Future living arrangements preferences of middle-aged individuals in Turkey

Sutay Yavuz, *Researcher*

Study Purpose

In Turkey population aging and related issues are increasingly attracting attention of academic, political circles and public opinion. The future of the traditional provision channels of care and health services provided to the older age groups are questioned due to rapidly changing demographics and family structure (State Planning Organization, 2007). These developments have required reviewing prevalent social policies (State Planing Organization, 2006). In order to develop proper plans for an aging society it is crucial to predict the proportion of elderly persons that likely to live alone, with his/her spouse, with children or other relatives or to be institutionalized in the future (National Research Council, 2001). In this way it would be possible to conjecture the extent of implications of these changes for caregiving needs and health service system in advance. In other words, better understanding of the trends in living arrangements of elderly people is critical to develop solutions to current and anticipated problems.

In Turkey, as in the rest of the world, the number of scientific studies in gerontology and geriatrics is rising. In the last 15 years, academic studies on the lifestyles of the elderly have also been on the rise. These studies include, identifying the living arrangements and key factors in these living arrangements for the 60 and over age group (Aytaç, 1998; Aykan & Wolf, 2000; Bandırma Sevimli, 2006), learning the opinions and expectations of the elderly regarding living arrangements (Kalaycıoğlu & Rittersberger-Tılıç, 2000; Turkey Science Academy, 2004; General Directorate of Family and Social Research 2005 and 2010), projections regarding households that will host the elderly populations (Canpolat, 2008) and determining the relationship between the living arrangement and the well-being of the elderly (Koç, Özgören, & Şirin, 2010).

In recent years, the amount of field research on the perceptions, expectations and demands regarding old age among the middle aged individuals has also been increasing. (General Directorate of Family and Social Research, 2010; General Directorate of Family and Social Services 2011a, 2011b). According to the findings in "Expectations Regarding Old Age in Turkey"; 7 out of 10 individuals aged 40-64 have concerns about who will take care of them besides their families (General Directorate of Family and Social Services, 2011). Also 84 percent of the participants desire to have assistance about personal care and domestic works from family and slightly over 40 percent wish to co-reside with their adult children. Preference for going a nursing home, on the other hand, is seen to be related with individuals socioeconomic status; 8 percent of the individuals with high socio-economic status, 6 percent of the individuals with average socio-economic status and only 4 percent of the individuals with low socio-economic status expressed a wish to stay in a retirement home.

Exploring the preferences and expectations of the middle-aged persons about their old ages is a highly important research topic in the research area of population aging. This research topic

has close relations to social policy planning due to the fact that most of the members of this generation, in about one or two decades, will move beyond age of 65. Moreoever, rapid and perpetual economic and social changes leads to increased diversity among individuals in terms of their socioeconomic situation, cultural attributes, and health conditions. Therefore, each age cohort and/or various social groups in the same age cohort would have diverse preferences and expectations about their future (Legare, 2006). Therefore, in order to develop appropriate social policies for the future, we need to take into account diversification of life circumstances of aging individuals and influence of these circumstances on individual's preferences.

This study aims at to contribute to literature in this direction. The living arrangement patterns in old ages is closely interrelated with the type and extent of support one can get from his/her family. Sociological life course perspective argues that continuities and cumulative experiences of an individual turn out to be determining factors of subsequent transitions that he/she experience in future (Wingens, Valk, Windzio, & Aybek, 2011). Thereby, we suppose that individuals demographic, socioeconomic and cultural attributes can be seen as their personal resources that enable or inhibit them when making preference among traditional or non-traditional old age living arrangement patterns.

For instance, having large number of children would be an enabling factor to prefer co-residence with children arrangement instead of solitary living. On the contrary, having few children, in other words deficiency in this demographic resource, might be an inhibiting factor of making the same peference. In the same fashion we argue that individuals who have attained higher level socioeconomic resources and/or more individualistic outlook throughout their life would more likely to choose non-traditional living arrangement patterns over the traditional ones. In contrast, those individuals who are in lack of socioeconomic resources and/or have not gained individualistic values over against collectivist one are less likely to do so the same choices. In brief, demographic, socioeconomic and cultural attributes of middle-aged individuals are the three key resources that can be seen individual-level constitutive elements of their old age living arrangement preferences.

