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Literature Review on Transnational Grandparent Migration: A View from Australia

1. Introduction

Given the phenomenal increase in transnational mobility, grandparents, like many others, are engaged in and influenced by this trend. Often grandparents are “left behind” when their adult children move to distant places (Ariadi, Saud, & Ashfaq, 2019; Evandrou, Falkingham, Qin, & Vlachantoni, 2017; Falkingham, Qin, Vlachantoni, & Evandrou, 2017; Deependra Kaji Thapa, Visentin, Kornhaber, & Cleary, 2018; Deependra K. Thapa, Visentin, Kornhaber, & Cleary, 2020; Zickgraf, 2017). Others become “flying grannies” or “older migrants” who either temporarily or permanently migrate to where their children are to provide or receive care and support (Hamilton, Kintominas, & Adamson, 2021; King, Cela, Fokkema, & Vullnetari, 2014; Plaza, 2000; Ran & Liu, 2021; Subramaniam, 2019; Wyss & Nedelcu, 2018).

Over the past two decades, researchers have become increasingly interested in transnational migrant grandparents and their roles in childcare and home care for transnational families (Askola, 2016a; Ho & Chiu, 2020; King et al., 2014; Lamas-Abaira, 2019; Plaza, 2000; Ran & Liu, 2021; Shih, 2012; Solari, 2017; Tezcan, 2021; Treas, 2008; Treas & Mazumdar, 2004; Wyss & Nedelcu, 2018). We gathered background information for a project on families’ roles in migration. We are specifically interested in representing perspectives from the Global South and North so the project is called the Decentering Migration Knowledge (DEMIKNOW) and includes scholars associated with migration research centres from Australia, Canada, China, and India. This literature review synthesizes current scholarship and identifies what research is needed from an Australian perspective.

2. Methodology

We reviewed research on Australia’s family and immigration policies and practices, and the key literature relevant to transnational grandparent migration in the international context. Generally, we aimed to answer the following research questions.

1. What do we know about Australia’s family and immigration policies, and their impact on migrant family structures and grandparent immigration?
2. What are some features of grandparent migration in other parts of the world?
3. What are some push and pull factors of transnational grandparent migration?
4. What are some roles and responsibilities of transnational migrant grandparents?
5. What benefits do transnational migrant grandparents and their adult children derive from each other?
6. What challenges do transnational migrant grandparents face?
7. What strategies do they use to address these challenges?
8. How do grandparents use information and communication technologies (ICTs) to maintain their transnational lives?
9. What recommendations can be made based on a synthesis of the current literature?
10. What research gaps might future research consider?

We started with an exploratory review of a wide range of documents followed by a systematic scoping review to identify relevant research reports, empirical studies, policy analysis papers, journal articles, and news about transnational grandparent migration. To
ensure a comprehensive review, an a priori review protocol involving a systematic, explicit, transparent, and peer-reviewed search strategy was developed. This protocol involved six stages: (1) identifying research questions; (2) identifying relevant studies; (3) selecting studies to be included in the review; (4) organizing the selected works; (5) collating and synthesizing the selected works; and (6) final consultation with relevant stakeholders and peer reviewers (Arksey & O’Malley, 2005; Jolley et al., 2017; Levac, Colquhoun, & O’Brien, 2010) (for detailed information about this protocol, please see our upcoming work entitled “Transnational grandparent migration and caregiving: a systematic scoping review” (Nguyen, Baldassar, & Stevens, 2022).

The databases we identified are multidisciplinary or particularly relevant to social research coming from both academic and non-academic sources. After consulting with a senior librarian who has rich experience in databases, we identified academic data sources for relevant studies. They include Web of Science, Scopus, ProQuest, SocIndex, Medline, PsycInfo, Academic Search Complete, Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI), and CINAHL Plus. We also conducted manual searches with other relevant data sources, and Google searches to identify additional academic and non-academic sources (e.g., reports, and electronic news in newspapers or magazines).

Key terms used for our initial searches include Australian family, Australian culture, Australian immigration policy, grandparent immigration in Australia, and parent visas. As a result, relevant data sources, including national census and survey data (e.g., national housing and population censuses by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS), the Household, Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia Survey (HILDA), news, journal articles, and research and policy reports published by Australian government bodies and research institutes were included in the review.

For the scoping review about transnational grandparent migration, the key terms used included migrant grandparent (synonyms: migrant grandparent, migrant grandfather, migrant grandmother, older migrant parent); caregiving (synonym: childcare, home care, informal care, intergenerational care), grandparenting, and global (synonym: transnational, international, global, multicultural). As a result of these terms’ use, relevant journal articles, theses and dissertations, news from newspapers and magazines, government reports, and policies were selected. Other relevant information and data sources were used to create an overall picture of the transnational grandparent migration phenomenon in Australia and beyond.

Using Nvivo 12, we coded and compiled selected texts into nodes, which were further summarized into themes. We did not aim to assess the quality of research evidence or information. Instead, we used the entire set of available information to create a report on the contemporary picture of transnational grandparent migration in Australia and some other parts of the world.

3. Australian Context

Australia is one of the most multicultural countries in the world (Markus, 2014), and home to people from about 300 ancestries, over 300 languages, and 100 religions according to the national population and housing census in 2016 (ABS, 2017). Since the removal of the “White Australia” policy in 1972 and the adoption of the multiculturalism approach in its national building project in 1973, the Australian government has acknowledged and promoted a society of ethnic diversity where immigrants can maintain their cultures, languages, and heritages. Under Australian law, immigrants are to be
respected and treated equally, regardless of their cultural beliefs and practices, origin, race, or religion (Moran, 2016).

