

Intergenerational Relationship Quality In Terms Of Lifelong Learning: The Effect of Family Climate on The Quality of Intergenerational Relationship

Tuğba Zişan SARI¹, Yasin CAN², Soner POLAT³

¹ Çolakoğlu Mesleki ve Teknik Anadolu Lisesi, Gebze, Kocaeli, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-9225-43447

Email: tzisansari07@gmail.com

² Bakü Türk Anadolu Lisesi, Bakü, Azerbaycan ORCID ID: 0000-0002-7798-2685

Email: yasincan@hotmail.com

³ Kocaeli University, ORCID ID: 0000-0003-2407-6491

Email: spolat@kocaeli.edu.tr

Abstract

Social, emotional and physical relationships are one of the most important tools that human beings need to continue their lives. The people that individuals firstly get in touch with are their families. It is quite possible that individuals who were grown up in the normally multigenerational families are impressed by these families' atmosphere. Some research findings indicate that individuals constitute their relationship at advancing ages by taking as a reference their first relationship forms. The purpose of this study is to examine this effect of family climate on the quality of intergenerational relationship in terms of different generations. The universe of the study consists of 672 individuals who live in Kocaeli Province in Turkey. The sample group was chosen by the convenience sampling method. Study data were gathered by using the "Family Climate Scale" which was developed by Björnberg and Nicholson (2007). And adapted into Turkish by Gonul, Isik-Bas, and Sahin-Acar (2018), and the "Multidimensional Intergenerational Relationship Quality Scale for Aging Chinese Parents" was developed by Xue Bai. For data gathering, online questionnaire forms were used. In the analysis of the data, the Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated for the correlation between variables. To examine the predictive power of the predictor variables on dependent variables simple linear regression analysis was firstly done, and then a multiple hierarchical regression analysis was carried out. The findings indicated that relatedness in family, intergenerational authority and cognitive cohesion which are the subdimensions of family climate variable affect and predict intergenerational relationship quality in a significant way. Thus, this study reveals that there is a moderate and positive relationship between family climate and intergenerational relationship quality. In the light of these findings, to increase the quality of intergenerational relationships, it is very important to increase interpersonal harmony, similarities in attitudes, beliefs and values and sharing things.

Keywords: Family climate, intergenerational relationship, relationship quality, intergenerational relationship quality, lifelong education

Introduction

In the information age that information and technology affect individuals and society deeply, the need for learning is constantly increasing, the need to add new ones to the acquired skills emerges, moreover job and employment security are constantly decreasing. At this point, lifelong learning emerges as an important tool in increasing the quality of human resources, which is the most important asset of countries, bringing them into the economy and employability. When the literature is examined, lifelong learning is defined in different ways by different researchers and institutions. Kulich (1982) defined lifelong learning as education offered to individuals throughout their lives. White (1982) discussed it as individuals' acquiring the necessary information to manage their lives (Gunuc, Kuzu & Odabası, 2012). Therefore, lifelong learning is at home, at school, and at work; in short, it can happen wherever the individual is (Gunuc et al., 2012). The "lifelong" phenomenon of learning tries to show that formal, non-formal and informal learning complement each other. It tells that learning that can be beneficial to the individual and at the same time enjoyable can take place or take place in leisure times, in the family, in daily life and in work environments (Kaya, 2010). One of the ways for learning in the family environment is intergenerational learning. intergenerational learning focuses on learning through interaction between members of different generations (Novotný & Brucknerová, 2014). According to Bandura, learning takes place through imitation, observation, and modelling processes (Santrock, 2011). From an early age,

children observe the behaviour of their parents, take models and thus form their own behaviour patterns. At the same time, grown-ups learn a great deal from young people about technology and the modern world. This is reverse generational learning. Social learning in the family is strongly connected with existent interaction, communication, and the quality of relations in the family. It is comprised of cognitive, emotional, and social components, which are closely interconnected (Illeris, 2004). Lave (2009) describes the learning process in the family as activity, reflection, communication, and negotiation among included members. Learning is personal, teachers are relatives. It is learning by observing and imitating; it is a tradition, perseverance, and continuity and it involves understanding, insight, emotions, and opinions. Also, Wenger (2009) understands learning as a social phenomenon; his 'social theory of learning' indicates that learners in the family experience the same historical and social sources, networks, and perspectives, which connect them in common learning activities. Therefore, this study focused on the relationship between the intergenerational climate of families and intergenerational relationship quality.

Family; it is defined as a group of individuals who are related by blood, have similar or common genetic characteristics, and live under the same family roof through marriage or through parental adoption (Fitzpatrick & Caughlin, 2002; Wilson, 1985). According to another definition; The family is the environment in which a person is a member at birth, where his/her needs are met and socialized in order to continue his/her life (Bayer, 2013). The family is the smallest building block of the society to which the people in it are connected biologically and psychologically. At the same time, it is an institutional structure that requires a common life, sharing responsibility, emotional, social, and financial unity (Gladding, 2017; Lamanna & Riedmann, 2006). In the literature, it is seen that it is not possible to talk about a single type of family and that there are family types that are classified differently. These family types are also found in the society we live in. It also affects the individuals in the structural type of the family. For example, while an individual born in a nuclear family interacts with his/her mother/father in the same home, the interaction of the child, the number of people he/she will be affected by, and the living space in a home where grandparents and sometimes still uncles live will be different. The family provides individuals with a physical, social, moral, psychological, and spiritual living space necessary for their development, and gives them the opportunity to experience phenomena such as belonging and life satisfaction in life. It enables individuals to become more mature, responsible, and healthy individuals in their adult lives (Bernard & Shea, 2013; Framo, 1996). The family has an important function in shaping the personality of the individual by transferring culture, norms, and value judgments (Celik, 2010). The interaction between the parent and the child is important for healthy personality development and adaptation to the environment of the child (Cagdas & Secer, 2004). Family structure has an important effect on the social and emotional development of children and adolescents (Darling & Steinberg, 1993). In a study conducted by Kocayoruk (2012), it is stated that the support received from parents contributes to individuals' self-management, meeting their psychological needs and well-being. In the family system, parents, especially the mother's caring for the child, meeting their needs and showing closeness to them play an important role in shaping the perceptions of the individual about himself and the individuals in the outside world, and thus in shaping the relationships that individuals will establish in the society. When the relevant literature is examined, it is seen that families are divided into two as healthy (functional) and unhealthy (non-functional) families. A healthy family is defined as a family where members are emotionally attached to each other, have open and comfortable communication, come together to overcome problems, support each other, respect individual ideas and differences, and each member fulfills the expected role (Bayramlar, et al., 2009). Families whose members speak little to each other, where problems are hidden, no real closeness is felt between their members, and who have negative feelings towards each other are described as unhealthy families (Alacahan 2010; Canel 2012). Based on the definitions of healthy and unhealthy families, it is seen that characteristics such as the quality of communication within the family, sense of responsibility, approach to problems, and closeness to family members are effective in separating family types. The open and direct relations between family members affect the general communication pattern of the family and make a significant contribution to the family climate (Zorbaz & Owen, 2013).