Data and Methodology

Sample

Data of this study stems from "Research on Family Structure in Türkiye" (RFST-2011) that was conducted by General Directorate of Family and Community Services of the TR Ministry of Family and Social Policies (GDFSR).

RFST-2011 has used two questionnaires: The Household Questionnaire and the Individual Questionnaire. The Questionnaires have been prepared by GDFSR, Turkish Statistical Institute (TURKSTAT) and Ministry of Development (MD) (hitherto State Planning Organization) experts and university faculty as a revised version of the questionnaire used in Turkey Research on Family Structure 2006.

The household fieldwork has involved individuals aged 18 and over. The three-phase, multi-layer and randomized sample for the research has targeted rural and urban Turkey and represented NUTS Level 1 (12 geographical zones) as well as Ankara and İzmir. The target sample size was 14,300 and was designed to represent rural and urban Turkey and NUTS Level 1. In order to ensure that the data was representative, 1045 additional households were surveyed in İzmir and 1155 households were surveyed in Ankara. Therefore, the total target sample was 16,500 households.

Settlements whose populations were below 200, institutionalized populations which comprise approximately 3% of the population and include retirement homes, military barracks, hospitals, hotels and kindergartens and, nomadic populations have been excluded from the sample.

The fieldwork was conducted between August and October 2011. As part of this research, information was collected from 12,056 households and 44,117 household members. Furthermore, detailed interviews have been conducted with 23,279 household members who were at or above 18 years old.

This study draws mostly from the data in the Individual Questionnaire. The analysis unit for this study is the individuals aged 50-59 who had at least one child. This group was selected because they represent the middle aged generation and may potentially live with their children in the future. This analysis group comprises of 3,065 individuals.

Measurements

We use following variables in our statistical models:

Dependent variable:

In the Individual Questionnaire, information on old age living arrangement preferences of the respondents aged between 18 and 59 were collected via following question: *How would you like to live when you get too old to look after yourself?* The dependent variable of the study is a categorical variable consisting of six groups: "*Going to a nursing home*", "*co-residence with son*", "*co-residence with daughter*", "*taking home care*", "*no idea*" and "*other*".

As given in Table 4; "*co-residence with son",* and *"co-residence with daughter"* categories are merged into a single category; "*co-residence with children*". This new category is formed comparison category in multivariate analysis. Regarding to the preferences of our study group; four out of 10 of individuals aged 50-59 would prefer to co-reside with his/her children when they feel too old to look after themselves. Those participants who choose non-traditional living arrangement patterns compose 30.4 per cent in total; 10, 2 percent would prefer *to go a nursing home* whereas 20.2 per cent would like to *take home care service*. One out of four respondents declared that they had not been developed a concrete idea on this issue yet.

Table 4. Descriptive statistics for the dependent variable (aged 50-59 group)

Dependent Variable	**Levels**	**N**	**%**
Living Arrangement Preferences: *"How would you like to live when you get too old to look after yourself?"*	*Going to a nursing home*	313	10,2
	***Co-residence with Children* (comparison category)**	1288	42,0
	Taking home care service	620	20,2
	No idea	755	24,6
	Other	72	2,3
	Missing	17	0,6
	Total	3065	100,0

Independent variables:

As stated in study of purpose section, the analysis adjusted for three main dimensions; namely, *family resources, socio-economic resources* and *cultural attributes*. Each dimension contains different number of independent variables. The independent variables are arranged in a way that the last category in each is forms comparison level for that variable.
Family resources: "Total number of children" and "Family Types"

1) "Total number of children" is a categorical variable and it shows the number of children that a respondent have. Levels of this variable are "1 child", "2 children", "3-4 children" and "5 or more children".

2) "Family Types" is a categorical variable and it presents the current living arrangement of the participants. There are 6 levels of this variable: "Solitary", "Single Parent", "Husband and Wife", "Husband & Wife and Child(ren)", "Non Family Household" and "Extended Family"

Socio-economic resources: "Asset Index" and "Education attainment"

Measures of household socioeconomic status can be reflected by income, consumption or expenditure information. However, the collection of accurate income and consumption data requires extensive resources for household surveys. Under these circumstances, application of principal components analysis (PCA) using asset indicators in creating an asset index has been increasingly routine procedure (Rutstein & Johnson, 2004; Vyas & Kumaranayake, 2006). We have computed an asset index using availability of household durable items that are supposed to capture socioeconomic differences among households. The detailed list of variables utilized in this procesure can be seen in Appendix table. The generated factor scores are normalized by subtracting the minimum value and dividing by the range of the indicator values and lastly multiplying with 100. This Min-Max normalization procedure normalized the distribution to have an range 0-100. Lastly the distribution is divided at the points that form the five 20- percent sections so as to form a categorical variable

1) "Asset Index" is a categorical variable that supposed to represent socioeconomic status of the households. It has 5 categories; "Highest", "High", "Middle", "Low" and "Lowest" groups.

