105
- Choi, H., & Nam B. (2016). Effects of married child and parent characteristics on intergenerational residential proximity. *Journal of Family Relations, 21*(1), 123-141. doi: 10.21321/jfr.21.1.123
- Choi, H., Nam, B., Kim, S., & Park, C. (2019). Contact with parents and parents-in-law, gender, and marital satisfaction in Korea. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 81*(5), 1192-1205. doi: 10.1111/jomf.12594
- Choi, H., & Yoo, J. (2022). Effects of various medical expense characteristics on the occurrence of household debt burden. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, online published. doi: 10.1111/ijcs.12817
- Choi, S., & Choi, S. (2012). A study on intergenerational affective solidarity in Korean

- families. *Survey Research*, 13(1), 89-112.
- Eun, K. (2006). A comparative study on family values: Focusing on sex and generational difference. *Family and Culture*, 18(3), 1-31.
- Eun, K. (2007). A comparative analysis of the changes in the values and attitudes toward gender equality and gender roles in Korea. *The Review of Korean Studies*, 10(2), 11-29.
- Grujters, R. J., & Ermisch, J. (2019). Patrilocal, matriloc, or neolocal? Intergenerational proximity of married couples in China. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 81(3), 549-566. doi: 10.1111/jomf.12538
- Han, G., & Yoon, S. (2004). The bilateralization of the kinship relations in Korean families: focused on the intergenerational exchange. *Korea Journal of Population Studies*, 27(2), 177-202.
- Jeon, S. (2020). Influence of subsystem between parent-in-law and children-in-law on marital adjustment in marital subsystem. *Family and Environment Research*, 58(3), 417-428. doi: 10.6115/fer.2020.030
- Jeon, S., & Jeon, G. (2014). The study on mother-in-law's relationship satisfaction between mother-in-law and son-in-law. *Family and Culture*, 26(1), 152-177. doi: 10.21478/family.26.1.201403.006
- Jeon, S., & Kim, S. (2012). Influence of son-in-law's support consciousness towards mother-in-law and marital quality based on the relation-satisfaction between the mother-in-law and son-in-law. *Family and Environment Research*, 50(3), 69-81. doi: 10.6115/khea.2012.50.3.069
- Jeon, S., & Yoo, J. (2017). The study on mother-daughter differentiation, solidarity and relationship satisfaction between mother-in-law and son-in-law: A comparative study on mother-in-law and son-in-law. *Family and Environment Research*, 55(3), 233-247. doi: 10.6115/fer.2017.018
- Johnston-Ataata, K. (2019). Space and the navigation of intimacy in intergenerational Tongan-European Australian relationships during partnering and early parenthood. *Emotion, Space and Society*, 31, 71-77. doi: 10.1016/j.emospa.2019.02.002
- Kim, K., Zarit, S. H., Fingerman, K. L., & Han, G. (2015). Intergenerational exchanges of middle-aged adults with their parents and parents-in-law in Korea. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 77(3), 791-805. doi: 10.1111/jomf.12185
- Knudson-Martin, C. (2013). Why power matters: Creating a foundation of mutual support in couple relationships. *Family Process*, 52(1), 5-18. doi: 10.1111/famp.12011
- Lee, J. (2017). Inheritance in Korean families: Experiences of adult children heirs and changes in family relationships. *Family and Culture*, 29(1), 225-264. doi: 10.21478/family.29.1.201703.008
- Lee, J. K. (2003). *In the name of the family: Modern families and feminism in Korea*. Seoul, Republic

of Korea: Alternative Culture.

