



Intergenerational Family Solidarity

Study of Older Migrants in Estonia

Tatjana Kiilo, Kairi Kasearu, and Dagmar Kutsar

Institute of Social Studies, University of Tartu, Estonia

Abstract. This paper focuses on the provision of help and care to the older generation, comparing the situation of those in Estonia with migrant backgrounds to those with nonmigrant backgrounds. The empirical evidence suggests that, in the case of Estonia, the main factor determining attenuated family solidarity is proximity between family members. Thus, mainly first-generation migrants whose parents live more than 100 km away are at risk from weakened family bonds. The analysis points out significant gender differences, where men are more often deprived of help and emotional support. More relations of solidarity in migrant families where different generations move together are assumed, but the empirical evidence for this conjecture is far from conclusive.

Keywords: intergenerational family solidarity, Estonia, migration, aging, sandwich generation

Introduction

The topic of aging and migration has received widespread academic interest seeing that the outcome of related research could potentially have an impact on policymaking in the domains of migration, social security, and healthcare. Controlled migration is traditionally pursued as a response to the processes of demographic aging. Therefore, many Western countries are becoming more actively involved in a global competition for labor, aiming at compensating for the processes of aging and low fertility rates. The problem lies in the long-term social and fiscal sustainability of this solution at the both the national and community levels, in a situation where the number of older people in absolute and in relative terms is growing, and where the present-day young and middle-aged migrants will constitute a part of the older population of their host countries in 25–40 years (one or one and a half generations). What will be the potential impact of migration on the social welfare and healthcare systems? How will the social aspects of family relations play out in a situation of increasing life expectancy and pressure on eldercare systems? There is evidence of the extremely important role of families in providing informal care to older people, although it is necessary to understand the dynamics of the transnational responsibility between generations and family members in the migrant families. How do mobility and migration impact the practices of intergenerational family solidarity, which are reflected in activities that save family unity and provide care to its fragile older members?

This paper concerns itself with the patterns of intergenerational family solidarity related to the provision of help and care to the older generation among those with a migrant background in Estonia. Together with Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, Ro-

mania, Slovenia, and France, Estonia has a foreign-born population that tends to be significantly older than the native population, the median age of the foreign-born population being over 50. At the same time, a large proportion of this population are non-EU citizens (Eurostat, 2011), whose close older relatives may still reside in the country of descent, for instance, in any region of the former Soviet Union. In Estonia, the influx of mainly Russian-speaking newcomers took place during the period of the Soviet occupation from 1940–1991, as a result of purposefully manipulated and regulated patterns of population movement accomplished via allocation of economic and social resources and various institutionalized mechanisms aimed at influencing individual choices (Buckley, 1995, p. 896). Despite a very high level of socioeconomic and political separation between migrant and Estonian communities, after Estonian independence was reestablished in 1991, the majority of the newcomers remained in the country. The Soviet-period immigrants were not “immigrants” in the classical meaning of this term because they had not crossed the border of a foreign country but had moved from one region of the Soviet Union to the other at some point in the past. However, their position changed literally overnight after the collapse of the totalitarian system, when the borders of the Soviet Union receded (Kutsar, Trumm, & Oja, 1998). Even today, there is evidence of “an imbalance between differentiation and identification mechanisms in identity construction processes” in the migrant population (Nimmerfeldt, 2011, p. 61). This process is characterized by diasporization – on the one hand, the preservation and cultivation of transnational relations, including those with family members, via a complex set of practices, and on the other hand, the development of immigrant ethnic minority identity (on the processes of reidentification see Friedman, 2005). Identity (re)construction and adaptation patterns can vary across generations

(parents–children; grandparents–grandchildren) in the migrant families in Estonia. Monitoring of integration indicates that the younger generation with a migrant background is more proficient in the Estonian language and integrates more quickly into Estonian society than do the older generations (Lauristin et al., 2011). Thus, there is a potential for discrepancies in values among family members in relation to both how the family functions (family roles, responsibilities of family members) and in how the family’s and community’s collective self-identity is shaped pursuant to the changes in the macrolevel social structure.