In the past, Australia was dominated by European immigrants but since the 1980s, there has been a rapid increase in population groups originating from Asia and other corners of the world. The 2016 national population and housing census data show that between 2011 and 2016, the number of Australians coming from China and India grew, rising from 6 to 8.3 percent and from 5.6 to 7.4 percent respectively. Of the top 10 countries of birth in 2016, five are located in Asia (China, India, Vietnam, Philippines, and Malaysia). Prior to 1981, no Asian countries were in this top-10 list (Parliament of Australia, 2018). The national census also shows that nearly half (49%) of Australians were born overseas (first-generation Australians) or had one or both parents born overseas (second-generation Australians) (ABS, 2017). More than one-fifth (21%) of the Australian population speaks a language other than English at home.

The country’s population aged 65 and older has increased steadily over the past two decades. According to ABS (2019), the senior population increased to 3.67 million in 2016 from 2.19 million in 1996, an increase of 68 percent. In particular, the Australian-born older population grew from 1.51 million to 2.29 million in the same period (+51%) while the overseas-born older population rose from 0.68 million to 1.38 million (+104%). In other words, there has been a sharp increase in the share of overseas-born older population in the total older population (from 30.9% in 1996 to 37.6% in 2016).

Based on the 2016 ABS data, Wilson, McDonald, Temple, Brijnath, and Utomo (2020) projected that by 2056, Australia’s population would grow constantly and reach 8.5 million. The share of the older population would increase from 15.2 percent in 2016 to 20.9 percent in 2056, of which the Australian-born population was projected to reach 58.8 percent of the older population (down from 62.4% in 2016). Meanwhile, there would be an increase in the share of Asian-born groups (19.1%, up from 6.0% in 2016). By contrast, the share of Europe-born groups would decrease sharply, from 25.5 percent in 2016 to 10.1 percent in 2056. Wilson and colleagues (2020) also forecast that Australia’s older population would become more diverse, with the population having European ancestry decreasing while the population from Asia, Africa, and the rest of Oceania will expand.

**Table 1. The past and projected population of Australia aged 65+ by birthplace category, 1996–2056**
Their data indicate that there has been a major shift in the share of the overseas-born older population. Older people from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds will dominate the country’s older population in the years to come. The government therefore needs to plan and deploy culturally relevant policies and services to address this population trend and effectively respond to the needs of older people from diverse backgrounds.

4. **Australian Immigration Policy**

Australia’s immigration policy is designed to target young workers (initially unskilled, now increasingly skilled) to develop its national economy (Fincher, Foster, & Wilmot, 1994; Lesleyanne, 2005). Because of its geographical isolation, modest population, a shortage of labour, and aging population, the country has employed the policy as a tool to recruit young and skilled immigrants (under 45 years old) and to limit the intake of those
coming via the family visa and other streams (Askola, 2016b; Crock, 2001). This policy has been successful in reducing the unemployment rate and increasing salary levels among immigrants over the past two decades (Lesleyanne, 2005). However, the exclusively economic rationale for importing young and skilled immigrants means that the migration of older migrants is discouraged because of “pragmatic calculations of national gain” (Mares, 2011).

Empirical studies and policy analyses indicate that since the 1980s elderly parents’ sponsorship by their children who migrated before them has been increasingly framed as an economic burden (Askola, 2016b; Birrell, 1990; Hamilton, Kintominas, & Brennan, 2018a). The government’s immigration policy over the past five decades conveys this view. In the 1980s, the family reunion rules introduced a “family balance test” and “assurance of support” to control the numbers of parent immigrants, followed by a cap on parent visas and the introduction of contributory parent visas in the 2000s (Katharine, 2003). The temporary elimination of non-contributory parent visas (subclass 103, 804, 114, 838, 115, 835, 116, and 836) for over three months from 2 June 2014 clearly showed that the immigration policy intended to limit older entrants. Although this type of visa was then resumed on 25 September 2014 because of public pressure and a disallowance motion in the Senate on 25 September 2014, its caps of around 1,500 places prior to 2018, 1,275 places between 2019 and 2021, and only 900 places for the 2022–23 migration show that older immigrants are discouraged from coming to Australia.

The only migration option for aged parents is accessing the contributory visas with a fee of around AUD 50,000 and a deposit of AUD 10,000 for “assurance of support” and a 10-year wait to qualify for full welfare benefits (such as old-age pension and other social benefits). However, this visa category goes with several conditions (full 65+ years of age, income family test, family balance test) and it is also unaffordable for non-wealthy families. Despite growing demands, the contributory parent visas have continuously decreased in their numbers, from 7,175 places in 2019 to 6,096 places in 2019–2021 and 3,600 places in the 2022–23 migration intake plus the waiting time of six and more years.

The other parent visa categories (aged dependant relative, remaining relative, carer visas) also experienced a decrease from 562 places in 2019 to 500 places in 2021 (DOHA, 2021). Because of the limitations in permanent parent visa categories, the government introduced the temporary parent visa subclass 870 in 2016, which allows overseas parents to stay in Australia for up to five years with a maximum length of 10 years. This policy, according to Askola (2016b) and Hamilton, Kintominas, and Brennan (2018a) continues to benefit Australia’s economy but does not benefit immigrants.

The visa subclass 870 emphasizes temporariness, which marginalizes older people, excluding them from full civic membership. This is despite their significant contributions to the host national economy in terms of unpaid childcare and home help which enables adult children to fulfill their policy-intended potential as skilled migrants and fully participate in the labour market for dual-income household earnings (Hamilton, Hill, & Kintominas, 2021; Hamilton, Kintominas, & Adamson, 2021; Hamilton et al., 2018a). The restrictions on permanent parent visas and the increasing focus on temporary mobility have created an “immobility regime” — increasingly restrictive migration policies and closed borders that prevent older adults from free mobility for transnational care exchanges (Brandhorst, Baldassar, & Wilding, 2020; Glick Schiller & Salazar, 2013; Merla, Kilkey, & Baldassar, 2020). As a result, many older people have become “fly-in fly-out” grandparents in order to practise transnational care (Da, 2003; Hamilton, Kintominas, & Adamson, 2021; Plaza, 2000). This “immobility regime” places older migrants in a
vulnerable position where they cannot access full social and health services, especially if their country of origin and Australia do not have reciprocal health care agreements (Brandhorst, 2020).

