

Intergenerational care and intersecting inequalities among transnational families in Europe

Ruth Evans, Rosa Mas Giralt and Eleonore Kofman

Introduction to Special Issue of *Population, Space and Place*, 2026; 32:e70317

<https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.70317>

Abstract

This special issue has a central focus on *intergenerational spaces of care*, which have been rather under-explored in studies of transnational families to date. In this introduction, we outline the potential innovative contribution of *care ethics* to understanding intergenerational caring relations within and across borders, showing how several papers in the special issue are enriched by this conceptual framing. The special issue also advances understandings of the *intersecting inequalities* that may marginalise different generations of transnational families. Such structural inequalities are often embedded within increasingly restrictive im/mobility regimes that characterise contemporary migration landscapes in Europe and beyond, within the wider global context of ‘crisis’-driven displacement and post-pandemic times. We call for a relational, intergenerational understanding of care and intersecting inequalities in transnational families. Future research needs to ensure children’s and young people’s perspectives are included, involve multiple generations to produce relational family analyses, and to connect studies of transnational families with those on family caring relations more generally. Finally, this special issue shows the harms caused by restrictive immigration, care and welfare regimes and the need for policies to be based on more expansive, non-normative definitions of ‘family’ that recognise the significance of transnational family care in filling gaps within sedentary welfare regimes and enabling different generations to live ‘care-filled lives’.

Key words:

Intergenerational care, care ethics, inequalities, intersectionality, transnational families, migration, care and welfare regimes

1. Introduction

Caring across borders is often fundamental to family members' efforts to fulfil intergenerational expectations and maintain a sense of familyhood across transnational spaces (Bryceson, 2019; Baldassar and Merla, 2013). Despite the burgeoning literature on caregiving arrangements among transnational families, research specifically exploring intergenerational care is limited. This special issue provides an important new focus on *intergenerational spaces of care* within transnational families and the *intersecting inequalities* different generations may face. It brings together five empirical papers based on multi-generational research undertaken for the [anonymised] ¹, alongside four papers on gendered and age-based family relations drawing from projects conducted with middle or older generations.

This editorial introduction provides a critical overview of existing literature on care in transnational families and highlights key conceptual and empirical contributions of the papers in the special issue. We focus on the themes of intersectional care ethics in transnational families, intergenerational relations, and impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic and the post-pandemic polycrisis context, before detailing the contributions of the special issue, including noting methodological innovations.

2. Intersectional care ethics in transnational families

The notion of the ‘transnational family’ captures the growing recognition that members of families “retain their sense of collectivity and kinship in spite of being spread across multiple nations” (Baldassar et al, 2007, p.13). Such families are characterised by considerable mobility (and immobility), including circular, return and onward migration, which may intensify in response to global financial crises (Mas Giralt, 2017; Turcatti, 2022). Meanwhile conflict and political instability often result in forced displacement and protracted refugeehood that may lead to the dispersal of family members, ‘enforced transnationalism’ and disrupted care relationships (Mas Giralt and Evans, 2025; Svensson, 2025).

While caring arrangements are the mainstay of studies of transnational families, care is rarely theorised from an ethic of care perspective; instead, it tends to be conceptualised in terms of the circulation of care across time and space (Baldassar and Merla, 2013). Within this understanding, care is regarded as a “reciprocal, multidirectional and asymmetrical exchange that fluctuates over the life course within transnational family networks”, circulating among family members over time and space (Baldassar and Merla 2013, p.25). While this approach is helpful in understanding transnational caring arrangements, we propose that care ethics provides a valuable theoretical framing that emphasises relationality and recognises the centrality of care to people’s lives across different spaces and times in the lifecourse. For Tronto (1993), care is defined as an activity involving maintaining, repairing, and supporting the world so all can live as well as possible. It is not limited to the private sphere but should be at the centre of political agendas shaping democratic life and how we live interdependently.

However, caring responsibilities are distributed unevenly in terms of gender, ethnicity, class and religion, reflecting differences in power. Drawing on Tronto’s (1993) and Sevenhuijsen’s

(1998) care ethics perspectives and integrating this with Hankivsky (2014), Raghuram (2019) and others' understandings of how care ethics can be combined with intersectionality, we propose that an intersectional approach to care ethics has much to offer scholarship on transnational families and migration studies that complements a care circulation approach.

Hankivsky (2014, p. 252) argues that the concept of intersectionality offers a “robust method for understanding the significance of intersections of difference and their relationship to power” and can significantly enhance care ethics. Crenshaw (1989, p.140) highlighted the limitations of “thinking about subordination as disadvantage occurring along a single categorial axis” and argued that for Black women, “the intersectional experience is greater than the sum of racism and sexism”. Gender, age and generation are key markers of social difference that shape family members' experiences of giving and receiving care. These social hierarchies are shaped by race, ethnicity, class, nationality, linguistic differences and embodied processes of ‘Othering’ within contrasting welfare, care and migration regimes that govern the social rights of migrant carers and their families in different European countries. Such fluid and contradictory processes of identification and disidentification produce specific effects in the shifting locales of migrants' lives (Anthias, 2008; Hopkins, 2017).