The family climate, which considers the family as a whole in the context of intergenerational relations, interaction, and culture, instead of the traditional perspective; is defined as the psychological atmosphere that includes the quality of the relationships and interactions of family members, the way of thinking, value judgments and beliefs transmitted from generation to generation (Björnberg & Nicholson, 2007). In another definition, family climate is expressed as the psychological state present in the family (Gönül et al., 2018). When the family is examined in terms of family systems approaches, it is seen that all kinds of phenomena that occur in the family are related to each unit in the system, the interaction between family members and the social climate in the family is also related to ecological systems, the phenomenon of intergenerationalism is important in relationships and self-development and differentiation. It is seen that it is necessary to deal with family processes in detail (Björnberg & Nicholson, 2007). The family climate,

which has different dimensions and is also described as a family environment, has a significant impact on the lives of individuals (Taş and Bulut, 2019). Family climate significantly affects the family system and its quality (Björnberg & Nicholson, 2007). In studies on family climate; It is seen that family climate has an impact on the character development of family members (Matheis & Adams, 2004), affects the emotional intelligence of family members (Chandran & Nair, 2015), and family climate has an impact on the process of adaptation to society (Kurdek, Fine & Sinclair, 1995).

Family climate sub-dimensions; emotional harmony, open communication, compatibility, intergenerational authority, interest, and cognitive harmony (Björnberg & Nicholson, 2007). However, in the Turkey sample study conducted by Gönül et al. (2018), it is seen that family climate components are handled in 3 dimensions intra-family relationality, intergenerational authority and cognitive adjustment. Intra-family relationality is defined by Björnberg and Nicholson (2007) as the social interaction between family members, open communication of family members, positive family relations, and harmony between individuals. Relationships within the family include the patterns of relationships within the family, the skills to cope with the difficulties encountered, and the decision-making methods regarding different situations that may be encountered. Processes that will enable family members to work effectively and functionally together in a system are evaluated (Broderick, 1993). The dimension of intra-family relationality, open communication in which family members express their thoughts openly and freely in relationships, intergenerational interest in what each of the individuals do, their health and goals, emotional harmony in which family members from different generations feel love, commitment and belonging to each other. It covers the dimensions of compatibility with which they cope with the difficulties that arise in a holistic way (Gönül et al., 2018). Intergenerational authority, which is another sub-dimension of family climate, is defined as the effort of the younger generations to adapt to the wishes of the older generation, the authority of the upper generation not being questionable, and the determination of family rules by the upper generations, and the acceptance of the words and behaviours of the older individuals as correct (Björnberg & Nicholson, 2007). It is stated that the friendships they establish, their personal issues and the authority of their parents about different events cause conflicts with their parents and differences in perspectives (Smetana & Asquith, 1994). Authoritarian parenting causes problems in the behaviour of individuals (Thompson, Hollis, & Richards, 2003). It is stated that the dominant authoritarian attitude of the mother/father is related to the perception of the parent's warmth at a lower level, the decrease in the level of family harmony, and the feeling of lack of family affection (Lau, Lew, Hau, Cheung, & Berndt, 1990). It is observed that individuals with authoritarian parents are good at obedience and adapting to the standards set by the upper generation individuals, but their levels of self-compassion are low (Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, & Dornbusch, 1991). The third dimension of family climate is the cognitive adjustment. Cognitive adjustment: It is expressed as the fact that family members have a similar perspective on many issues, that individuals have similar attitudes, beliefs and values about life, that they have common interests and activities they enjoy, and that they have similar thoughts on many issues related to life (Björnberg & Nicholson, 2005). The cognitive adjustment has a facilitating effect on decision-making in family matters. The similarity in the thoughts, values, attitudes, and beliefs of family members is seen as an important factor in the decision-making processes and the functionality of the family (Gönül et al., 2018). Cultural values, social environments and beliefs are very important in shaping the structure of relationships between parents and their children. It is seen that the adjustment levels of individuals with a common cultural background are similar to their parents (Fuligni, 1998). It is stated that the high level of harmony among family members is associated with an increase in the level of personal strength and a low level of loneliness (Sharabi, Levi, & Margalit, 2012). It is seen that the identity development of individuals is positive in families where family members meet at a common point about life, each helps each other, and the sense of togetherness is high (Matheis & Adams, 2004). When all these expressions are evaluated, it is seen that family climate and sub-dimensions contain the most important elements in the holistic development of individuals.

A generation is defined as an individual or a community born close to each other, influencing many important factors and being affected by many important factors, and having similar experiences. The important elements mentioned are the changes in the attitudes of the majority of the society; it includes changes in social, economic, and important events and changes in public policies (Kupperschmidt 2000). Changes in attitudes, social, economic, and political issues have led to the emergence of different generations. In the literature, there are generation classifications that reflect different time periods and are named differently from time to time. The commonly used generation classification is as follows: Old wolves (veterans): 1925-1944, Baby Boomer Generation: 1945-1964, Generation X: 1965-1980, Generation Y: 1981-2000 born (Hart 2006; Yu and Miller 2003). Those born between 2000 and 2015 are called Generation Z.