Some people argue that older immigrants can move back to their homelands to access social welfare services. However, costly airfares, the physical toll of travel, and family obligations in the country of destination prevent older migrants from accessing their homeland’s full social services. The exclusion of older parents from the immigration policy because of assumptions about their low productivity—assumptions that overlook the critical role they play in their household’s workforce participation—also raises “a broader question about the global ethics of the migration program,” whereby host governments want to take advantage of the labour forces of only young skilled workers but ignore other ethic dimensions such as nourishment, education, and care undertaken by parents and societies—both in the countries of origin and at point of destination (Askola, 2016b, p.315).

According to the classifications of families by the Australian Institute of Family Studies (AIFS), between 1976 and 2011, there were four main types of families in Australia: one-parent families with dependent children, couple-only families, couples with dependent children, and couples with nondependent children (AIFS, 2013). Most Australian households consist of nuclear families (a couple and their children) (Qu, 2020). However, with the increase in cohabitation, separation, and divorce rates (Simons, 2006; Weston & Qu, 2014) this pattern is changing. Emerging non-traditional forms of families include grandparent-headed families, one-parent families, blended families, stepfamilies, couple-only families, and same-sex families (Qu, 2020).

Migration is also changing the nature of family structures in the country. The 2016 national census data revealed that 49 percent of Australians had at least one parent born overseas (ABS, 2017). Among immigrant families those from Asian regions had grown to 11 percent, followed by the families from Southern, Eastern, South-Eastern, North-West, Northern and Western Europe (10%); UK and Ireland (6.4%); and other regions (Middle East and North Africa, Sub-Saharan Africa, New Zealand) (1% to 3%) (Qu, 2020). The increase in immigrant families has increased the growth of extended families in households, which was once uncommon in Australia’s individualistic culture. Extended families are those with three generations (parents, children, and grandparents) and/or other extended family members (uncle, aunt, cousins, or siblings) and/or unrelated people and/or adult children aged 25 years and older. According to Qu (2020), these four types of extended families accounted for 16 percent of all Australian family households in 1991 and 20 percent in 2016. Family households with three generations increased from 3 percent in 1991 to 5 percent in 2016. The increase of extended families is correlated with the increasing number of immigrants, especially those from Asia where familism and collectivism are central to familial relations (See Figure 1).

**Figure 1. Proportions of households including extended families by region/country of birth, 2016**
Immigration has partly contributed to ongoing changes in family structure in Australia. Although these changes are currently insignificant in numbers, empirical studies indicate that extended families benefit from the exchange of care and maintenance of language and culture (Da, 2003; Plaza, 2000; Timonen, 2019).

As the Household, Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia Survey (HILDA) reported, 65 percent and 27 percent of grandparents aged 40 to 69 and over 70 years respectively sometimes cared for grandchildren. The survey results also revealed some gendered patterns in grandparent care: more grandmothers (54%) provided care for grandchildren than grandfathers (46%). Based on data from 2011 to 2017, the report by ABS shows that one in three families with both parents born in Australia received care for their children from a grandparent in a typical week (ABS, 2017). This ratio is almost one in five families with both parents born overseas and one in four families with one parent born overseas. These data show that migrant families have less access to grandparent care than non-migrant families because of geographical distance.

Grandparent migration to Australia is not a new phenomenon - aged parents have migrated to Australia under the Family Reunion Program since the 1990s (Okhovat, Hirsch, Hoang, & Dowd, 2017). However, over the past two decades Australian regulations for parent visas have become stringent, and permanent grandparent migration has reduced significantly, which has contributed to the increase in temporary grandparent migration (Hamilton, Kintominas, & Adamson 2021; Hamilton, Kintominas, & Brennan, 2018b). As Hamilton, Kintominas, and Adamson (2021) point out, although grandparents typically provide low-cost (or even unpaid) childcare to migrant families, Australia’s migration program targets only young workers and keeps out older immigrants (Adamson, Cortis, Brennan, & Charlesworth, 2017; Mares, 2016). When this young skilled population participates in the labour market, they will face constraints caused by family care duties (e.g., childcare, domestic work).
To address these constraints, many young migrant couples in Australia have brought their overseas parents to support them in caring for their young children and maintaining their homes (Hamilton, Hill, & Kintominas, 2021). While Australian immigration policy recognizes that migrant grandparents (either temporary or permanent) are unlikely to participate in paid work, their roles as unpaid childcare providers, consumers, community volunteers, workers, and income contributors to the family have not been taken into account by economists or policymakers in the national economy (Hamilton, Hill, & Kintominas, 2021; Hamilton et al., 2018b; Kintominas & Hamilton, 2019). Migration regulations are challenging for both young migrants and their parents because they rupture reciprocal care relationships. Several policy analysts and scholars have called for changes in Australia’s immigration policy toward older parents’ migration to join their migrant adult children (Askola, 2016b; Hamilton, Hill, & Kintominas, 2021).

5. Conceptualizing Transnational Grandparents

Depending on the objective(s) of each study, researchers have variously conceptualized transnational grandparents to depict how they are involved in care provision and grandparenthood.

In his research into Caribbean-born grandmothers in Britain, Plaza (2000) called older migrants “international flying grannies” or “frequent flyer grannies” because they made multiple transnational flights to different countries (such as the US and Canada) to provide “temporary foster care or childminding services” (p. 97) for their migrant families. In another study, Hamilton, Kintominas, and Adamson (2021) named migrant grandparents in Australia who actively take part in caring for their adult migrant children “migrant grannies”. Treas and Mazumdar (2004) classified this population as “seniors on the move” and discussed how they use various resources to move back and forth between multiple countries. Similarly, other scholars refer to transnational grandparents as “zero generation” - those who visit their migrant descendants and live with them in the same house for a long or short time (King et al., 2014; Wyss & Nedelcu, 2018; Wyss & Nedelcu, 2020). In his recent publication, Tezcan (2021) explored the “first-generation circular migrant grandparents” who are financially independent thanks to their life savings, investments, and retirement pensions. These grandparents travel frequently between countries to transfer their cultural values and sustain intergenerational relationships with their grandchildren.