This special issue provides an original contribution that responds to this call. Several of the papers (Mas Giralt and Evans, 2025; Suter et al, 2025; Capstick et al, 2025) explicitly draw on an ethics of care perspective that emphasises the relationality of care and human vulnerability. Other papers adopt a gendered, intersectional lens to analyse caring practices and relationships. Collectively, the papers demonstrate how such intersectional identities and social processes are mutually constitutive (Hopkins, 2017; Hankivsky, 2014) and shape transnational intergenerational caring relations.

3. Intergenerational relations in transnational families

Within the limited literature on intergenerational caring relationships in transnational families to date, the focus tends to be on transnational parenthood and childcare provided by non-migrant kin in countries of origin for adult migrants (Bonizzoni, 2015; Dankyi et al, 2017; Carling et al, 2012). Some studies explore ‘reverse remittances’ flowing from the older generation in the Majority world to middle generation migrants in the Minority world (Mazzucato, 2011; Palash and Baby-Collin, 2018). Yet within these and other studies of transnational families, children are often regarded as recipients of care and their contributions to transnational family life are neglected.

Migration studies conducted with children and young people to date have tended to explore their perspectives in isolation from that of other family members. Available studies have investigated the experiences of ‘stayer’ (non-migrant) children and youth (Osei et al, 2023) or of ‘unaccompanied’ or undocumented refugee and other migrant youth (Heidbrink, 2014; Rosen, 2025). While these studies provide important insights into the diverse ways that children and youth maintain transnational ties and engage in caring practices despite geographical distance, very few studies have sought to understand young people’s perspectives and experiences of transnational care when they are co-resident with migrant parents and relatives. The *Care, Inequality and Wellbeing in Transnational families in Europe research project*¹ reported here explicitly set out to explore children’s and young people’s perspectives of care and transnational family life, alongside those of the middle and older generations, through relational family-focused analyses. Researching children’s perspectives as social actors in their own right is important, in line with the tenets of the

social studies of childhood (James and Prout, 1997; Evans and Holt, 2011; Twum-Danso Imoh et al, 2019). This special issue shows, however, that young people's perspectives also greatly enrich understandings of transnational familyhood, particularly when investigating inter- and intra-generational spaces of care.

Indeed, several scholars have called for greater attention to be paid to intergenerational spaces (Vanderbeck and Worth, 2015) and generational orderings (Punch, 2020; Khan, 2021) more widely, in order to understand age and generation as key social variables that shape relations within and across a range of spatial scales. Valentine (2025, p.12) argues that age cohorts and intergenerational dynamics are “fundamental to understanding emerging patterns of wealth inequality and the transmission of privilege in contemporary advanced economies”. This special issue shows that such analyses are crucial, given recent demographic shifts due to population ageing and international migration, accompanied by worsening inequalities and heightened bordering practices in many European countries and elsewhere globally (McAuliffe and Ceriani Cernadas, 2026).

4. Impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic and post-pandemic geopolitical crises

The COVID-19 crisis brought into stark relief the care deficits many European countries are confronting as ageing societies (Evans, Mas Giralt et al, 2024). The provision of care and wellbeing is shared among different actors – the State, the market, families and communities, including forms of transnational social protection for international migrants and their families (Levitt et al 2017; Kilkey and Merla, 2014). This distribution results in major inequalities in access to care resources and services, in terms of gender, age and generation, ethnicity, socio-economic and legal status, both within each country and between countries. For transnational families with mobility rights, the COVID-19 pandemic from 2020 led to extended periods of

‘care on hold’ and changes in migration strategies for family members subject to ‘immobility regimes’ (Brandhorst et al, 2020; Amelina et al., 2024).

Indeed, the current global ‘poly-crisis’ (Tooze, 2021; Triandafyllidou et al, 2024) of multiple, entangled crises related to conflict and displacement, the climate and ecological emergency, and post-pandemic socio-economic transformations, compounds the range of im/mobility trajectories that characterise contemporary migration landscapes in Europe and beyond (Engbersen, 2018; Merla et al, 2020; Benton et al, 2024). As new contingencies arise and conditions change in sending, transit or receiving societies in response to crisis-driven socio-political contexts, it can lead to new im/mobilities, re-mobility or ‘re-transnationalisation’ (Mas Giralt, 2017; McCarthy, 2021; Turcatti, 2022). To maintain their familyhood across borders, particularly if new care needs arise, transnational families must re-negotiate their caregiving arrangements within increasingly restrictive migration regimes (Evans, Mas Giralt et al, 2024; Mas Giralt and Evans, 2025; Amelina et al, 2024). In particular, the conditions for obtaining visas and for family reunification for migrants and refugees have progressively tightened, especially in countries such as the UK (Triandafyllidou et al, 2024; Coddington and Williams. 2022). As the papers here show (Mas Giralt and Evans, 2025; Ryan et al, 2024), this has differential outcomes depending on the generational position and role of each family member, potentially leading to new intra-familial inequalities, or diminished relational wellbeing.

5. The Special Issue

Having explored some of the key themes relevant to this collection, alongside some of the lacunae of previous studies of transnational care, this special issue provides a novel intergenerational, relational care perspective. The nine original contributions, individually

and together, analyse how caring relations, practices and institutional contexts affect the wellbeing and opportunities of different generations of transnational families within the post-pandemic, polycrisis context. The families participating in the research reported here were based in the UK, Sweden, France, Spain, Italy and Germany, and thus had experiences of contrasting Northern, Western and Southern European migration, care and welfare regimes (Martinelli, 2017; Kilkey and Merla, 2014). Many had extensive kinship ties across borders to other settlement countries in Europe and North America and lower or middle income or conflict-affected origin countries globally.