- Lee, J., & Bauer, J. W. (2013). Motivations for providing and utilizing child care by grandmothers in South Korea. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 75*(2), 381-402. doi: 10.1111/jomf.12014
- Lee, J., Park, J., Kim, H., Oh, S., & Kwon, S. (2020). Typology of young Korean adults' relationships with their parents from an intergenerational solidarity lens. *Family and Environment Research, 58*(1), 43-60. doi: 10.6115/fer.2020.004
- Nam, B., Lee, J., Choi, S. (2015). Compensating for spouse's and child's contribution to assets and caregiving in inheritance cases: An analysis of precedents on "contribution-based portion." *Family and Culture, 27*(2), 212-261. doi: 10.21478/family.27.2.201506.008
- NAVER Dictionary (2022). Retrieved July, 5, 2021, from <https://ko.dict.naver.com/#/entry/koko/a766573f06b64e4a8acb51715eee2cee>
- Ok, S. W. (2011). *Continuity and change in patrilineal culture of Korean families*. In Korean Family Studies Association (Ed.), *Korean families: Continuity and change* (pp. 1 - 18). Seoul, Republic of Korea: Seoul National University Press.
- Peng, C., Cheng, Q., & Yip, P. S. (2022). Does gender difference exist in typologies of intergenerational relations? Adult son-parent and daughter-parent relations in Hong Kong. *Journal of Family Issues, 0192513X211066954*. doi: 10.1177/0192513X211066954
- Roberts, R. E., & Bengtson, V. L. (1993). Relationships with parents, self-esteem, and psychological well-being in young adulthood. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 56*(4), 263-277. doi: 10.2307/2786663
- Sprecher, S., & Felmlee, D. (1997). The balance of power in romantic heterosexual couples over time from "his" and "her" perspectives. *Sex Roles, 37*(5), 361-379. doi: 10.1023/A:1025601423031
- Stepniak, C., Sutor, J. J., & Gilligan, M. (2022). Mothers' functional limitations and relationship quality with adult children: Exploring the moderating roles of race and gender. *Research on Aging, 44*(5-6), 414-425. doi: 10.1177/01640275211044834
- Sutor, J. J., Gilligan, M., Peng, S., Jung, J. H., & Pillemer, K. (2017). Role of perceived maternal favoritism and disfavoritism in adult children's psychological well-being. *Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences, 72*(6), 1054-1066. doi: 10.1093/geronb/gbv089
- Sung, M. (2006). Bilateralization phenomena in Korean families: A qualitative approach. *Journal of Families and Better Life, 24*(3), 59-72.
- Sung, M., & Lee, J. (2013). Adult sibling and sibling-in-law relationships in South Korea: Continuity and change of Confucian family norms. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 44*(5), 571-587. doi: 10.3138/jcfs.44.5.571

- Swartz, T. T. (2009). Intergenerational family relations in adulthood: Patterns, variations, and implications in the contemporary United States. *Annual review of sociology*, 35, 191-212. doi: 10.1146/annurev.soc.34.040507.134615
- Tan, P. L. (2018). Dual burdens of care: “Sandwiched couples” in East Asia. *Journal of Aging and Health*, 30(10), 1574-1594. doi: 10.1177/0898264318796061
- Yoo, J. (2017). The effect of intergenerational care needs on parent-child geographical proximity. *The Women’s Studies*, 92(1), 31-56. doi: 10.33949/tws.2017.92.1.002
- Yoo, J., & Choi, H. (2019). Intergenerational exchange between older couples and their non-coresident children: Comparison between 2008 and 2017. *Journal of Korean Home Management Association*, 37(2), 69-87. doi: 10.7466/JKHMA.2019.37.2.69
- Yoo, J. (2020). Is inheritance fair in South Korea? The difference in inheritance allocation according to birth order, gender, and caregiving contribution. *Asian Women*, 36(1), 1-23. doi: 10.14431/aw.2020.3.36.1.1

Biographical Note. **Youngmi Shin** graduated from Seoul National University with a Ph. D. in Child Development and Family Studies. She is now a senior researcher in Population Policy Research Center, Institute of Health & Environment at Seoul National University, and an instructor in Department of Child Development and Family Studies at Seoul National University. Email: ymshin@snu.ac.kr

Biographical Note. **Jaerim Lee** is an associate professor in the Department of Child Development and Family Studies at Seoul National University. She received her doctoral degree in family social science at the University of Minnesota in 2009 and has studied Korean families with a focus on intergenerational relationships in emerging and young adulthood. Email: jrlee@snu.ac.kr

Biographical Note. **Jaeon Yoo** graduated from Iowa State University with a Ph. D. in Human Development and Family Studies (Minor in Women's Studies and Gerontology), and served as an associate research fellow at the Korea Institute for Health and Social Affairs. He is now an assistant professor in the Department of Social Welfare at Gachon University. Email: jejowa0205@gachon.ac.kr.