Wyss and Nedelcu (2018, p. 180) identify four roles of transnational grandparents (G0-A) who engage in: (1) mothering the mother and celebrating the birth of a child (family support in childbirth); (2) urgency troubleshooting and planning to troubleshoot (primarily for temporary childcare); (3) mothers’ substitutes at home (full and permanent childcare and family support); (4) doing, enjoying, and being together (intergenerational care and support). These roles were also conceptualized in other transnational family and migration studies. For example, King and colleagues (2014) categorized grandmothers as childcare providers and socialization agents for their grandchildren. Mihaela and Ionuț (2020) identified three types of older parents who are affected by migration of their adult children and either visited: (a) to provide grandchild care; (b) not to provide grandchild care; and (c) not to visit their migrant children in the receiving country.

Da (2003) and Treas and Mazumdar (2004) in their empirical research with different migrant groups identified transnational grandparents’ roles in the US and Australia as transmitters of home cultural and family values to their grandchildren. In her
recent research on transnational Zhejiangese families, Lamas-Abraira (2019) conceptualized transnational grandparents and great-grandparents as both caregivers and care recipients who were engaged in care-exchange relations with their migrant descendants. This study suggests that not only grandparents but also great-grandparents, as long as their health conditions allow, perform caring roles in transnational contexts.

Treas (2008) first categorized older migrant adults in the US into three types: temporary visitors, permanent US residents, and naturalized US citizens. However, after decoding older migrant adults' narratives, the author conceptualized this group as “permanent” visitors, permanent residents who are not permanent, and naturalized US citizens who maintain ties to another country. Similarly, Zhou (2019) in her research with Chinese migrant grandparents in Canada classified them into three types: Canadian visitor visa holders, Canadian permanent residents, and naturalized Canadian citizens. In their recent study on transnational family research and aging, Ran and Liu (2021) claimed another newly emerging type of transnational grandparents—those who are left-behind older parents in the country of destination. The authors examined Chinese elders in New Zealand and found that older parents who followed their migrant children/grandchildren under family reunification programs to become permanent residents of the country of destination were “abandoned” or “left behind” again when their family migrated to a third country to seek better employment and career opportunities.

Wilding and Baldassar (2018) classified three main types of older people shaped by transnational migration in Australia. The first is aging migrants who migrated when they were young and are now aging in the host country. The second type - migrant elderly - are those who relocate either after or near retirement age. They are mainly temporary and seek accessible, affordable, and desirable lifestyles in a developing nation such as Thailand (Botterill, 2017) or visiting/reuniting with their migrant family members in a receiving country. Wilding and Baldassar (2018) also mentioned another type of older cohort, the left-behind elderly who do not migrate but whose lives are affected by other family members' migration such as adult children, grandchildren, siblings, or other relatives (Evandrou et al., 2017; Falkingham et al., 2017). However, this grandparent cohort is not the group that we investigated in this review.

The types of transnational migrant grandparents we listed represent distinct patterns and trajectories of older people’s migration. They also feature multifaceted complexities of a phenomenon that needs to be more closely examined.

“Push-pull” migration theory refers to the process of selection, cost- and benefit-weighting made by migrants themselves (Mak, 2016). This weighting is often driven by economic motivations, for instance, seeking higher income, a better career, business development, and/or better living conditions (Liu, 2016; Ran & Liu, 2021; Shankar, 2003). However, empirical studies indicate that families play a critical role in decision making for their members' migration. Family relationships may significantly influence migration behaviours from the perspective of maximizing family welfare (Hamilton, Hill, & Kintominas, 2021; Shankar, 2003).

The literature on transnational grandparent migration indicates an interplay of push-pull migration theory and family welfare maximization in the migration process (Hamilton, Kintominas, & Adamson, 2021; Liu, 2016; Sohn, 2007; Solari, 2017; Subramaniam, 2019; Treas, 2008). However, the family-welfare-maximization approach is likely to outweigh the push-pull factor theory because migration at a younger age is more driven by economic, educational, and welfare motives while migration in older age is driven more
by family welfare, that is, providing childcare for grandchildren when their adult children request it (Hamilton, Kintominas, & Adamson, 2021; Sohn, 2007; Subramaniam, 2019). In his research with Indian late-life migrants in the US, Subramaniam (2019) outlined three reasons to push and pull grandparents’ relocation to a foreign country, namely: all their adult children had migrated to the receiving country; their adult children needed grandparents’ support for childcare; and widowed grandparents increasingly needed care as they aged. In another study with Chinese migrants, Treas and Mazumdar (2002) found that adult migrant children facilitated their aging parents’ migration to the US to help with childcare; benefit from the receiving country’s functional welfare system; and receive care when they age.