5.1 Caring relations, care ethics and intersecting inequalities

The contributions in this special issue further understandings of intersectional care ethics (Hankivsky, 2014; Raghuram, 2019) and the unequal power geometries that shape migration, care and welfare regimes. The papers consider diverse relational care needs (based on young or older age, disability, chronic or mental health and linguistic challenges) and the role of varying legal statuses, entitlements and differential access to welfare and health and social care support among diverse groups of migrants in contrasting contexts in Europe. Together, the papers show the significance of care to the relational wellbeing (Atkinson et al, 2012; White, 2016) of different generations of transnational families.

Transnational familyhood is often premised on the values of reciprocity and intergenerational solidarity, although caring relations may simultaneously be fraught with intergenerational tensions and power asymmetries. The papers also demonstrate how intersecting inequalities and monolingual, sedentary institutional settings within the wider hostile environment for migrants in many European countries have detrimental impacts on carers and those they care

for at a range of spatial scales (Suter et al, 2025; Capstick et al, 2025; Mas Giralt and Evans, 2025; Ryan et al, 2024; Evans, Mas Giralt et al, 2024).

Suter et al (2025) directly address the oversight of young people's perspectives in the transnational families' literature through analysis of young people's proximate and distant caring practices for transnational family members. The paper demonstrates how young people's responsibilities in Sweden and the UK are shaped by the transnational social field in which their families are embedded, integrating insights from the literature on young caregiving and care ethics with migration studies. The paper recognises young people's agency in providing a continuum of care for middle and older generations (parents, grandparents and other adult relatives) as well as intra-generationally for siblings and cousins. Language brokering and digital mediation in particular are important dimensions of migrant young people's caring responsibilities that may be crucial in helping parents and older relatives to access formal care resources and integrate into settlement countries.

While caregiving may be valued within families and have benefits for children and families, the paper shows that in some cases, care needs became too demanding and led to inter- or cross-generational conflicts which had negative impacts on young people's wellbeing. Inadequate resources often undermined young people's competence to provide 'good care' (Tronto, 1993) and could lead to conflicting care needs. The paper thus calls for more awareness of young people's active roles in filling the deficits in care, welfare and migration regimes in transnational spaces and questions assumptions about the need for proximity and propinquity to enable 'care-giving' to take place.

Pisaltu's (2024) paper illuminates the role of older generation migrants in Italy as key providers of financial care for their adult children and grandchildren who 'stayed behind' in Romania. The paper challenges previous scholarship that positions the older generation as either recipients of care from the middle generation (usually their adult children) (Baldassar et al, 2007) or as carers of grandchildren, whether through frequent, extended visits as 'flying grandmothers' to settlement countries or as 'stay behind' grandmothers in countries of origin (Nedelcu and Wyss, 2020). Through the case of Romanian domestic and care workers in Italy, Pisaltu's (2024) paper illuminates intergenerational dynamics of (financial) caregiving between older-generation migrant women and their transnational families over time.

Drawing on an intergenerational solidarity framework, the research shows how older migrant women endure hardship and poor working conditions as live-in care workers in the unregulated Italian care sector and play down their own needs, in order to send as much money as they can to adult children and grandchildren in multiple households in Romania. Indeed, older migrant women postpone their return and retirement plans to continue to provide financial and material care to their transnational families, making retirement seem precarious. While participants expressed a strong sense of intergenerational family solidarity, such care was often accompanied by tensions and ambivalences, linked to conflicts between older migrant caregivers' and 'stay behind' care-receivers' differing needs and intergenerational expectations.

Schiefer and Nowicka (2025) focus on the middle generation's caring responsibilities for older parents in Germany, providing insight into the role of geographical distance and cross-border separation on perceptions of the intergenerational care burden. Through analysis of large-scale survey data, the authors provide an innovative comparison of the perceptions of

international migrants caring for ageing parents across borders and those of ‘domestic migrants’ caring for parents at a distance within Germany. While both groups perceived an intergenerational care burden, transnational caregivers reported a greater burden linked to international mobility restrictions such as visa requirements and bureaucracy. The paper concludes that transnational care is not qualitatively different from other caring relations, but entails a higher level of stressors related to im/mobility regimes. We support the authors’ call for stronger links between studies of transnational families and studies of family caring relations more generally.

Family narratives of illness and disability often provide important insights into mobility strategies and the complexity of giving and receiving ‘proximate’ and ‘distant’ care (Evans, 2011). Adopting an intergenerational, lifecourse perspective, Palash et al (2025) offer an in-depth exploration of care trajectories of multi-generational transnational Colombian families to show how care needs drive mobilities and may even determine the persistence of transnationality. The authors draw on in-depth multi-sited ethnographic research with a matched transnational sample that enables them to trace the lifecourse, care trajectories and social protection arrangements of transnational family members in Spain, France and Colombia over time. The research captures complex mobilities and migration temporalities, including the onward mobility of Colombians from Spain and France to other destinations in Europe.