Relationship in the dictionary of Turkish Language Association; It is defined as mutual interest, bond, relationship, and contact between two things. Individuals establish their first relationships with their mothers and fathers, and generally, individuals learn to establish relationships within the family, which is their first social community. Considering family structures, there are normally age and generational differences between individuals, and essentially an individual establishes the first generational relationship within his family. The culture we are born into generally advises us to approach individuals older than ourselves with respect and to treat individuals younger than ourselves in a loving way. It can be the subject of widespread conversations among the people to whom our elders are attributed the title of wisdom by our society. Although the increase in the number of nuclear families compared to previous years seems to have decreased the upper generation family relations, it can be observed that the grandfather-grandchild relationship still exists in our society. On the other hand, the increase in the geographical distance between the lower and upper generations and the migration from the village to the city for the reasons of education and employment negatively affect the intergenerational social relations. This situation can lead to conflict between individuals belonging to different generations (grandparents, parents, and their children) (Tufan & Yazici, 2009). Today, there are more cases that are related to intergenerational relations. In our society, family structures and the relationships between different generations of individuals in the family are changing, and the point that is taken into consideration is not the structure of the relationships, but the quality and level of interaction (Muftuler, 2019). Acquiring new information, transferring traditions from generation to generation, young people benefiting from the experiences of older individuals and participation of the elderly in society, etc. These phenomena can enrich the quality of life of individuals in different generations, contribute to their life satisfaction and strengthen the relationships between individuals from different generations. Intergenerational relations are very important in many ways. Studies have shown that a positive and high level of intergenerational relationship results in higher levels of self-confidence and self-esteem in individuals (Lowenstein, 2007; Pinquart & Sörensen, 2000), high level of marital relationship quality (Stokes, 2016), well-being in adult children (Polenick, Fredman, Birditt, & Zarit, 2016); low levels of loneliness (Long & Martin, 2000), high levels of psychological well-being (Reczek & Zhang, 2016; Umberson, 1992), and higher levels of life satisfaction for each generation (Bai, Guo, & Fu, 2017; Polenick et al., 2016). Today, care is taken to build intergenerational relations in line with these benefits. In this direction, increasing the interaction between the elderly and children in Turkey; It is argued that it is necessary to provide environments where they can be together and to allocate time to each other in the family (Arpacı & Şahin, 2015). In Turkey, the importance of the lower/upper generation interaction has been realized and intergenerational activities that bring together the young and old generations have increased. Sub-Dimensions of Intergenerational Relationship According to the solidarity model, the intergenerational relationship includes 6 solidarity dimensions: Structural (interaction opportunities), Relational (frequency and type of interaction and activity), Emotional (positive feelings and emotions), Reciprocity/together (attitude and value coexistence), normative (obligations and family obligations), They are functional (providing resources and support) sub-dimensions (Bengtson & Schrader, 1982; Bengtson & Roberts, 1991).

Some researchers objected to this model and stated that the conflict sub-dimension, which has an important place in intergenerational relations, is missing. They claim that conflict phenomena such as intergenerational differences and intergenerational tension should also be addressed in this context (Clarke, Preston, Raksin, & Bengtson, 1999; Lowenstein, 2007; Van Gaalen & Dykstra, 2006). Considering the quality of intergenerational relations in the light of this information; it can be said that the interaction opportunities created, the activities done together, positive emotional support, consensus on attitudes and values, and volunteering about obligations and support will affect the relations. An interdisciplinary initiative is needed in the development of intergenerational relations (Larkin & Newman, 1997). The smallest social unit of the society is the family, and intergenerational communication and interaction primarily start within the family. When a large family is imagined, it can be said that in the past years, grandparents and grandchildren lived in the same house, and the relationship and interaction with the upper generation were quite high. Today, as mentioned above, migration due to living conditions and other reasons and separation from grandparents also affect intergenerational relations within families. In addition to the relationships within itself, the family has a very important role in establishing and maintaining relationships with other people, such as friendship, colleagues, and marriage (Covey, 1997).

In this study, the relationship between family climate, which consists of different sub-dimensions and dynamics, and the quality of the intergenerational relationship is investigated. The main research question of the problem situation investigated within the scope of the research: Does the family climate have an effect on the intergenerational relationship quality between family members? In the context of this question, the sub-research questions are: What is the family climate level of the participants? What is the level of intergenerational relationship quality of the participants? What is the relationship between the

participants' family climate and intergenerational relationship quality levels? Is family climate a predictor of intergenerational relationship quality?

Method

In accordance with the purpose of the research, exploratory correlational research method, which is a correlational research type from quantitative research methods, was used. Correlational research is the research conducted to determine the relationships between two or more variables or to obtain clues about the cause-effect relationship between them. While selecting the research group, convenient/accidental sampling method was used. It is difficult to find rich enough information to allow us to see events and the logical connections between events. With this sampling method, time, money and labor savings are achieved by starting the sampling starting from the most accessible respondents until the required size group is reached (Buyukozturk et al., 2020). The research group consists of 672 people who were formed by convenient sampling method and participated in the research voluntarily.