Received: August 14, 2021
Revised: August 9, 2022
Accepted: September 13, 2022

Appendix Table 1
Intercorrelation for Women and Men Samples

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
1. Quality of relation	1.00	.29***	.43***	.02	.11	.16**	.20***	.19**	.14*	.08	.08	.01	.08	-.14*	-.13*	-.11	-.01
2. Closeness with own parents	.25***	1.00	.40***	.27***	.05	.57***	.33***	.34***	.26***	.06	.02	.17**	.09	.11	-.09	.07	-.10
3. Closeness with parents-in-law	.45***	.39***	1.00	-.06	.19***	.22***	.47***	.13*	.26***	.04	.06	.07	.23***	-.08	-.04	-.06	.05
4. Meeting with own parents	.04	.35***	.08	1.00	.14*	.34***	.07	.26***	.11	.01	.05	.23***	-.04	.15**	.07	.35***	-.04
5. Meeting with parents-in-law	.03	.11	.23***	.19**	1.00	.14*	.28***	.25***	.30***	-.11	-.04	-.08	.16**	.06	.20***	.06	.42***
6. Phone with own parents	.08	.48***	.07	.38***	.11	1.00	.51***	.47***	.37***	.01	-.07	.08	.06	.19**	.00	.15*	-.03
7. Phone with parents-in-law	.24***	.14*	.49***	.02	.36***	.24***	1.00	.43***	.62***	.08	.02	.05	.13*	-.02	.06	.06	.07
8. Text to own parents	.09	.28***	-.01	.35***	.17**	.61***	.08	1.00	.66***	-.05	-.02	.03	-.00	.17**	.06	.24***	.06
9. Text to parents-in-law	.18**	.07	.30***	.11	.28***	.19**	.51***	.46***	1.00	-.01	-.08	.06	.02	.03	.08	.15*	.10
10. Providing financial assistance to own parents	-.12*	.13*	-.02	.18**	.05	.18**	.02	.06	-.04	1.00	.46***	.34***	.18**	-.19**	-.04	-.01	-.01
11. Providing financial assistance to parents-in-law	-.07	.02	-.03	-.03	.07	.05	.06	-.09	-.14*	.44***	1.00	.29***	.26***	-.03	.02	.10	.09
12. Providing housework to own parents	.10	.07	.09	.29***	.09	.11	.05	.03	.00	.23***	.16**	1.00	.32***	.01	.03	.04	-.01
13. Providing housework to parents-in-law	-.04	.04	.05	.05	.28***	.05	.05	.04	.03	.17**	.32***	.38***	1.00	-.01	.06	-.00	.26***
14. Receiving financial assistance from own parents	.03	.12*	.07	.14*	.03	.19**	.11	.15*	.06	-.01	-.02	-.01	.03	1.00	.26***	.28***	.10
15. Receiving financial assistance from parents-in-law	.07	-.02	.09	-.01	.14*	.03	.17**	.08	.14*	.05	.03	.06	.20***	.22***	1.00	.18**	.26***
16. Receiving housework from own parents	-.03	.19**	-.01	.46***	.01	.32***	.02	.33***	.14*	.13*	.06	.05	.09	.22***	.05	1.00	.19**
17. Receiving housework from parents-in-law	.04	-.00	.08	-.02	.33***	-.01	.21***	.06	.22***	-.04	.07	-.00	.21***	.01	.35***	.11	1.00

Note. Correlations for the women sample are below the diagonal. Correlations for the men sample are above the diagonal.
 *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.