The paper illustrates the gendered nature of care and transnational family formation over time, with ‘*Berracas*’ [brave women] becoming the main income earners and caregivers, and with migration becoming often the best way of caring for their families. The paper demonstrates the ways that transnational family constellations are constantly evolving and

how critical moments in the lifecourse when care needs emerge - related to economic crises, structural violence, family death and paternal abandonment, as well as child birth - shape mobilities and transnational care. Indeed, such dynamics may be the genesis for the formation, maintenance, and dissolution of transnational families - in the authors' words, their 'birth, life and symbolic death'.

The gendered dynamics of caring relations are also evident in institutional settings. Capstick et al.'s (2025) interdisciplinary contribution brings together a care ethics perspective, socio-linguistic analyses and insights from migration studies to highlight the language and literacy practices of transnational families as they navigate institutional systems to access healthcare and education. While the focus is on proximate care in settlement contexts in Sweden and the UK, the paper highlights the importance of understanding the role of the 'transnational' in family members' understandings of 'good care' (Tronto, 1993). The paper highlights how responsibility to provide care is often assumed by (and expected of) women. It reveals the power dynamics involved in interactions with institutional care providers. Through detailed linguistic analysis of case study transcripts, the authors demonstrate how specific communication resources are required in order to successfully navigate unfamiliar institutional contexts. Such unequal power relations particularly disadvantage migrants, even when they have good language competence in the dominant societal language.

5.2 Responses to familial and geo-political crises

Many of the contributions in this special issue provide rich insights into 'critical moments' in the lifecourse (Thomson et al., 2002; Baldassar, 2014; Lam et al, 2026) where a need for care emerges within extended family networks and 'transnational topographies' (Mitchell and Kallio, 2017) are created or reconfigured. Such care needs may be related to economic crises

and onward migration, conflict and displacement, the COVID-19 pandemic, or to other biographical disruptions caused by chronic illness and disability. The papers provide timely insights into caring practices, intersecting inequalities and im/mobility power geometries in different and/or contrasting geographical, political and institutional contexts.

Turcatti (2024) focuses on onward migration in response to the 2008 economic ‘crisis’, analysing the gendered dynamics of social reproduction and care of children among Colombian parents from Spain living in London, UK. Focusing on the middle generation, the paper explores the perspectives of both fathers and mothers regarding material provision and childcare responsibilities and critically discusses how these arrangements may change following settlement in the onward destination. The research reveals that the onward migration process was characterised by gendered patterns of male breadwinning roles in the destination country and female mothering to care for children until their partner was settled. However, following onward migration, some fathers became more involved in social reproductive tasks in the onward destination to cope with downward mobility, while some mothers outsourced social reproductive responsibilities to local and transnational actors such as relatives (usually women), including older children, as well as NGOs, or the state (through welfare benefits). The paper thus challenges hegemonic representations of migrant fathers as uninvolved in the care of their children, and calls for a relational, fluid understanding of social reproduction across time and space.

The COVID-19 pandemic made visible the crucial importance of care, as well as the myriad of ways it is undervalued, cutting across intersecting inequalities. By integrating an (im)mobilities approach with analysis of transnational social protection, Oso et al (2025) address the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, which resulted in the restructuring of

prevailing models of welfare provision and migration in Spain and other settlement countries. Indeed, the pandemic produced immobility regimes (Brandhorst et al, 2020; Merla et al, 2020) that exacerbated existing inequalities facing transnational families. The paper furthers understandings of the immobility regime that emerged in the wake of the COVID-19 crisis, comprising not just spatial immobility, but also barriers to occupational, legal and socio-economic mobility, which shape transnational family care. Drawing on secondary data and qualitative methods, Oso et al (2025) conceptualise the impacts of the pandemic in terms of ‘an assemblage of immobilities’, comprising spatial, socio-occupational, legal and residential, educational, care and health immobilities and immobility of gender. The authors conclude that more recently arrived Latin American families were more affected by the pandemic, becoming entangled in social and spatial immobility. The paper provides a much needed gendered, intergenerational analysis at the macro, meso and micro levels in a Southern European, ‘familistic’ (Saraceno, 2016) welfare context.

Examining transnational refugeehood following a specific moment of geopolitical crisis, Ryan et al’s (2024) paper explores transnational family relationships in the aftermath of mass evacuation from Kabul, Afghanistan in 2021. Drawing on qualitative longitudinal data with Afghan women in London, the research examines how refugees dispersed across different countries confront different immobility regimes. Visa regimes, in particular, shape the possibilities for in-person family visits that previous studies have shown are crucial for maintaining transnational familyhood and care across borders (Baldassar, 2023; Ramirez et al, 2007; see also Mas Giralt and Evans, 2025 this issue). In view of inequalities in global mobility rights and restrictive visa regimes (Mau et al, 2015), Ryan et al (2024)’s paper shows how family members exert their agency to find alternative third countries where dispersed transnational kin can meet. The authors, however, highlight the complexities of

such family visits, where important silences about family tragedies may be maintained. This supports research in other contexts which has pointed to the relevance of processes of silencing, concealing information and emotions, and avoiding conflict to transnational care (Sampaio, 2020; Serra Mingot, 2020).