In the research, "Demographic Information Form" was used to measure the demographic information of the participants, the "Family Climate Scale" to measure the family climate levels, and the "Intergenerational Relationship Quality Scale" to measure the intergenerational relationship quality levels. The scales used are five-point Likert type. The demographic information of the participants was obtained with the Demographic Information Form prepared by the researchers. In the form, questions about age, gender, marital status, education level and income status of the participants were included. Developed by Björnberg and Nicholson (2007) and adapted to Turkish by Gonul, Isik-bas and Şahin-Acar (2018), the Family Climate Scale has a six-factor structure consisting of 48 items in the original, and a three-factor structure consisting of 34 items in the Turkish version supported the structure. While the intergenerational authority and cognitive adjustment dimensions in the original scale remained largely the same in the adaptation study, the other four dimensions (open communication, emotional adjustment, intergenerational interest, compatibility) were combined under a single factor and this factor was named intra-family relationality (Gonul, Isik-Bas and Şahin-Acar 2018). In this study, the Cronbach Alpha internal consistency reliability coefficients of the scale were calculated. This coefficient was found to be 0.90 for the 34-item whole of the scale, 95% for the relational dimension consisting of 21 items, 0.73 for the authority dimension consisting of 7 items, and 0.80 for the concordance dimension consisting of 6 items.

"Multidimensional Intergenerational Relationship Quality Scale for Aging Chinese Parents" developed by Xue Bai (2017) was used in the research. After the scale had been translated into Turkish by 4 different English teachers, it was applied by taking the opinion of an expert academician. Consisting of 13 items, the scale consists of structural-relational solidarity (4 items), emotional closeness (3 items), normative solidarity (3 items) and intergenerational conflict (3 items). In this study, the Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient was determined as 0.67 for the whole scale, 0.68 for the structural-relational solidarity dimension, 0.67 for the emotional closeness dimension, 0.73 for the normative solidarity dimension, and 0.79 for the intergenerational conflict dimension.

In the research, an online questionnaire was applied, and it was tried to reach as many individuals as possible belonging to the targeted generations. The online survey, which is applied using web-based programs, is a method that has been widely used in recent years due to the rapid developments in technology. This method, by using various package programs or by making software for this purpose; It provides the opportunity to quickly apply to a large number of people by using electronic communication addresses or websites and the cost is very low (Büyüköztürk et al., 2020). This research is limited with 672 people who live in Kocaeli province.

Findings

In this part of the study, in order to find answers to the research questions, descriptive statistics about the collected data and correlation between variables are included.

When Table 1 is examined, it is seen that 67% (450) of the respondents are female and 33% (222) are male. When the participants were examined according to their education level, it was seen that 3.1% (21) were primary school graduates, 23.1 (155) high school graduates, and 73.8% (496) university graduates. According to the marital status variable, 40.2% (270) of the participants were married and 59.8% (402) were single. It was observed that 25.1% (169) of the participants were members of Generation Z, 41.1% (276) of them were members of Generation Y, and 33.8% (227) of them were members of Generation X. In the analysis made according to the income status variable, it is seen that 10.1% (68) of the participants

are in the lower-income group, 86.6% (582) are in the middle-income group, and 3.3 (22) are in the upper-income group.

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of the sample

Variables	Categories	n	%
Gender	Female	450	67
	Male	222	33
Educational level	Primary School	21	3,1
	High School	155	23,1
	University	496	73,8
Marital status	Married	240	40,2
	Single	402	59,8
Generation	Z	169	25,1
	Y	276	41,1
	X	227	33,8
Income status	Low	68	10,1
	Middle	582	86,6
	High	22	3,3
Total		672	100

According to Table 2, the analysis results obtained from the responses given to the Intra Family Relationality sub-dimension of the Family Climate Scale and the arithmetic mean value ($\bar{x}=4.144$ $SD=.596$) revealed that the family climate level is "very high" in relational terms. Intergenerational authority sub-dimension ($\bar{x}=2.803$ $SD=.646$) is at the "moderate" level; cognitive adjustment sub-dimension ($\bar{x}=3.264$ $SD=.722$) indicates that the level of agreement is "high". The Family Climate Scale arithmetic mean ($\bar{x}=3.712$ $SD=.452$) indicates that the climate level is "high".

When Table 2. is examined, it can be said that the arithmetic mean values of the Structural Relational Solidarity sub-dimension generally show a normal distribution and accordingly, the participants gave similar answers. The answers given to the items belonging to the structural relational solidarity sub-dimension show a normal distribution. The arithmetic averages of the items included in the sub-dimension ($\bar{x}=3,842$, $ss=.800$) indicate that the quality of intergenerational relations is at a "high" level. The arithmetic mean value of the emotional closeness sub-dimension ($\bar{x}= 2,850$ $SD=.697$) indicates that there is a "moderate" level of emotional closeness. It is observed that the arithmetic mean value of the intergenerational conflict sub-dimension ($\bar{x}= 2,850$, $sd=.697$) the level of experienced/perceived intergenerational conflict is at the "moderate" level. Normative solidarity sub-dimensions arithmetic mean value ($\bar{x}=3,347$, $sd=.793$) shows a right-skewed tendency and is generally at a "high" level and the intergenerational relationship quality scale's arithmetic mean value ($\bar{x}=3.712$, $ss=.435$) indicates that the existing intergenerational relationship quality is at a "high" level.

Table 2. Descriptive findings

Variables	\bar{x}	SD
Family climate	3,71	,45
Intra family relationality	4,14	,60
Intergenerational authority	2,80	,65
Cognitive adjustment	3,26	,72
Intergenerational relationship quality	3,71	,44
Structural relational solidarity	3,84	,80
Emotional closeness	2,85	,70
Normative solidarity	3,35	,79
Intergenerational conflict	2,85	,70

Finally, Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated in order to reveal the relationships between the variables of the study. For this purpose, the Pearson correlation coefficient of the relationships among the variables of family climate, intrafamily relationality, intergenerational authority, cognitive adjustment, intergenerational relationship quality, structural-relational solidarity, emotional closeness, normative solidarity, and intergenerational conflict was calculated and shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Correlations between variables

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Family Climate								
2. Intrafamily relationality	.920**							
3. Intergenerational authority	.154**	-.170**						
4. Cognitive adjustment	.727**	.550**	-.009					
5. Intergenerational relationship quality scale	.411**	.361**	.073	.338**				
6. Structural relational solidarity	.197**	.186**	.035	.126**	.836**			
7. Emotional closeness	-.377**	-.394**	.174**	-.379**	.154**	.148**		
8. Normative solidarity	.563**	.480**	-.003	.612**	.596**	.229**	-.385**	
9. Intergenerational conflict	-.377**	-.394**	.174**	-.379**	.154**	.148**	1**	-.385**