2) "Education" is a categorical variable that provide information about attained level of education. There are 6 categories of this variable: "College/University or above", "High School", "Secondary", "Primary", "Non Family Household" and "*Have not completed a school*"

Cultural tendencies: "Residence type until age 18", "Individualistic Values Index", "Religiosity Index" and "Filial Obligation Index"

We have also used PCA so as to construct these three indexes. We have followed a similar procedure that mentioned above. Factor scores again normalized in a way that the distribution has had a range 0-100. Lastly, each distribution is categorized into three equal groups (33 per cent sections): "Low", "Middle" and "High". The detailed list of items and further explanations about the procedure can be seen at Appendix table.

1) "Residence type until age 18" is intends to show whether a participant has a rural or urban background. Three out of fourth of the Turkish population now lives in urban areas today, however a very large proportion of urban dwellers were actually born in villages, or they are the children of village-origin parents (Sunar & Fişek, 2005).

2) "Individualistic Values Index" is assumed to show to what extent a participant sees certain individualistic behaviors as acceptable. Items we employed to form this index are representing atypical situations in Turkey's collectivistic cultural setting. For example, if a person gets "High" value from this index we suppose that he/she has high degree of permissiveness for marriages between individuals from different religious or ethnic background.

3) "Religiosity Index" shows religiousness of a participant. The items used in construction of this variable are about to what extent a participant consider religious precepts in his/her decision makings; namely in choosing: spouse, friend, neighbor, job, political party to vote, dressing and eating. If religion has a decisive role at most of these decisions than that participant got "High" value from Religiosity Index.

4) "Filial Obligation Index" presents to what extent a participant value to have a son or daughter and to what extent he/she has expectations from his/her children (in today and in future). For example; higher degree of consent about those statements "The child provides material support to his parents when he grows up" and "The child takes care of his parents when they are old" means that participant got "High" value from Filial Obligation Index.

Regarding the content of these three cultural tendency indexes, we claim that they are useful tools to identify effect of modern vs. traditional cultural tendencies on dependent variable; that is old age living arrangement preferences.

Background characteristics of the study population are provided in Table 5 and 6.

Table 5. Descriptive Statistics for (Categorical) Independent Variables

	Independent Variables	**Levels**	**N**	**%**
Family Resources	Total Number of Children	1 Child	255	8,3
		2 Children	928	30,3
		3-4 Children	1359	44,3
		5+ Children (ref.)	523	17,1
	Family Types	Solitary	113	3,7
		Single Parent	150	4,9
		Husband and Wife	849	27,7
		Husband&Wife and Child(ren)	1440	47,0
		Non Family Household	27	,9
		Extended Family (ref.)	487	15,9
Socioeconomic Resources	Education	College/University or above	266	8,7
		High School	334	10,9
		Secondary	314	10,2
		Primary	1627	53,1
		Have not completed a school (ref.)	523	17,1
Sociocultural Attributes	Residence type until age 18	Province center/Abroad	669	21,7
		Township	984	32,1
		Village (ref.)	1413	46,1
		Total	3065	100,0

Table 6. Descriptive Statistics for (Index) Independent Variables

	Asset Index	Individualistic values	Religiosity	Filial Obligation
Mean	25,30	22,61	60,40	81,55
Std. Deviation	13,955	24,320	22,350	24,763
Min	0	0	0	0
Max	100	100	100	100
Missing cases	189	121	13	15

Method of analysis

We used Multinominal Logistic Regression models to evaluate factors associated with older age living arrangement preferences. Multinomial logistic regression is the extension for the (binary) logistic regression when the categorical dependent outcome has more than two categories as in this study (Retherford & Choe, 1993; Chan, 2005). Analysis results display whether an independent variable has an effect on the outcome of the dependent variable, and if so, it gives information about the size of that effect. (University of California., 2011)

In the analysis to follow a reference group has to be chosen for comparison. In this study; *preferring to stay with children* is chosen as a reference category, for it is the most frequently preferred old aged living arrangement pattern (Table 4). The odds ratios display how the risk of preferring other options; namely, the nursing home, home care service and not having any idea compared to risk of preferring co-residence with children changes with the independent variable in question, while holding all other variables constant in the models. Parameters with significant positive (negative) coeffients increase (decrease) the likelihood of that response category with respect to the reference category.