Hamilton, Kintominas, and Adamson (2021) argued economic and care imperatives are the two major push factors driving grandparents to migrate internationally. Empirical findings suggest that grandparents are pushed to engage in transnational migration because of care obligations embedded in their cultural values (Hamilton et al., 2021; Subramaniam, 2019). These values are strongly held not only by the grandparents coming from Asian culture (Da, 2003; Guo, Lemke, & Dong, 2021; Ho & Chiu, 2020; Liu, 2016; Shih, 2012; Treas & Mazumdar, 2002, 2004; Wyss & Nedelcu, 2020) but also those coming from other cultures (Askola, 2016a; Deneva, 2012; Hieta, 2016; King et al., 2014; Plaza, 2000; Solari, 2017). A strong sense of familial obligations drives grandparents to participate in transnational mobility regardless of personal willingness (Subramaniam, 2019; Treas, 2008). For example, a migrant grandmother in the US said she felt that her daughter “forced” her to migrate to provide critical childcare support for her grandchildren. She said, “she [her daughter] is always mad at me at the telephone and crying (laughing) … Yeah, she pushed. Just [so I] could take care of you! (laughs)” (Treas, 2008, p. 474). Similarly, an older couple claimed they felt obliged to support their daughter in caring for their young grandchild - they couldn’t leave him to be cared for by a stranger. They therefore had to stay back in the US and apply for a green card (Subramaniam, 2019).

This “forced” migration can be also attributed to the pull factor - adult children’s filial obligations make them “pull” their older parents to countries where they reside when the parents age (Ran & Liu, 2021; Subramaniam, 2019; Treas, 2008; Treas & Mazumdar, 2002). Adult children feel that they have to fulfill their filial duties. For example, an Indian adult migrant child confided, “It was somehow not said to you maybe, maybe it was not even expected of you but there was that responsibility that, as your parents grow older you would be the one to step in and take care of them” (Subramaniam, 2019, p. 76). Older adults think they have no choice but to follow their adult children to the new country. An Indian grandmother disclosed, “I only have two children and they are not with me. I have many cousins, relatives and friends but they have their life and they won’t be free to come and look into my affairs and I didn’t want to live with them. So my daughter persuaded me to come here and told me that ‘we can travel to India to visit everyone whenever possible.’ I thought about this long and hard as I wanted to stay in India. But when I started having knee problems, I felt that if I fell suddenly or had any health issues it would not be safe to be staying on my own” (Subramaniam, 2019, p. 52).

While many seniors feel compelled or pressured to migrate, some also choose to migrate for their own personal goals. For instance, Solari (2017) reported on Ukrainian grandmothers who took the lead to migrate to Italy and the US and then persuaded their children and grandchildren to join them in the country of destination. In this migration pattern, grandmothers take the role of the sole decision maker for their migration, which
is different from the other grandparents whose transnational relocations are principally “forced” by their adult children and heavily driven by their family and cultural values. In sum, grandparents’ migration is informed by a complex set of socioeconomic, cultural, and institutional contexts of the home and host country, as well as individual and family circumstances, and migration policies.

A number of empirical studies have captured the gendered aspect of transnational grandparent migration scholarship (Askola, 2016a, 2016b; Braedley, Côté-Boucher, & Przednowek, 2019; Hamilton, Hill, et al., 2021; Hamilton, Kintominas, et al., 2021; Lamas-Abraira, 2019; Mihaela & Ionuţ, 2020; Nesteruk & Marks, 2009; Shankar, 2003; Shihi, 2012; Sohn, 2007; Subramaniam, 2019; Sun, 2014; Tian, 2016; Timonen, 2019; Treas & Mazumdar, 2002). These studies show gender differences where grandmothers take over the primary caregiving role for transnational families, although some grandfathers also engage in transnational caregiving. Such grandfathers occasionally share the caring role with their wives and sometimes become the main caregivers to their migrant descendants when their wives pass away (Hamilton, Hill, et al., 2021; Sohn, 2007; Subramaniam, 2019; Sun, 2014; Timonen, 2019; Treas & Mazumdar, 2002). These differences may overburden grandmothers who prioritize family care obligations based on their cultural and social practices.

In his research with Indian grandparents in the US, Subramaniam (2019) revealed how gender roles manifested when older couples engaged in grandparenting. Grandmothers often cooked and cleaned while grandfathers mostly engaged in transporting grandchildren to schools and bringing them back as well as going out with their grandchildren for movies, sports, and social events. These gendered patterns seem universal in both receiving and sending countries, where grandmothers are principally engaged in “time-critical and physical care tasks” while grandfathers are more involved in “talk-based and social care time” with grandchildren (Craig, Hamilton, & Brown, 2019; Tian, 2016). Such gender roles continue even when grandparents move away from patriarchal systems in their home country to live in a receiving country with more egalitarian norms (Sun, 2014). These differences may overburden grandmothers who prioritize family care obligations based on their cultural and social practices.

Gender disparities are observed not only in caregiving relations, practices, and exchanges but also in premigration periods when families make decisions about intergenerational care. Empirical findings indicate that grandmothers from the global south are often the primary choice of transnational families when they decide which family member (grandmother or grandfather) will migrate first, or alone, to provide hands-on personal care (mainly child care and home help) to their family (Hamilton, Hill, et al., 2021; Lamas-Abraira, 2019; Mihaela & Ionuţ, 2020). These decisions are often influenced by the sending country’s gender norms, where grandmothers are considered the most “suitable” candidates to care for young children and engage in household tasks for their adult migrant children (Sun, 2014; Tian, 2016).

Gender disparities are also evident in the processes of recruiting potential grandparents to participate in empirical studies (Shih, 2012). Researchers often aim to invite both grandfathers and grandmothers to participate in their studies to ensure a gender balance. However, several researchers claim they could not achieve that goal because most of their potential participants were grandmothers (Hamilton, Kintominas, et al., 2021; Solari, 2017; Wyss & Nedelcu, 2018) and grandfathers are often unable or unwilling to participate as a result of work, personal, and gendered commitments (Shih, 2012).

The literature suggests that cultural and social and norms are the biggest contributing factors to these gendered differences in transnational grandparenting and
caregiving. Childcare is traditionally categorized as women’s work (Hochschild, 1989; Kahn, McGill, & Bianchi, 2011). This norm is reinforced in transnational families when migrant men are offered employment opportunities while migrant women are expected to continue their traditional gender roles as mothers and caregivers. These women often choose to stay at home to fulfill their caregiving role, or engage in low-paid, unstable (casual) work (Askola, 2016b; Hamilton, Kintominas, & Adamson, 2021; Sohn, 2007). When comparing grandparents’ caregiving roles in Canada, Tian (2016) found no significant differences between immigrant and native grandmothers. However, Tian claims that immigrant grandfathers are less likely to engage in this task than native (Canadian-born) grandfathers.