When Table 3 showing the correlation analysis of the variables and their sub-dimensions is examined, it is seen that there is a moderately significant positive relationship between family climate and intergenerational relationship quality ($r = .411$; $p < .01$). In addition, emotional closeness ($r = -.377$; $p < .01$) and intergenerational conflict ($r = -.377$; $p < .01$), which are sub-dimensions of family climate and intergenerational relationship quality, are negatively moderately significant, and normative solidarity ($r = .563$; $p < .01$) is a highly significant positive correlation. The relational sub-dimension and the authority sub-dimension ($r = -.170$; $p < .01$) have a negative “high” significant relationship. When the relation between the relational sub-dimension and the other sub-dimensions is examined, the relation between the cohesion sub-dimension ($r = .550$; $p < .01$) is positive and significant at the “moderate” level, and the structural relational sub-dimension ($r = .186$; $p < .01$) is low and significant in the direction, negatively significant with the emotional sub-dimension ($r = -.394$; $p < .01$), negatively significant with the conflict sub-dimension ($r = -.394$; $p < .01$), normative solidarity sub-dimension and ($r = .480$; $p < .01$) it is seen that there is a significant positive correlation. When the relationship of the authority sub-dimension with the other dimensions was examined, it was found that the cohesion ($r = -.009$; $p > .01$), structural relational ($r = .035$; $p > .01$) and normative solidarity sub-dimensions ($r = -.003$; $p > .01$) has no significant relationship. However, there is a low level of positive correlation with emotional intimacy and intergenerational conflict sub-dimensions ($r = .174$; $p < .01$). When we examine the relationship of the adjustment sub-dimension with the other dimensions according to the table, it is found that the structural relational sub-dimension ($r = .126$; $p < .01$) has a very low level of positive and emotional and conflict sub-dimensions ($r = -.379$; $p < .01$).) has a low negative correlation and a positive and high correlation with the normative solidarity sub-dimension ($r = .612$; $p < .01$). Considering the relationship of the structural relational sub-dimension with the other sub-dimensions; It is seen that there is a low-level positive correlation between emotional intimacy and intergenerational conflict sub-dimensions ($r = .148$; $p < .01$), and a low-level positive correlation with normative solidarity sub-dimensions ($r = .229$; $p < .01$). The emotional sub-dimension has a very high positive correlation with the conflict sub-dimension ($r = 1$; $p < .01$) and a low negative correlation with the normative solidarity sub-dimension ($r = -.385$; $p < .01$). The results of the simple linear regression analysis regarding the prediction of the intergenerational relationship quality variable by family climate are given in Table 4.

Table 4. Simple regression analysis results on the prediction of family climate on intergenerational relationship quality

Predictor Variable	B	ShB	β	t	p	r
Stable	2.00	.127		15.763	.000	
Family Climate	.396	.034	.411	11.668	.000	.411
R= .411	R2=.169		F=136.131	P=.000		

Considering the correlation analysis coefficient between the predicted variable, the intergenerational relationship, and the predictive variable, the family climate, it is seen that there is a high level of positive relationship ($r = .411$) between the family climate and the intergenerational relationship. As seen in the table, family climate emerges as an important predictor of the intergenerational relationship ($R = .411$, $R^2 = .169$, $p < .01$). Family climate explains 16% of the intergenerational relationship. It is seen that all sub-dimensions of the family climate variable are predictors of intergenerational relationship quality ($R = .411$, $R^2 = .169$, $p < .01$). Family climate explains 16% of the intergenerational relationship. The order of importance of the sub-dimensions of the organizational family climate, which is the predictor variable, in explaining the intergenerational relationship quality; relational ($\beta = .280$), concordance ($\beta = .168$), and authority ($\beta = .122$). When the values related to the significance of the regression coefficients are examined, it is seen that the three dimensions of family climate, relational ($p < 0.01$), authority ($p < 0.05$) and harmony ($p < 0.01$), significantly explain organizational happiness. When we look at the relationship between the predictor variables and the intergenerational relationship; correlation at the level of correlation with ($r = .143$), [when the effect of other predictive variables was controlled ($r = .266$)], with authority ($r = .035$), ($r = .130$); with concordance ($r = .062$), ($r = .162$)). In multiple linear regression, the predictor variables participate in the analysis together. Hierarchical regression analysis is performed to control the predictive variables that were previously analyzed and to include other predictor variables in

the analysis individually or as models. In this regression analysis, the predictor variables that entered the analysis in the previous steps are the control variables for the predictor variables that will be analyzed later (Büyüköztürk, 2020). In the first step of the analysis, the intergenerational relationship quality, and the relational dimension ($r = .361$) were discussed. Approximately 13% of the variance of the relational variable and the intergenerational relationship quality variable is explained. There is a positive significant relationship between the relational dimension and the quality of intergenerational relations. In the second step, the authority variable was included in the analysis. When the relational variable is controlled, it is seen that the authority variable contributes 1.7% to the previously explained variance in the intergenerational relationship quality variable. When the relational and authority variables were controlled, it was seen that the fit variable included in the analysis in the third step contributed 2.3% to the variance explained earlier in the intergenerational relationship quality variable. There is a positive significant relationship between fit and intergenerational relationship quality.