In socioeconomic terms, during the first two decades of Estonian reindpendence, the Russian-speaking newcomers lost their privileged position in society and were additionally experience an identity search. There is evidence of an increase in social inequality and ethnic differences in life expectancy, unemployment, alcohol consumption, poverty, etc., between the Estonian and Russian-speaking populations (Lauristin, 2011; Leinsalu, Vågerö, & Kunst, 2004). To summarize, the Estonian posttransition society is characterized by a “sharp differentiation of life opportunities (including opportunities related to the labor market), based on market capacities, and the importance of status groups (especially ‘Estonian’ vs. ‘Russian-speaking’ ethnicity)” (Helemäe & Saar, 2012, p. 53). The preretirement age group of Russian-speaking migrants went through a troubled identity (re)construction process under the conditions of Estonianization of all spheres of life and the deconstruction of the Soviet past (Kutsar & Kärner, 2010). In objective terms, this generation experienced a decrease in welfare and exposure to different social risks, causing them to perceive inequality of opportunities in employment, business, and social life (Pettai & Hallik, 2002).

From the perspective of intergenerational family relations, belonging to the preretirement age group makes Russian-speakers with a migrant background in Estonia also potentially a part of the so-called “sandwich generation”: still active in the labor market and taking care of aging parents and children or grandchildren. Previous research (Laidmäe, Hansson, Tulva, Lausvee, & Kasepalu, 2010; Wu, Kasearu, Värnik, Tooding, & Trommsdorff, 2015) shows that this twofold load of responsibilities can be stressful and can considerably decrease satisfaction with different areas of life, while satisfaction with family life and relationships with adult children are strongly related to general life satisfaction, especially for older women as being the main in-family carers. When approaching the preretirement age, people may face various dilemmas in terms of personal time, career and well-being vs family solidarity and quality of relationships, determined, on the one hand, by increasing individualism and traditionalism on the other – depending on the availability and affordability of welfare services addressed to older people. We hypothesize that family solidarity is weakened in people with a migrant background in Estonia compared to those belonging to the native-born population. Our hypothesis is based on the following considerations: (1) geographical dis-

tance (proximity) may separate the generations; (2) cross-border help and care provision may be constrained and thus be less functional; (3) migrant status as such may negatively influence (via differentiation in socioeconomic status) family solidarity patterns.

This paper searches for answers to two questions: First, are there any differences in intergenerational family solidarity patterns between people with migrant backgrounds and native-born people of preretirement age? Second, how significant are the differences between generational cohorts of migrants?

The paper is based on data from Waves 4 and 5 of the Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe (SHARE). This dataset allows for differentiation between migrant and native backgrounds of respondents in the preretirement age group. In the survey, there are questions on the country of birth and on the countries of birth of the respondents’ parents, also on the year of immigration. However, the SHARE dataset does not offer a good basis for differentiating ethnic or cultural identity. This leads to a possibility that the dataset also covers special return migration cases, for example, when ethnic Estonians whose grandparents lived in a foreign country move back to Estonia. In adjusting to life in their home country return migrants might face similar challenges as in the immigration situation (Barrett & Mosca, 2013). Unfortunately, this special case cannot be identified in the data.

In the next section we examine the typology of the intergenerational relations in the context of migration and suggest links to migration; in the second and third sections we present the methods and findings followed by a conclusion section.

Intergenerational Family Solidarity and Migration: A Brief Overview

This paper proceeds from the assumption that the family is a central component in migration (Cooke, 2008; Mulder & Cooke, 2009), and that both the decision to migrate and the consequences of long-distance moves should be considered within the broader context of a family, family members’ life events, and their life courses (Boyle, Kulu, Cooke, Gayle, & Mulder, 2008; Mulder, 2007).