This phenomenon can be explained by the fact that immigrant grandfathers are less involved in childcare and household tasks in their home country, a practice that continues when they migrate. Socially constructed gender roles are also shaped by the ages of grandchildren. Grandmothers are more likely to be engaged in raising their young grandchildren while grandfathers get involved when their grandchildren are older (Arber & Ginn, 1991; Thomas, 1995). This explains why migrant grandfathers often choose to migrate later (Lamas-Abraira, 2019) or engage in only school pickups and drop-offs or outings with their grandchildren (Torres & Cao, 2018).

6. Transnational grandparents’ key issues

Grandparents’ lived experiences in receiving countries are often overlooked and under-researched in the transnational grandparent migration scholarship. The literature often focuses on how grandmothers in particular provide care to their adult children and grandchildren. Grandparents often spend most of their time staying at home and performing their caring roles in cooking, cleaning, gardening, and especially providing hands-on personal care for their young grandchildren (Askola, 2016a; Ho & Chiu, 2020; King et al., 2014; Lamas-Abraira, 2019; Ran & Liu, 2021; Shih, 2012; Solari, 2017; Tezcan, 2021; Wyss & Nedelcu, 2018). However, the issues they face during their sojourns and/or settlements have not been well explored and/or systematically reviewed. The literature we reviewed examines the (1) roles of transnational migrant grandparents; (2) benefits of grandparents’ transnational mobility; (3) role of ICTs and new media; (4) constraints faced by transnational grandparents; and (5) strategies grandparents used for transnational mobility.

The current scholarship indicates there are at least eight roles that transnational migrant grandparents play in transnational families. The first is that of a child caregiver who takes the primary or secondary role in caring for young grandchildren when their parents are studying or working (Askola, 2016a, 2016b; Da, 2003; Deneva, 2012; Hamilton, Kintominas, & Adamson, 2021; King et al., 2014; Kintominas & Hamilton, 2019; Lamas-Abraira, 2019; Liu, 2016; Mihaela & Ionuț, 2020; Nesteruk & Marks, 2009; Plaza, 2000; Ran & Liu, 2021; Shankar, 2003; Shih, 2012; Sohn, 2007; Solari, 2017; Subramaniam, 2019; Tezcan, 2021; Torres & Cao, 2018; Treas, 2008; Williams, 2015; Wyss & Nedelcu, 2018; Zhang, 2009).

The second role is home maintainer, where grandparents help with home maintenance, including gardening, cooking, cleaning, laundry, and some light handyman work (Hamilton et al., 2018b; Horn, 2017; Lamas-Abraira, 2019; Shankar, 2003; Shih, 2012; Sohn, 2007; Torres & Cao, 2018; Treas, 2008; Zhou, 2019).
Income contributor and social safety net is the third role, which describes the grandparent who either participates in casual work to generate income or uses their savings to provide financial support for their children (Horn, 2017; Ran & Liu, 2021; Tezcan, 2021; Treas, 2008; Zhou, 2019).

The fourth role is the kin-keeper and moderator of intergenerational solidarity. This grandparent acts as the bridge to connect family members in a kinship bond, fostering and sustaining social relations in the extended family (Kintominas & Hamilton, 2019; Mihaela & Ionuț, 2020; Nedelcu, 2017; Plaza, 2000; Shankar, 2003; Shih, 2012; Subramaniam, 2019; Treas & Mazumdar, 2004; Williams, 2015; Wyss & Nedelcu, 2018; Zhang, 2009).

The fifth role is the nurturer and gatekeeper of morality and home culture - those who teach young grandchildren cultural norms and practices of the homeland in addition to regularly hosting and practising cultural rituals in the host country (Shankar, 2003; Shih, 2012; Subramaniam, 2019; Tezcan, 2021; Torres & Cao, 2018; Zhang, 2009).

The emotional supporter is the sixth role - the person who provides emotional support to their migrant descendants (Horn, 2017; Plaza, 2000; Shih, 2012; Subramaniam, 2019; Wilding, Baldassar, Gamage, Worrell, & Mohamud, 2020; Wyss & Nedelcu, 2018).

The seventh role involves facilitating labour market participation and women’s emancipation. Through their extensive engagement in helping with domestic chores and child caregiving, they enable daughters and daughters-in-law to study or do paid work (Da, 2003; Horn, 2019; Nesteruk & Marks, 2009; Plaza, 2000; Ran & Liu, 2021; Shankar, 2003; Sohn, 2007; Subramaniam, 2019; Treas & Mazumdar, 2004; Wyss & Nedelcu, 2018).

Finally yet importantly, grandparents arbitrate for transnational family disputes as Tezcan (2021) noted in a study on Turkish older immigrants in Germany. Although these many roles illustrate how grandparents make significant contributions to migrant families, these contributions are not widely recognized or valued.

Apart from supporting their migrant children and grandchildren, migrant grandparents also benefit from transnational migration in different ways. For example, they often value hands-on personal care from their migrant descendants (Ran & Liu, 2021; Subramaniam, 2019). Caring for grandchildren often brings them great joy and spiritual satisfaction (Ho & Chiu, 2020; Lamas-Abraira, 2019; Shankar, 2003; Shih, 2012; Sohn, 2007; Wyss & Nedelcu, 2018). Through transnational migration, grandparents also gain greater financial, physical, social, and emotional support from their adult children as a form of care exchange (Shankar, 2003; Horn, 2017; Subramaniam, 2019). Another benefit is that grandparents may gain more negotiating power in familial matters (Wyss & Nedelcu, 2018). Transnational mobility can also offer grandparents new living experiences, including holidays and leisure time in another country (Wyss & Nedelcu, 2018).