Results, Conclusions and Recommendations

As a result of the research, it was found that there was a significant relationship between the level of family climate and the quality of the intergenerational relationship, and family climate significantly predicted the quality of intergenerational relationship. It is possible to state that the increase in the level of positive family climate, which significantly predicts the intergenerational relationship quality of individuals, will have a positive effect on the intergenerational relationship quality. It is known from research on the development of the family that family generation relationships are emotionally charged. Both the old and the young are greatly satisfied with it. In their relationships, which are built on the basis of solidarity and assistance, young people are more attracted to offering practical help to their elderly parents. It is seen that the elderly give more economic support to their children (Schütze & Wagner, 1995)

As stated in the literature (Björnberg and Nicholson, 2007), the family climate is an important factor that affects the general functioning and functionality of the family as well as the personal lives of members of the same family. The quality of the relations between individuals living in the family, the intergenerational transmission of the family's values and skills, and the whole concepts such as interactions and family organization creates the family climate (Van et al. 2015).

In the study titled "The Family Climate Perceived By University Students And The Evaluation Of Intergenerational Relations And Family Harmony" conducted by Kaplan (2019) it is seen that individuals who perceive the family climate positively have a positive and high intergenerational relationship perception (Kaplan, 2019). In the multiple regression analysis, it was concluded that the sub-dimensions of family climate, relational, authority and harmony, significantly predicted the intergenerational relationship quality levels of individuals. Although there is no research in the literature that can be associated with the result of the study, there are studies that indirectly reach this conclusion. Tas and Bulut (2019) concluded in their study that the climate of the family directly affects life satisfaction, Kalyencioglu and Kutlu (2010) concluded that adolescents who perceive their families as unhealthy families have a low level of adjustment, Palabiyikoglu et al. (1998), on the other hand, concluded that individuals who attempt suicide perceive family functions negatively. When the relationship levels of the scale sub-dimensions are examined; The relationality sub-dimension, which is one of the sub-dimensions of the family climate scale and aims to determine the level and quality of family relations; It was observed that the level of correlation with the structural relational sub-dimension ($r = .186$) was quite low. This finding: It is supported by a study conducted in Hong Kong. Similarly, the study revealed that adults living in Hong Kong are at a very low level of reaching consensus on values and relationships when compared to European countries (Chan, 2013). The correlation level ($r = -.394$) between the relatedness sub-dimension and the Intergenerational conflict sub-dimension is moderate and negative. According to this, If the climate is positive, intergenerational conflicts will decrease among family members, in the household that most of us call home, and if the climate level increases negatively, intergenerational conflict will increase. It can be said that there is an opposite correlation between intergenerational conflict and relationships. When the authority sub-dimension is examined; It is seen that there is a positive and low level ($r = .174$) relationship between emotional intimacy and intergenerational conflict. This situation shows us that an existing authority in the sense of "wisdom that comes with age" affects the relations positively, but the level of this relationship is low. It can be said that the more qualified use of technology, especially by the younger generations, and the speed experienced in accessing information, the presence of authority in terms of wisdom do not affect the relations much today. The low level of relationship between the sub-dimensions of authority and other sub-dimensions supports this idea. Family members who know the communication skills within the family are knowledgeable about solving problems, are aware of the power of the family, and know the characteristics of healthy and strong families, protect their families

from negative communication and interaction (Canel, 2012). The results of the analysis regarding the adjustment sub-dimension, the consensus reached by the individuals in the family on cognitive issues, or the similarity of their attitudes and beliefs are moderately and highly correlated with the intergenerational relationship quality sub-dimensions. In families where cognitive adjustment is intense, the values related to the relational dimension will also be high. The correlation level of the congruence sub-dimension and the relatedness sub-dimension ($r=.55$) is high. Similarly, the level of relationship with the normative solidarity sub-dimension ($r=.612$) is high and positive. According to the Pearson correlation analysis made on the relationship of the data obtained from both scales applied; There is a moderately positive and significant relationship ($r=.411$) between family climate and intergenerational relationship quality. Recent studies on this subject, especially in Hong Kong, have revealed complex results. While some studies show that younger generations are still willing to take care of older generations, be in contact with them and benefit from their experiences, some studies show the opposite (Chow & Bai, 2011). At this point, it can be said that this study reveals the current situation in our society with the sample reached. According to this, Information exchange within the family, close relationships, and similar attitudes and beliefs constitute the family climate, and the quality of this climate affects the quality of intergenerational relations. Likewise, the point of view of individuals from the younger generation towards the individuals of the older generation and the position they position (wise, authority, experienced people to be respected, etc.) affect the relations positively, albeit at a low level. In the light of these findings, in order to increase the quality of intergenerational relations, and interpersonal harmony in families; It is very important to increase the unity and sharing of attitudes, beliefs and values. Especially in parental attitudes, an attitude that is loving and supportive of individual independence rather than a parental attitude and that can include the younger generations in the decision-making processes will positively affect the family climate. The relationships that individuals who grow up in a moderate, harmonious, and compassionate family climate will establish with both family members and other individuals will be healthier and more sustainable. A positive family climate in which family relations are constructive, family harmony is very good, and there is no or almost no family hierarchy; It is an indispensable element for the growth of healthy individuals. In order to develop a positive family climate, it is necessary to increase the cognitive harmony and solidarity within the family. Recently, researchers see "extreme individualization" as the basis of the problems in the societies of the western world countries, and insist on the necessity of re-examining the concept of family, reconsidering traditional family relations and family order according to the conditions of the day. They think that in the treatment of mental disorders arising from the family relationships of young people in their lives, they can be eliminated by providing communication and emotional security in an environment of love, sharing and tolerance, similar to the "extended family" model (Unlu, 2007). Researchers, for future research, can examine the other factors that affect intergenerational relationships in the family and in the whole community. More time can be spent with children. In this way, both children time spent with technological devices can be adjusted appropriately and family relationships can be developed. It is perfectly normal and healthy to have differences of opinion in a family. Therefore, attention and encouragement can be made to be frank in conversations. All family members can be encouraged to express their thoughts, and care can be taken not to criticize or mock them unjustly when speaking to them. you should adopt a positive communication style in which you can express yourself clearly. You can also be an effective listener by speaking at the person's level and making them feel valued.