Statistical analysis was performed using the PASW Statistics 18 software.

Results

The multinominal logistic regression analysis indicate to what extent differences in old age living arrangement preferences are arise due to differences in family resources, socioeconomic resources and cultural tendencies. The model results are presented at Table 7. In each independent variable the last category is selected as reference category

The indicators about model fitting information show that the final model with all independent variables, is outperforming the null model (i.e. model without any independent variable). - 2 Log Likelihood (-2LL) is lower for the final model (6122,0) than it is for the null model (6681,9); that shows inclusion of independent variables has improved upon the null model. The Likelihood Ratio chi-square test, $\chi^2(96) = 559{,}8, p < .001$, also indicates that our final model predicts significantly better than the null model.

Effect of family resources:

The number of children that a participant has significant influence for "going to nursing home" and "have not got any idea" options relative to co-residence with children preference. The lesser the number of children a participant has the higher the likelihood he/she will opt for "going to nursing home" or "have not got any idea" options instead of co-residence with children. For instance, of those middle-aged participants with one child, odds ratio of preferring "going to nursing home" option is more than 4 times higher than "co-residence with children" choice, given the other variables in the model are held constant.

There is high level relationship between participant's prevalent family type and his/her old age living arrangement preferences. Those participants living alone, in non-family households, in husband and wife and in husband &wife and children family types are respectively more prone to choose "nursing home", "home care" and "no idea" compare to the middle-aged individuals living in extended family households. That is, given all other independent variables kept constant, simpler the form of participant's family type, the more likely he/she will choose non-traditional old age living arrangement patterns.

Effect of socioeconomic resources:

The model findings about the asset index variable has shown that those participants who got the highest level in this index are more likely to prefer a non-traditional old age living arrangement pattern compared to the participants who live in the least affluent households. That is for the highest level of affluence relative to the lowest level, the relative risk of preferring nursing home and home care would be expected to increase nearly by two times, given that other variables are kept constant.

Likewise, when the effect of the education level is considered we found that that those participants who has at least university or college degree, compare to the those who have not completed a school, more than 2 times more likely to prefer going to "nursing home" and "home care" options relative to "co-residence" option. Moreover, the relative risk of preferring home care arrangement over co-residence with children one of high school and primary school graduates are also higher than the uneducated individuals, given all other independent variables in the model kept constant.

Effect of cultural tendencies:

Cultural tendency variables have also significant influence on old age living arrangement preferences.

For the province center/abroad type of residence until age 18 relative to village type residence, the odds ratio of choosing “nursing home” to “co-residence with children” would be expected to increase by a factor of 2.28. There is a similar result when comparing home care preference relative to co-residence with children. That is those participants who spent their lifetime until age 18 in a province center/abroad or in township are more like to choose modern options of old aged living arrangement over co-residence with children than those participants originated from villages.

The high individualistic values are seen to lead participants to prefer “nursing home” option and “have not got idea” about old age living arrangement relative to co-residence with children choice, given that all other variables in the model are held constant. On the contrary, those less religious participants and those who have low level of filial expectations more likely to prefer modern type old age living arrangements and have got any idea about this subject relative to the prefer going to co-reside with children

Table 7 – Multinominal logistic regression analysis to identify factors associated with preferring nursing home service, home care service or having not any idea relative to co-residence with children option