Although the roles and relationships of older immigrants are well-documented in the literature, little is known about how grandparents use ICTs and new media to “do family” (Ahlin, 2020; Baldassar, 2008, 2016; Baldassar, Nedelcu, Merla, & Wilding, 2016; Horn, 2017; Madianou, 2016; Nedelcu & Wyss, 2016; Share, Williams, & Kerrins, 2018; Wilding, 2006; Wilding et al., 2020). Only recently has some research explored how transnational grandparents (who temporarily visit or permanently settle in host countries) use ICTs and new media to stay in touch with their physically distant kin, providing transnational care, preserving cultural and social identity, and maintaining intergenerational solidarity, social support, and connections (Baldassar & Wilding, 2020; Demirsu, 2022; Ho & Chiu, 2020; Nedelcu, 2017; Popyk & Pustulka, 2021; Wilding & Baldassar, 2018). Nedelcu (2017) in
her research with Romanian migrants in Switzerland, depicts how these grandparents used ICTs to practise transnational grandparenting. With the affordances of ICTs and new media, grandparents can participate in family processes, which gives them a sense of usefulness and emotional well-being. Wilding and Baldassar (2018) discuss the role of (in)formal social support that older migrants provide not only to their migrant descendants but also to left-behind family members.

With the development of polymedia - “the emerging environment of proliferating communication opportunities and its consequences for interpersonal communication” (Madianou & Miller, 2012, p.170), ICTs and new media have the potential to provide transnational grandparents with solutions to cope with loneliness, isolation, and depression as well as access to informal care through social support networks. With this mind, Baldassar and Wilding introduce the concept of “digital kinning,” which refers to “the processes of engagement with new technologies to maintain support networks to sustain social support and connections, maintain cultural identity, and protect social identity, which is all particularly at risk during the ageing process” (2020, p. 319). Using digital technologies and new media can assist older migrants to age successfully in their transnational lives. Despite the constraints related to the digital divide (Friemel, 2016) and the fact that elders often need great support from family members and digital support programs, older migrants are increasingly using ICTs and new media to make their transnational lives more meaningful.

Although significant benefits accrue from grandparents’ transnational migration, the literature also exposes several constraints and challenges that this population faces. The first and most common constraint involves language barriers (Hamilton, Hill, et al., 2021; Ho & Chiu, 2020; Lie, 2010; Shankar, 2003; Shih, 2012; Sohn, 2007; Subramaniam, 2019; Tezcan, 2021). The second constraint is the risk of intergenerational conflicts, especially between the first generation (grandparents) and the second generation (adult migrant children) while living under the same roof (Ran & Liu, 2021; Shankar, 2003; Tezcan, 2021; Timonen, 2019; Treas, 2008). The third constraint relates to the autonomy and social position that grandparents lose when they leave their home country (Ran & Liu, 2021; Shankar, 2003; Subramaniam, 2019; Treas, 2008). The fourth is the care burden on migrant grandparents’ shoulders (Hamilton, Hill, et al., 2021; Ho & Chiu, 2020; Lie, 2010; Shih, 2012; Tian, 2016; Treas, 2008; Treas & Mazumdar, 2002).

The fifth constraint refers to the lack of social protection, especially for flying grandparents who are under the sending countries’ social protection schemes but often travel to the receiving country to live temporarily. This limits their access to social services because of financial constraints, language barriers, and information inaccessibility (Deneva, 2012; Hamilton, Hill, et al., 2021; Hamilton, Kintominas, et al., 2021; Ho & Chiu, 2020). Finally, families have to bear rising visa costs and meet stricter conditions to bring their older parents to join them (Braedley et al., 2019; Hamilton, Hill, et al., 2021; Hieta, 2016; Liu, 2016; Treas, 2008; Zhou, 2019).

To cope with the constraints faced in their transnational mobility, migrant grandparents apply different strategies. To address language barriers, grandparents seek help from their adult children for interpretation when shopping, attending medical appointments, going on outings, and socializing (Ran & Liu, 2021). Some grandparents seek help from their grandchildren to teach them about local geography, news, and events (Shankar, 2003). With the assistance of information communication technologies (ICTs), some grandparents use smartphones connected to the Internet or installed with computer-assisted translation tools (CAT) to address language barriers.
To handle intergenerational conflicts, some respect their adult children’s privacy and independence, which fits with the individualistic culture of the host country (Nesteruk & Marks, 2009). Others reduce their intensive caring role when they begin to receive income from their employment or pension (Shankar, 2003). However, most grandparents endure their care burdens even when the care work affects their physical and psychological health in the long run (Lamas-Abraira, 2019; Mihaela & Ionuț, 2020; Sun, 2014; Treas & Mazumdar, 2002). To cope with the loss of autonomy and social position, migrant grandparents adapt to their new positions as caregivers and grandparents in the host country (Subramaniam, 2019). They often spend most of their time caring for their grandchildren and/or helping their adult children with domestic chores (Da, 2003; Shih, 2012; Treas & Mazumdar, 2004; Wyss & Nedelcu, 2018). Only some grandparents join social groups maintained by local churches or their ethnic diasporas (Ho & Chiu, 2020; Sohn, 2007). To cope with the lack of social protection, particularly relating to limited or no access to the host country’s public healthcare system, many grandparents do regular exercises to stay healthy and independent so they don’t become a burden on their adult children (Hamilton, Hill, et al., 2021; Subramaniam, 2019). Others bring their own medicine to the host country for daily use. When they have health problems, several grandparents fly back for or delay their medical treatment until they return to their home country (Hamilton, Hill, et al., 2021; Ho & Chiu, 2020). To address the constraints of migration regulations the first and foremost strategy that transnational grandparents use is flying back and forth if they cannot apply for, or are waiting for, a permanent visa (Hamilton, Hill, et al., 2021; Hamilton et al., 2018b; Treas, 2008). Those who desire a permanent residency can choose to pay expensive costs (e.g., around AUD50,000) to join their adult children in the host country (Hamilton et al., 2018b).