While the evacuation from Kabul offered women new opportunities and freedoms from the controlling influence of in-laws and older male relatives, it also distanced them from sources of family solidarity and mutual support from female relatives. The authors thus question an unproblematic notion of transnational family life among evacuated Afghans as part of the humanitarian resettlement scheme in the UK and call for a more nuanced understanding of specific transnational family relationships from a gendered perspective. This also speaks to Serra Mingot's (2020), Mas Giralt and Evans' (2025), Palash's et al (2025) wider arguments about the need to investigate care within more expansive extended family networks across multiple spaces and through time. Furthermore, Ryan et al's (2024) paper highlights gendered and intergenerational inequalities in access to information and communication technologies, such as smart phones, and infrastructural barriers, such as poor internet connectivity, to transnational communication and providing emotional care across borders. This provides an important counter-balance to the 'celebratory tone' (Ryan et al, 2024, p.9) in some scholarly work on the role of ICTs (Alencar, 2020).

At the intersection of care and refugeehood, Mas Giralt's and Evans' (2025) paper examines the ways that forced migrants have to adopt transnational family configurations in response to immigration enforcement strategies. The authors expand the theoretical and empirical scope of the notion of 'enforced transnationalism' (Al Ali et al, 2001) by integrating an ethics of

care perspective through their analysis of caring relations in displaced families with higher care needs, which have been hitherto rather neglected in studies of transnational families.

The research demonstrates how displaced families are subject to a continuum of enforcement strategies which jeopardise their ability to live ‘care-filled lives’ (Tronto, 2013) and undermine their relational wellbeing. The paper also helps to shift the focus from ‘nuclear’ transnational families to more expansive understandings of ‘extended’ transnational families and how these are affected by im/mobility regimes. The research shows how individualised, medicalised practices of resettlement, restrictive visa and family reunification policies and sedentary models of welfare, health and social care can result in enforced ‘nuclearisation’ and the immobility of families over time and space. Transnational family members nevertheless exert their agency and resist enforcement strategies through maintaining and recreating intra- and inter-generational caring relationships and values of family solidarity across family and community spaces in places of sanctuary, as well as transnationally.

Family reunification policies, a particularly significant ‘relational enforcement strategy’ (Coddington and Williams, 2022) governing transnational family life, are inconsistent between different European countries. Moreover, they are based on assumptions about family structures informed by Western nuclear family models that do not acknowledge the diversity of family forms and intergenerational care common in the Majority world (Kofman et al 2011). The special issue papers here collectively challenge reductionist framings of ‘family’ evident in policy and demonstrate the crucial importance of paying attention to tensions and silences within extended transnational family networks about unpaid care work, access to formal care resources and the wellbeing of family members (Poeze et al, 2017).

5.3 Methodological innovations

Engaging in research with transnational family members living in two or more countries is challenging and has tended to focus on small-scale qualitative and ethnographic research with particular ethnic groups rather than provide cross-country comparisons or compare the experiences of migrants from differing cultural backgrounds (Mazzucato and Schans, 2011).

The papers in this special issue together provide rich comparative insights into caring arrangements and intersecting inequalities among transnational social actors of diverse ethnicities and varying legal status. Some papers individually also provide a cross-country comparative approach and are based on research with family members in both settlement and origin countries, addressing concerns about the biases of ‘methodological nationalism’ (Wimmer and Glick Schiller, 2002) and single-location studies.

Schiefer and Nowicka (2025) expand this comparative dimension by contrasting the perspectives of international, internal middle generation migrants and non-migrants caring for ageing parents in Germany. The quantitative analysis demonstrates the similarities as well as the differences in perceptions of the intergenerational care burden between transnational, long-distance and local intergenerational caring relations.

Methodologically, five of the papers are based on a multi-sited, family-focused qualitative, participatory action research and ethnographic methodology that forms the basis of the [anonymised] research project. Underpinned by an ethic of care approach, migrant community members were recruited, trained and supported to conduct qualitative interviews and participatory activities with transnational family members in their preferred language, including remote interviews with kin in countries of origin or other countries of settlement. This peer researcher approach, also adopted by Ryan et al (2024), provided insights into

private family spaces that ‘outsider’ academics would not have been able to access. In-depth ethnographic research, in some cases with a matched sample (between Spain, France and Colombia; see Palash et al, 2025), complemented the peer researcher approach in the [anonymised] project. Such approaches involving multiple generations of transnational families enabled rich understandings to emerge of relational family dynamics of care and mobilities over time.

The other papers draw on a diversity of methods, including quantitative analyses of large-scale survey data, longitudinal qualitative data, life histories, participant observation, focus groups and in-depth interviews, that address some of the methodological limitations of previous studies and provide different windows onto transnational family relations and intergenerational care in contrasting migration, care and welfare regimes in Europe.

6. Conclusion: Towards a relational, intergenerational understanding of care and intersecting inequalities in transnational familyhood

This editorial introduction has provided a critical discussion of existing literature on care in transnational families and identified key themes where there is scope for further development, including: intersectional care ethics in transnational families, intergenerational relations in transnational families and responses to familial and geo-political crises. We have also highlighted the ways that the papers address some of the methodological limitations of previous studies.