References

- Alacahan, O., (2010). "Factors and Functions of Family Unity". *CU Journal of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, 11(1), 289-298.
- Arpaci, F. and Şahin, F.T. (2015). Views of Elderly Individuals on the Interaction of Elderly and Child. *Turkish Journal of Social Research*, 1(1), 231-246
- Bai, X., Guo, Y., & Fu, Y. Y. (2017). Self-image and intergenerational relationships as correlates of life satisfaction in Chinese older adults: Will gender make a difference? *Aging and Society*, 1-18. Advance online publication. doi:10.1017/S0144686X17000113
- Bayer, A., (2013). "Family in Changing Social Structure", *Şırnak University Faculty of Theology Journal*, 1 (8), 101-129.
- Bayramlar, K. , Kumbas, H. , Çam, O. , Keskin, G. & Form, Q. (2009). Assessment Of Family Functions of a Group of Adolescents . *Ankara Journal of Health Services*, 8 (1), 29-39. Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/ashd/issue/40354/482301>
- Bengtson, V. L., & Roberts, R. E. L. (1991). Intergenerational solidarity in aging families: An example of formal theory construction. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 53, 856-870. doi:10.2307/352993

- Bengtson, V. L., & Schrader, S. S. (1982). parent-child relations. In D. J. Mangen & W. A. Peterson (Eds.), *Research instruments in social gerontology: Social roles and social participation* (pp.115-129). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Bernard, C., & Shea, J. (2013). *Family heart of humanity*. UK: Cambridge Scholars.
- Björnberg, A., & Nicholson, N. (2005). *Family Business Leadership Inquiry* Paperback
- Björnberg, A., & Nicholson, N. (2007). The Family Climate Scales-Development of a New Measure for Use in Family Business Research. *Family Business Review*, 20(3), 229-246. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-6248.2007.00098.x>
- Broderick, C. B. (1993). *Understanding family process: Basics of family systems theory*. Sage Publications, Inc.
- Buyukozturk, S., Kılıc-Cakmak, E., Akgun, Ö. E., Karadeniz, S., and Demirel, F. (2020). *Scientific Research Methods*. (28th Edition). Ankara: Pegem A Publishing.
- Canel, A (2012). *Family Life Skills*, Nakis Publishing, Istanbul.
- Chan, Y. L. (2013). Filial piety requires emotional care, not just financial support. *South China Morning Post*.
- Chow, Nelson & Bai, Xue. (2011). Modernization and its impact on Chinese older people's perception of their own image and status. *International Social Work - INT SOC WORK*. 54. 800-815. [10.1177/0020872811406458](https://doi.org/10.1177/0020872811406458).
- Chandran, A., & Nair, B. P. (2015). Family climate as a predictor of emotional intelligence in adolescents. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, 41(1), 167-173.
- Clarke, E. J., Preston, M., Raksin, J., & Bengtson, V. L. (1999). Types of conflicts and tensions between older parents and adult children. *The Gerontologist*, 39, 261-270. doi:10.1093/geront/39.3.261
- Covey, S.R. (1997). *The 7 Habits of Highly Effective Families*. Franklin Covey Company, New York.
- Cagdas, A ve Secer, Z. (2004). *Parent Education*. Konya: Education Bookstore.
- Celik, C. (2010). Turkish Family Structure And Religion in The Process of Change. *Black Sea International Scientific Journal*, (08), 25-35.
- Darling, N., & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting style as context: An integrative model. *Psychological Bulletin*, 113(3), 487-496. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.113.3.487>
- Fitzpatrick, M. A., & Caughlin, J. P. (2002). *Interpersonal Communication in Family Relationships*. Handbook of Interpersonal Communication. Third Edition. Thousand Oaks, Sage, 726-778.
- Framo, J. L. (1996). A personal retrospective of the family therapy field: Then and now. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 22(3), 289-316.
- Fulgini, A. J. (1998). Authority, autonomy, and parent-adolescent conflict and cohesion: A study of adolescents from Mexican, Chinese, Filipino, and European backgrounds. *Developmental Psychology*, 34(4), 782-792. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.34.4.782>.
- Gladding, S. T. (2017). *Family therapy history, theory and practice*. (İ. Keklik and İ. Yıldırım, Trans.). Ankara: Turkish Psychological Counseling and Guidance Association Publications.
- Gönül, B., Işık-Bas, H. and Acar, B. Ş. (2018). "Adaptation of the Family Climate Scale to Turkish and its Psychometric Analysis". *Turkish Journal of Psychological Counseling and Guidance*, 8(50), 165-200.
- Günüç, S. Odabaşı, H. Kuzu, A. (2012). Yaşam Boyu Öğrenmeyi Etkileyen Faktörler. *Gaziantep University Social Sciences Journal*. 11(2), 309-325
- Hart KA. (2006) Generations in the workplace: finding common ground. *MLO Med Lab Obs*. 2006 Oct;38(10):26-7. PMID: 17086828.
- Hui-Chun, Yu & Miller, Peter. (2003). The generation gap and cultural influence: A Taiwan empirical investigation. *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*. 10. 23-41. [10.1108/13527600310797621](https://doi.org/10.1108/13527600310797621).
- Illeris, K. (2004). *The Three Dimensions of Learning*. Frederiksberg: Roskilde University Press.
- Kalyencioglu, D., & Kutlu, Y. (2010). Adjustment levels of adolescents according to their perceptions of family function. *Florence Nightingale Journal of Nursing*, 18(2), 56-62.
- Kaplan, M. (2019) Üniversite öğrencilerinin algıladıkları aile iklimi, kuşaklararası ilişkiler ve aile uyumunun değerlendirilmesi. Adana
- Kaya, H. E. (2010). *European Union lifelong learning and adult education policies*. Doctoral Thesis, Ankara University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.