	Nursing home relative to co-residence with child(ren)		**Home Care relative to co-residence with child(ren)**		**Have no idea relative to co-residence with child(ren)**	
	Odds ratio	95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)	Odds ratio		Odds ratio	
Total Number of Children						
1 Child	4.38***	(2.13 - 8.99)	0.89	(0.53 - 1.48)	1.49*	(0.94 - 2.35)
2 Children	3.04**	(1.60 - 5.75)	1.23	(0.86 - 1.75)	1.68**	(1.21 -2.33)
3-4 Children	2.29**	(1.24 - 4.22)	1.17	(0.85 - 1.60)	1.353**	(1.01 -1.82)
5+ Children (ref.)	*1.00 (ref)*		*1.00 (ref)*		*1.00 (ref)*	
Family Types						
Solitary	3.71**	(1.62 - 8.51)	3.32***	(1.73 - 6.38)	2.41**	(1.25 - 4.65)
Single Parent	1.55	(0.76 - 3.18)	0.72	(0.38 - 1.36)	1.23	(0.72 - 2.10)
Husband and Wife	1.80**	(1.07 - 3.03)	1.97***	(1.38 - 2.80)	2.67***	(1.92 - 3.72)
Husband&Wife and Child(ren)	1.68**	(1.04 - 2.72)	1.77***	(1.29 - 2.44)	1.99***	(1.46 - 2.71)
Non Family Household	3.51**	(1.02 - 12.1)	1.50	(0.42 - 5.30)	2.26	(0.78 - 6.56)
Extended Family Household (ref.)	*1.00 (ref)*		*1.00 (ref)*		*1.00 (ref)*	
Asset Index						
Highest	1.90**	(1.15 - 3.15)	1.91**	(1.32 - 2.76)	1.04	(0.74 - 1.46)
High	1.41	(0.87 - 2.27)	1.26	(0.89 - 1.79)	0.83	(0.61 - 1.13)
Middle	0.81	(0.48 - 1.37)	1.39*	(0.99 - 1.95)	0.92	(0.68 - 1.23)
Low	0.99	(0.57 - 1.73)	1.66**	(1.16 - 2.36)	0.96	(0.70 - 1.31)
Lowest (ref.)	*1.00 (ref)*		*1.00 (ref)*		*1.00 (ref)*	
Education						
College/University or above	2.11**	(1.05 - 4.26)	2.84***	(1.62 - 4.96)	1.43	(0.82 - 2.50)
High School	1.58	(0.84 - 2.96)	2.12**	(1.32 - 3.40)	1.31	(0.83 - 2.05)
Secondary	1.05	(0.56 - 1.97)	1.03	(0.65 - 1.64)	0.84	(0.56 - 1.28)
Primary	1.04	(0.63 - 1.73)	1.39*	(1.00 - 1.94)	1.19	(0.90 - 1.59)
Have not completed a school (ref.)	*1.00 (ref)*		*1.00 (ref)*		*1,00 (ref)*	
Residence type until age 18						
Province center/Abroad	2.28***	(1.54 - 3.40)	1.30*	(0.96 - 1.76)	1.121	(0.85 - 1.48)
Township	1.81**	(1.25 - 2.63)	1.53**	(1.18 - 1.96)	1.127	(0.89 - 1.43)
Village (ref.)	*1.00 (ref)*		*1.00 (ref)*		*1.,00 (ref)*	

Table 7 – Multinominal logistic regression analysis to identify factors associated with preferring nursing home service, home care service or having not any idea relative to co-residence with children option (Continues)

	Nursing home relative to co-residence with child(ren)		**Home Care relative to co-residence with child(ren)**		**Have no idea relative to co-residence with child(ren)**	
	Odds ratio		**Odds ratio**		**Odds ratio**	
Individualistic Values Index						
High	1,39*	(0.96 - 2.02)	1,25	(0.95 - 1.65)	1,42**	(1.10 - 1.84)
Middle	0,84	(0.55 - 1.27)	1,21	(0.92 - 1.58)	1,60***	(1.25 - 2.04)
Low (ref.)	*1,00 (ref)*		*1,00 (ref)*		*1,00 (ref)*	
Religiosity Index						
Low	2,36***	(1.61 - 3.47)	1,50**	(1.14 - 1.98)	1,60***	(1.23 - 2.08)
Middle	1,07	(0.71 - 1.60)	0,80	(0.61 - 1.05)	1,08	(0.85 - 1.37)
High (ref.)	*1,00 (ref)*		*1,00 (ref)*		*1,00 (ref)*	
Filial Obligation Index						
Low	1,60**	(1.06 - 2.41)	1,43**	(1.06 - 1.93)	1,33***	(1.01 - 1.76)
Middle	1,15	(0.79 - 1.67)	1,04	(0.81 - 1.34)	0,93	(0.74 - 1.17)
High (ref.)	*1,00 (ref)*		*1,00 (ref)*		*1,00 (ref)*	
R^2 (Nagelkerke)	0,199					
Wald F						