By applying a focus on intergenerational spaces of care and intersecting inequalities, the papers in this special issue make novel contributions to existing literature, advancing conceptual and empirical understandings that will foster further scholarly debates and future

research. We call for a relational, intergenerational understanding of care and intersecting inequalities in transnational families. This includes a need for greater attention to be paid to children's and young people's views and experiences of 'proximate' and 'distant' care, for more research with multiple generations to produce relational family analyses, and for more connections between studies of transnational families and family caring relations more generally. Finally, this special issue shows the harms caused by restrictive immigration, care and welfare regimes. Policies need to be based on more expansive, non-normative definitions of 'family' that recognise the significance of transnational family care in filling gaps in sedentary welfare regimes, and, following Tronto (2013), enabling different generations to live 'care-filled lives'.

Endnote

1. The research project... *[anonymised]*.

References

- Al-Ali, N., R. Black, and K. Koser. 2001. The limits to “transnationalism”: Bosnian and Eritrean refugees in Europe as emerging transnational communities. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 24, no.4: 578–600. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870120049798>
- Alencar A. 2020. Mobile communication and refugees: An analytical review of academic literature. *Sociology Compass*. 14:e12802. <https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12802>
- Amelina, A., Barglowski, K., & Bilecen, B. 2024. Transformations of Transnational Care in Times of the Pandemic: Spotlights and Future Prospects. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 47(14), 2925–2937. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2024.2351088>
- Anthias, F. 2008. Thinking through the lens of translocational positionality: An intersectionality frame for understanding identity and belonging. *Translocations: Migration and Social Change* 4, no.1: 5–20.
- Atkinson, S., S. Fuller and J. Painter, J. 2012. *Wellbeing and Place*. London: Ashgate.
- Baldassar, L. 2023. Migrant visits over time: Ethnographic returning and the technological turn. *Global Networks*, 23: 160–173. <https://doi.org/10.1111/glob.12393>
- Baldassar, L., Baldock, C. and Wilding, R. 2007. *Families Caring Across Borders. Migration, Ageing and Transnational Caregiving*. London: Palgrave.
- Baldassar, L. 2014. Too sick to move: distant ‘crisis’ care in transnational families, *International Review of Sociology*, 24, no.3: 391-405.
- Baldassar, L. and Merla, L. 2013. Introduction: transnational family caregiving through the lens of circulation. In *Transnational Families, Migration & the Circulation of Care*, edited by Loretta Baldassar and Laura Merla, 1-24. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Benton, Meghan, Lawrence Huang, Jeanne Batalova and Tino Tirado. 2024. *The State of Global Mobility in the Aftermath of the COVID-19 Pandemic*. Washington, D.C., and Geneva: Migration Policy Institute and International Organization for Migration.

https://www.migrationpolicy.org/sites/default/files/publications/mpi-iom-post-pandemic-state-of-mobility-2024_final.pdf.

Bonizzoni, P. 2015. Here or There? Shifting Meanings and Practices in Mother–Child Relationships across Time and Space. *International Migration*, 53: 166-182. <https://doi.org/10.1111/imig.12028>

Brandhorst, R., Baldassar, L. and Wilding, R. 2020. Introduction to the Special Issue: “Transnational Family Care ‘On Hold’? Intergenerational Relationships and Obligations in the Context of Immobility Regimes, *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships*, 18, no.3: 261-280.

Bryceson, D. F. 2019. Transnational families negotiating migration and care life cycles across nation-state borders. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 45, no.16: 3042–3064. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2018.1547017>

Carling, J., Menjívar . and Schmalzbauer, L. 2012. Central Themes in the Study of Transnational Parenthood, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 38, no.2: 191-217, DOI: 10.1080/1369183X.2012.646417

Capstick, T., Mozetič, K. and Simpson, J. 2025. Mediating Proximate Care in Transnational Families in Sweden and the UK: Language Practices and Institutional Processes. *Population, Space and Place*, 31: e70015. <https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.70015>

Coddington, K. and J.M. Williams. 2022. Relational enforcement: The family and the expanding scope of border enforcement. *Progress in Human Geography*, 46, no.2: 590-604. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03091325211044795>

Crenshaw, K. 1989. Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 1, no.8: 139-167. Available at: <http://chicagounbound.uchicago.edu/uclf/vol1989/iss1/8>

- Dankyi, E., Mazzucato, V. and Manuh, T. 2017. Reciprocity in global social protection: providing care for migrants' children, *Oxford Development Studies*, 45, no.1: 80-95. DOI: 10.1080/13600818.2015.1124078
- Engbersen, G. 2018. Liquid Migration and Its Consequences for Local Integration Policies. In *Between Mobility and Migration*, edited by P. Scholten, P. & M. van Ostaijen. IMISCOE Research Series. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-77991-1_4
- Evans, R., Mas Giralt, R. et al., 2024. *Care, Inequalities and Wellbeing among Transnational Families in Europe. Report of the CareWell comparative, intergenerational study in Spain, France, Sweden and UK*. University of Reading and University of Leeds, UK.
<https://doi.org/10.48683/1926.00119301>
- Evans, R. 2011. Young caregiving and HIV in the UK: caring relationships and mobilities in African migrant families. *Population, Space & Place* 17, no.4:338-360.
- Evans, R. and L. Holt. 2011. Diverse spaces of childhood and youth: Gender and other socio-cultural differences. *Children's Geographies* 9, no.3-4: 277-284.
- García-Sánchez, I. M. 2018. Children as Interactional Brokers of Care. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 47:167-84.
- Hankivsky O. 2014. Rethinking Care Ethics: On the Promise & Potential of an Intersectional Analysis. *American Political Science Review* 108: 252-264.
- Heidbrink, L. 2014. *Migrant youth, transnational families, and the state: Care and contested interests*. University of Pennsylvania Press
- Hopkins, P. 2017. Social geography I: Intersectionality. *Progress in Human Geography*, 43, no. 5: 937-947. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132517743677>
- James, A. and A. Prout. Eds. 1997. *Constructing and Reconstructing Childhood: Contemporary Issues in the Sociological Study of Childhood* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203362600>