- Kocayörük, E. (2012). "The Relationship Between Parental Perception and Affective Well-being of Adolescents in terms of Self-Determination Theory". *Turkish Journal of Psychological Counseling and Guidance*, 4(37), 24-37.
- Kulich, J. (1982). Lifelong education and the universities: A Canadian perspective. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 1(2), 123-142.
- Kupperschmidt, B. R. (2000). Multigeneration employees: strategies for effective management. *The health care manager*, 19(1), 65-76.
- Kurdek, L. A., Fine, M. A., & Sinclair, R. J. (1995). School adjustment in sixth graders: Parenting transitions, family climate, and peer norm effects. *Child Development*, 66(2), 430-445.
- Lamanna, M.A., & Riedmann, A.C. (2003). *Marriages and families : making choices in a diverse society*.
- Lamborn, S. D., Mounts, N. S., Steinberg, L., & Dornbusch, S. M. (1991). Patterns of competence and adjustment among adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful families. *Child Development*, 62(5), 1049-1065.
- Larkin, E., Newman, S. (1997). Intergenerational Studies: A Multi-Disciplinary Field. *Journal Of Gerontological Social Work*, 28 (1-2), 5-16.
- Lau, S., Lew, W. J. F., Hau, K.-T., Cheung, P. C., & Berndt, T. J. (1990). Relations among perceived parental control, warmth, indulgence, and family harmony of Chinese in mainland China. *Developmental Psychology*, 26(4), 674-677. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.26.4.674>
- Lave, J. (2009). *The Practice of Learning*. In K. Illeris (Ed.), *Contemporary Theories of Learning*. London, New York: Routledge, 200-208.
- Lowenstein, A. (2007). Solidarity-conflict and ambivalence: Testing two conceptual frameworks and their impact on quality of life for older family members. *The Journals of Gerontology, Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, 62, S100-S107. doi:10.1093/geronb/62.2.S100
- Matheis, S., & Adams, G. R. (2004). Family climate and identity style during late adolescence. *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research*, 4(1), 77-95.
- Muftuler H. G. (2019). "Conflict and Solidarity in Intergenerational Relations in Terms of Parsons System Theory". *Turkish Journal of Social Work Research*, 3 (2), 100-135. Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/tushad/issue/51701/605133>.
- Novotný, P. & Brücknerová, K. (2014). Intergenerational learning among teachers: An interaction perspective. *Study pedagogy*, 19(4), www.studiapaedagogica.cz DOI: 10.5817/SP2014-4-3.
- Palabıyınkoğlu, R., Azizoğlu, S., Özayar, H., Ercan, A. (1993). İntihar girişiminde bulunanların Aile İşlevlerinin Değerlendirilmesi. *Kriz Dergisi*, 1(2): 62-67.
- Pinquart, M., & Sörensen, S. (2000). Influences of socioeconomic status, social network, and competence on subjective well-being in later life: a meta-analysis. *Psychology and aging*, 15(2), 187.
- Polenick, Courtney & Fredman, Steffany & Birditt, Kira & Zarit, Steven. (2016). Relationship Quality with Parents: Implications for Own and Partner Well-Being in Middle-Aged Couples. *Family process*. 57. 10.1111/famp.12275.
- Reczek, C., & Zhang, Z. (2016). Parent-child relationships and parent psychological distress: How do social support, strain, dissatisfaction, and equity matter? *Research on Aging*, 38, 742-766. doi:10.1177/0164027515602315
- Santrock, J.W. (2011). *Lifelong Development*. Nobel Publications.
- Schütze Y. ve Wagner M. (1995) 'Famililire Solidaritt in den splten Phasen des Familienverlaufu, In: B. Nauck C. Onnenlsemann (Ed.), *Familie im Brennpunkt von Wissenschaft und Forschung*, (307-327), Neuwied, Luchterhand
- Sharabi, A. & Levi, Uzi & Margalit, Malka. (2011). Children's Loneliness, Sense of Coherence, Family Climate and Hope: Developmental risk and protective factors. *The Journal of Psychology*. 146. 61-83.
- Smetana, J. G., & Asquith, P. (1994). Adolescents' and parents' conceptions of parental authority and personal autonomy. *Child Development*, 65(4), 1147-1162. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1131311>
- Stokes, J. E. (2016). The influence of intergenerational relationships on marital quality following the death of a parent in adulthood. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 33(1), 3-22.
- Taş, B., Bulut, S. (2019). "Examination of the Relationship Between Family Climate and Life Satisfaction in Adults". V. International TURKCESS Education and Social Sciences Congress Full Text Booklet, 1984-1998.

- Thompson, A., Hollis, C., & Richards, D. (2003). Authoritarian parenting attitudes as a risk for conduct problems. *European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 12(2), 84-91.
- Tufan, İ., Yazıcı, S. (2009). "ntergenerational Relations in Old Age. *Community and Social Work* , 20 (1) , 47-52 . Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/tsh/issue/48475/614059>
- Umberson, D. (1992). Gender, marital status and the social control of health behavior. *Social Science & Medicine*, 34(8), 907-917. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-9536\(92\)90259-S](https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-9536(92)90259-S)
- Unlu, H (2007). Family Communication in Circumcision, Master Thesis, Marmara University, Institute of Social Sciences, Istanbul
- Wenger, E. (2009). A Social Theory of Learning. In K. Illeris (Ed.), *Contemporary Theories of Learning*. London, New York: Routledge, 209-218.
- White, J.P. (1982). *The aims of education re-stated*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Wilson, A. (1985). *Family* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203182017>
- Van Gaalen, R. I., & Dykstra, P. A. (2006). Solidarity and Conflict between Adult Children and Parents: A Latent Class Analysis. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 68(4), 947-960. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2006.00306.x>
- Van Steijn DJ, Oerlemans AM, van Aken MA, Buitelaar JK, Rommelse NN. The influence of parental and offspring autism spectrum disorder (ASD) and attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) symptoms on family climate. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 2015; 24:2021-2030.
- Zorbaz, S. D., and Owen, F. K. (2013). "Developing the Family Relationship Scale for Children". *Turkish Psychological Counseling and Guidance Journal*, 4(39), 58-67.