* p <0.1, ** p <0.05, *** p<0.001

Discussion

In Turkey prevailing demographic forces of the population have been swiftly changing in new directions and as a result demographic structure of the country resembles that of developed countries. The growth rates of young age groups have been declining as older age groups have been rapidly increasing. Currently nearly 7 per cent of the total population is in 65 and above ages and a decade later one out of ten in total population will reach old ages (8.4 millions). The increase in the share and size of the older population will have various implications. The number of persons in the main working ages (15-64) to support older people (65 or older) will decline and the demand on middle aged individuals (aged 50-64) to provide support for their oldest-old members (aged 85 or older) will increase. That change in age structure may also bring about compelling demands for change in economic and social resources shared between the generations.

In Turkey predominant cultural values are familistic and relations among family members are strong. Considering its social structure present-day Turkish society can be considered as traditionalist and religious by and large. Elderly care is traditionally accepted as the responsibility of family and the community and that is why today nearly half of the elderly population lives with their children in the same household and of nearly one-third live nearby to their adult children. Nevertheless, intensive social and economic changes have been taking place since the mid-20th century in Turkey. Societal changes; urbanization, economic development female labor force participation, migration, secularization and changing life styles, increasing level of education have been transforming Turkey's social structure into a modern, urban and industrial one. Present-day Turkey is far from to have a homogenous social structure in terms of its cultural values, norms and attitudes. The persisting familistic family practices more and more intertwined with cultural trends of modern urban middle-class. There has been a transition trend from complex and crowded family types to simple and small (i.e. nuclear) families and increasingly more the older people live nearby to their adult children instead of co-reside with them. In brief, Turkey is in a period wherein relations and interdependencies between cohorts are redefined along with increasing diversity in the society. In this societal context, issues related with well-being and care of older people gain more importance, likewise in other "greying" countries.

This study aimed to provide further insight into the old-aged living arrangement preferences and care expectations of middle-aged individuals, between 50 and 59 years old, in Turkey. We assumed that middle-aged individual's preferences would be related mainly with their demographic, socioeconomic and cultural attributes. These three main factors could be seen important resources that enabling or constraining individuals while making preference among traditional or non-traditional living arrangement patterns. The results have shown that middle aged individuals who have fewer children, lives in small and simple families, lives in more affluent conditions and have high level of education, originally exposed to urban environment longer and seized upon individualistic, modern and secular values are significantly more likely to prefer non-traditional living arrangement patterns over co-residence with children arrangement. The results of our analysis is consistent with the developed country experiences, wherein found important relationship between rising level of education, affluence and rise in individualism (Golini & Iacoucci, 2006). It seems that accumulation of socioeconomic resources and adoption of modern individualistic tendencies provides individuals certain flexibility and by suing these sources individuals would like to enjoy with their autonomy during their advance ages.

In contrast, in our analysis we have shown that having high number of children and living in more complex households, in low socioeconomic status and being adopted of popular collectivistic, traditional and religious values leads to choose co-residence with children living arrangement pattern over other options. This finding suggests that having high familial resources is an enabling factor for middle aged individuals to prefer a traditional way of living arrangement. On the other hand lack of socioeconomic resources and cultural support are seen to be constraining factors to choose a non-traditional path for old age living arrangement.

Overall, our analysis suggests that familial and socioeconomic resources and cultural tendencies of middle-aged adults influence their preferences for old- age living arrangement choices. Considering ongoing trends of population aging and societal changes in Turkey; we argue that demand and expectations of individuals about old age living arrangement and care needs may turned out to be a pressing issue in one or two decades. The likely extent of importance of this issue is depending upon to expansion rate of urban middle class and to what extent they will serve as a model of behavior for the social segments, socioeconomically less affluent and culturally more traditionalistic. In this respect, we anticipate that prevalence of co-residence with adult children will proceed to decline in Turkey along with declining fertility, improvements in educational level and income and spread of non-traditional outlook on life. Even so much so that some parts of middle-aged individuals who prefers to live with their children in old ages may not able to do so due to declines in traditional patterns among younger generations. Regarding the fact that old aged care institutions, in particular nursing homes, have been negatively stigmatized in Turkey there would be increasing demand for home care services. In present condition such services are mainly provided by adult children old aged persons and there is acute shortage of qualified professional personnel in this area. Social policies should be directed in a way that both the number and quality of service providers in home care services area should be raised rapidly.