- Khan, A. A. 2021. Advancing children's geographies through 'grey areas' of age and childhood. *Geography Compass* e12584. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gec3.12584>
- Kilkey, M. and L. Merla. 2014. Situating transnational families' care-giving arrangements: the role of institutional contexts. *Global Networks* 14, no.2: 210–47.
- Kofman E., Kraler A., Kohli M. and Schmoll C. 2011. Introduction Issues & debates on family-related migration & the migrant family. In *Gender, Generations & the Family in International Migration* edited by A. Kraler et al. 13-54. Amsterdam University Press.
- Lam, T., B. S. A. Yeoh, and Y. Tan. 2026. Linked Life-Course: Mapping the Intertwined Trajectories of Skilled Australian Migrants in Singapore. *Population, Space and Place*, 32: 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.70195>.
- Levitt, P., J. Viterna, A. Mueller, and C. Lloyd. 2017. Transnational social protection: setting the agenda. *Oxford Development Studies*, 45, no.1: pp.2–19.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13600818.2016.1239702>.
- Martinelli, F. 2017. Social services, welfare states and places: An overview. In *Social Services Disrupted: Changes, Challenges and Policy Implications for Europe in Times of Austerity*, edited by F. Martinelli, A. Anttonen, & M. Mätzke, 11-48. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Mas Giralt, R. 2017. Onward Migration as a Coping Strategy? Latin Americans Moving from Spain to the UK Post-2008. *Population, Space and Place* 23: e2017. doi: 10.1002/psp.2017.
- Mau, S., F. Gülzau, L. Laube, and N. Zaun. 2015. The Global Mobility Divide: How Visa Policies Have Evolved Over Time. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 41, no. 8: 1192–1213. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2015.1005007>.
- Mazzucato V. and Schans D. 2011. Transnational families and the well-being of children: conceptual and methodological challenges. *Journal of Marriage & Family* 73: 704-712.

- Mazzucato, V. 2011. Reverse remittances in the migration – development nexus: Two-way flows between Ghana and the Netherlands. *Population Space and Place* 17, no.5: 454-468. DOI: 10.1002/psp.646.
- McAuliffe, M. and P. Ceriani Cernadas, Eds. 2026. *World Migration Report 2026*. International Organization for Migration (IOM), Geneva.
<https://reliefweb.int/report/world/world-migration-report-2026>
- McCarthy, H.N.J. 2021. Onward migration of Latin American families: negotiating citizenship and mobility in times of crisis. *International Migration* 59: 59-76.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/imig.12763>.
- Merla, L., Kilkey, M., and Baldassar, L. 2020. Examining transnational care circulation trajectories within immobilizing regimes of migration: Implications for proximate care. *Journal of Family Research*, 32(3), 514–536.
- Mitchell, K. and Kallio, K.P. 2017. Spaces of the Geosocial: Exploring Transnational Topologies. *Geopolitics*: 22, no.1: 1-14.
- Nedelcu, M. and Wyss, M. 2020. Transnational grandparenting: an introduction. *Global Networks*, 20: 292-307. <https://doi.org/10.1111/glob.12249>
- Osei, O.E., Mazzucato, V., Haagsman, K. 2023. Sustaining Ghanaian Transnational Parent–Child Relationships through WhatsApp: A Youth-Centric Perspective. In *Handbook of Transnational Families Around the World*, edited by J. Cienfuegos, R. Brandhorst, and D. Fahy Bryceson. Handbooks of Sociology and Social Research. Springer, Cham.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-15278-8_7
- Palash P. and V. Baby-Collin 2018. The other side of need: reverse economic flows ensuring migrants’ transnational social protection. *Population, Space & Place* 25.