7. Research Gaps and Future Research

Most studies on transnational grandparent migration employ qualitative research methods, including semi-structured interviews, participant observation, and focus groups. These studies have a small sample (Da, 2003; Hamilton, Hill, et al., 2021; Shih, 2012; Sohn, 2007; Zhang, 2009). Some studies use quantitative research methods but do not provide an in-depth understanding of the phenomenon. These limitations prevent researchers from generalizing based on available empirical studies. Further research on transnational grandparent migration should employ a mixed method (using both qualitative and quantitative approaches) to better capture a complicated picture of transnational grandparent migration. In addition, culturally appropriate questionnaires combined with different research techniques (observational measures, qualitative interviewing) should be applied to ensure data validation (Shih, 2012; Zhang, 2009). Some studies focus on examining the perceptions of either migrant grandparents (Mihaela & Ionuț, 2020; Tezcan, 2021) and/or adult migrant children only (Da, 2003; Lie, 2010; Wyss & Nedelcu, 2018; Malika Wyss & Nedelcu, 2020). No research has examined the perceptions of grandchildren, grandparents, and adult migrant children toward grandparents’ caregiving and grandparenting. It is therefore unknown how grandchildren perceive their grandparents’ involvement in their lives or how grandparents’ caregiving and grandparenting affect them. More detailed and systematic empirical studies should be carried out to identify various dimensions of interdependent multigenerational transnational families (Liu, 2016; Mihaela & Ionuț, 2020). More theories are also needed.
to develop an overall framework for transnational multigenerational migrant families (Liu, 2016; Shih, 2012). Further research is also necessary to explore the consequences of temporary and permanent visas and immigration policies on the social, psychological, and economic well-being of grandparents and their transnational family members (Kintominas & Hamilton, 2019).

Although grandfathers’ involvement in transnational caregiving and grandparenting in transnational families has been occasionally investigated, they remain underrepresented (Hamilton, Hill, & Kintominas, 2021; Shankar, 2003). Further research should seek to understand the multifaceted relationships of grandparenting roles and responsibilities in providing childcare (Sohn, 2007), especially with reference to young children where affordable, flexible, and accessible childcare is unavailable (Hamilton, Kintominas, & Adamson, 2021).

Despite the increasing role of ICTs and new media in supporting transnational migrant grandparents’ adaptation to their transnational life, little research has investigated this technology. We recommend that further research should examine different practices and relationships between ICTs and transnational aging (Ho & Chiu, 2020; Popyk & Pustułka, 2021; Share et al., 2018).

Despite the studies on mixed cohorts of transnational migrant grandparents (visitors, permanent residents, citizens), no study deals with differences in migration history, socioeconomic backgrounds, lived experiences, roles, benefits, and constraints of this cohort’s members. Comparative studies for each type of migrant grandparent should be carried out.

Although several inquiries have examined relations between transnational grandparent migration and adult children’s professional growth, less is known about how they support adult children’s higher education. Although some research has mentioned migrant grandparents’ poor access to social welfare and health care in receiving countries, no research has specifically examined this topic. In-depth studies will help us understand specific constraints that immigrant grandparents and their adult children face in receiving such support.

We continue to need theories regarding the political economy of informal care that implicates transnational migrant grandparents.

### 8. Conclusion

Grandparents, despite their older age, continue to hold various roles in transnational families, especially in caregiving and grandparenting for young generations. Apart from caregiving, they also serve as income contributors, social safety nets, cultural maintainers, facilitators of women’s emancipation, emotional supporters, and arbitrators of family disputes. By engaging in transnational migration, both grandparents and their migrant children benefit from their journeys. Grandparents can maintain close relations with their young grandchildren, which brings them satisfaction and pleasure because they can see the younger generations grow up. They can also enjoy intergenerational relationships and receive financial and emotional support from their adult children. Meanwhile migrant children and grandchildren enjoy hands-on personal care from older migrants and having more time to study and pursue career advancement.

However, compared to young migrant cohorts, older people are more disadvantaged in different ways. Older migrants continue to be marginalized by immigration policies in which stringent migration conditions (high migration cost, long waiting times, family
income test, family balance test) create an “immobility regime” that constrains older people’s free transnational mobility (Merla, Kilkey, & Baldassar 2020). Apart from that, older migrants face other constraints such as language barriers, intergenerational conflicts, social isolation, care deficits, and financial constraints. To cope with these challenges, older migrants apply different strategies such as keeping silent or not interfering with their migrant children’s matters. They also adapt to changes in cultural and social practices, use ICTs and new media to maintain transnational lives, and pursue life-course learning to master new knowledge and skills.

What we currently know about transnational grandparent migration suggests several policies and practical recommendations to address the issues that this population faces. First, research findings clearly show how transnational migrant grandparents play a significant role in filling care deficits in the country of destination so their contributions need to be recognized and counted in national welfare and migration policies. Second, transnational migrant grandparents face various constraints related to language barriers, cultural differences, isolation, loneliness, depression, care burden, losses of social support networks, and losses of autonomy and power. The governments of receiving countries therefore need to design and deploy culturally appropriate social services and language-teaching programs to aid older migrants to better adapt to the new society.

Finally, transnational grandparenting should not be viewed only through the lens of cross-border grandparental relationships. It should be linked with translocal processes that are shaping and being shaped by various familial, social, cultural, economic, and political elements in both the home and host country, including neoliberal economic globalization. Investigation into interactions between transnationalism and translocality can expose complicated but dynamic relationships between mobility and locality and between the structural inequalities and cultural resiliency rooted in immigrant families’ changing intergenerational relationships.
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