- Poeze, M, E. Dankyi and V. Mazzucato 2017. Navigating transnational childcare relationships: Migrant parents and their children's caregivers in the origin country. *Global Networks* 17, no.1: 111-129.
- Punch, S. 2020. Why have generational orderings been marginalised in the social sciences including childhood studies? *Children's Geographies* 18, no.2: 128–140.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14733285.2019.1630716>
- Raghuram, P. 2019. Race and feminist care ethics: intersectionality as method, *Gender, Place & Culture*, 26, no.5: 613-637.
- Ramirez, M., Z. Skrbiš, and M. Emmison, M. 2007. Transnational family reunions as lived experience: narrating a Salvadoran autoethnography, *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power*, 14, no.4: 411-431. doi: 10.1080/10702890701578456
- Mas Giralt, R., and R.Evans. 2025. Enforced Transnationalism From an Ethics of Care Perspective: Barriers to Living 'Care-filled Lives' and Resistance Tactics Among 'Forced' Transnational Families in the UK. *Population, Space and Place* 31: 1–10.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.70103>.
- Oso, L., R. Martínez-Buján and P. Moré. 2025. Navigating Care in the Assemblage of (im)Mobilities: Social Protection Strategies Among Latin American Transnational Families in the Post-Pandemic Period. *Population, Space and Place*, 31: e70035.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.70035>
- Palash, P., A. Souto, L. Oso, and V. Baby-Collin, V. 2025. Berracas Caring. The Birth, Life and Death of Transnational Families: A Multi-Sited Ethnography Across Colombia, Spain and France. *Population, Space and Place*, 31: e70071. <https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.70071>
- Pisaltu, I. 2025. Special issue: The experiences of older migrant mothers and grandmothers with intergenerational solidarity in their transnational families. *Population, Space and Place*, 31, e2846. <https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.2846>

Punch, S. 2020. Why have generational orderings been marginalised in the social sciences including childhood studies? *Children's Geographies*, 18, no. 2: 128–140.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/14733285.2019.1630716>

Rosen, R. 2025. From waithood to alternative futures: unaccompanied children and young people's temporalities of care in the UK's migration regime. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 51, no.6: 1543-1560. DOI: 10.1080/1369183X.2024.2441586

Ryan, L., M. Lopez, and M. Rasa. 2024. 'It hurts my heart': Afghan women in London negotiating family relationships and (im)mobility regimes across borders. *Population, Space and Place*, 30: e2814. <https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.2814>

Sampaio, D. 2020. Caring by Silence: How (Un)documented Brazilian Migrants Enact Silence as a Care Practice for Aging Parents. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships* **18**, no.3: 281–300. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15350770.2020.178703>

Saraceno, C. 2016. Varieties of Familialism: Comparing Four Southern European and East Asian Welfare Regimes. *Journal of European Social Policy* 26, no. 4: 314–326. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0958928716657275>.

Schiefer, D. and M. Nowicka. 2025. Intergenerational Care in Local, Long-Distance, and Transnational Families: The Role of Geographical Distance and Cross-Border Separation on Subjective Care Burden. *Population, Space and Place*, 31: e2866. <https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.2866>

Serra Mingot, E. 2020. The gendered burden of transnational care receiving: Sudanese families across The Netherlands, the UK and Sudan. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 27, no.4: 546–567. DOI: 10.1080/0966369X.2019.1611546

- Sevenhuijsen, S. 1998. *Citizenship and the Ethics of Care. Feminist Considerations on Justice, Morality and Politics*. London: Routledge.
- Suter, B., R. Evans, R. Mas Giralt, and K. Mozetič 2025. Young People's Caring Practices in Transnational Families in Sweden and the UK: Care Ethics and Wellbeing. *Population, Space and Place* 31: e70002. <https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.70002>
- Svensson, H. 2025. Transnational belonging and disrupted care relationships, *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 38, no.13: 510-525. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/feae070>.
- Thomson, R., R. Bell, J. Holland, S. Henderson, S. McGrellis and S. Sharpe. 2002. Critical Moments: Choice, Chance and Opportunity in Young People's Narratives of Transition. *Sociology*, 36, no.2: 335-354.
- Tooze, A. 2021. *Shutdown: How Covid shook the world's economy*. Penguin.
- Triandafyllidou, A., Bivand Erdal, M., Marchetti, S., Raghuram, P., Sahin Mencutek, Z., Salamońska, J., Scholten, P. & Vintila, D. 2024 Rethinking Migration Studies for 2050, *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies*, 22, no.1: 1-21, DOI: 10.1080/15562948.2023.2289116
- Tronto, J. 1993. *Moral Boundaries. A Political Argument for an Ethic of Care*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Tronto, J. 2013. *Caring Democracy: Markets, equality and justice*, New York University Press.
- Turcatti, D. 2022. Remapping onward migration through the trajectories of Colombian parents in London, *Migration Studies*, 10(4): 703–721.
- Turcatti, D. 2024. Social reproduction in onward migration: Colombian mothers and fathers from Spain to London. *Population, Space and Place*, 30, e2803. <https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.2803>

- Twum-Danso Imoh,, A, M. Bourdillon, and Meischner, S. 2019. “Exploring Children’s Lives Beyond the Binary of the Global North and Global South.” In *Global Childhoods Beyond the North-South Divide*, edited by A. Twum-DansoImoh, M. Bourdillon, and S. Meischner, 1–10. New York: Palgrave.
- Valentine, G. 2025. Age inequality: Geography’s overlooked dimension of difference. *Progress in Human Geography*, 50(3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/03091325251398859>
- Vanderbeck, R.M. and Worth, N. Eds. 2015. *Intergenerational space*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Wimmer, A. and Glick Schiller, N. 2002. Methodological nationalism and beyond: nation–state building, migration and the social sciences. *Global Networks*, 2: 301-334. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-0374.00043>
- White, S. 2016. Introduction: the many faces of wellbeing. In *Cultures of Wellbeing*, edited by S. White and C. Blackmore. London: Palgrave, 1-44.