From the sociological point of view, an act of migration may be seen as interplay between social structures (including family) and individual actions. A personal decision to stay or to move is always taken within the context of family relations. From the structuralist perspective, family relations are constituted by cultural schemas and sets of resources that empower or constrain social action (adopted from Sewell, 1992). Family is thus both an outcome and a matrix of social interactions between family members. Migration as a family-centered social action (alongside other life events such as parenthood, union dissolution, etc.) brings change to the position and disposition of agents

within family structures, and by this it empowers or disempowers human agency. This change can be considered both in objective terms – as a transmission and reallocation of resources – and also subjectively – in the terminology of solidarity, mutuality, interdependency, and cultural transmission. Like other significant life events, this change requires accommodating tensions within the family structures and (re)negotiating the self-identities of family members.

When looking at families holistically, the sociological way of thinking leads us to the typology of *intergenerational family relations*. Julia Brannen (2003) examines two conditions that are supposed to shape intergenerational relations: (1) occupational status continuity/mobility and (2) geographical proximity/mobility. Occupational status and changes in the occupational status of family members shape the material resources of families. The dimensions of occupational status and geographical proximity (migration) may be connected. Change in one dimension could cause changes in the other. It is important to consider both the objective and subjective consequences of the change. Decreases and increases in earnings because of changes in occupational status or geographical proximity can potentially impact the mechanisms of both cultural and resources' transmission (in Bourdieu's 1986 terms, transmission of economic, cultural, and symbolic capital) between family members – and as a result the sociopsychological well-being of both the whole family and its individual members. In the intergenerational solidarity model of Bengtson and Roberts (1991), geographic proximity is also one of the most important variables influencing the contacts between family members, including associational, functional, and structural solidarity. Indirectly, geographic proximity might also affect the other three dimensions of intergenerational solidarity. Brannen (2003) examined intergenerational relations on a number of dimensions of intergenerational support (including financial transfers, supply of services and care, emotional support, congruence of values and beliefs, and commitment to norms of family obligations). Brannen outlined four types of intergenerational support:

- 1) *Relations of solidarity*, which are exhibited in families that remain intact geographically and when the occupational status of older generation males is reproduced by the younger male generational unit; functional support of a different kind is provided to one another and lifestyles are reproduced across generations.
- 2) *Incorporation of differences in family relations*, which occurs when families stay close geographically, but there is discontinuity in the males' occupational statuses. Considerable social and functional support is provided by different generations, although more tensions on the one hand and more innovation on the other emerge in such families.
- 3) *Differentiation processes*, which may occur in cases of occupational (upward) mobility and geographical mobility; there is less balanced reciprocity, stronger commitment to formal sources of support with less functional support provided by the family members.

- 4) *Reparation in estrangement type of relations*, which occurs in cases of geographical mobility not accompanied by social and/or occupational mobility. Such cases can be characterized by strong tensions between generations, where the parent generation is involved in the process of reparation of kin relations and attempting to break with the traditionalist roles of parents and grandparents. In these cases functional support can even be constrained and family members may feel deprived of both financial/material and emotional support.

Empirical research in different cultural settings (Baldassar, 2007; Barrett & Mosca, 2013; Narchal, 2012; Ponizovsky & Ritsner, 1998) also points out the risk of dissolution of family ties, as well as isolation and loneliness in the case of migration and long-distance relationships. It is important to note that intergenerational solidarity is a multidimensional construct, and family functioning patterns can be determined by different variables across time and space. It would be too narrow to consider the experience of migration/mobility only from the perspective of geographic proximity and/or occupational mobility. There are also other cultural and social aspects that can influence the experiences and consequences of migration, including health issues, cultural, and even political aspects. However, in view of the scope of the current study, contact frequency and giving help to parents alongside giving help to children are considered the main dependent variables to be examined when exploring the possible differences in family solidarity between migrant and native groups in Estonia.

Data and Methods

A dataset from Waves 4 and 5 of the Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe (SHARE) was used (Börsch-Supan, Brandt, Hunkler et al, 2013; Börsch-Supan, Brandt, Litwin, & Weber, 2013; Malter & Börsch-Supan, 2015; Malter & Börsch-Supan, 2013). In Estonia, the SHARE Wave 4 data collection was carried out in 2010/11, Wave 5 in 2013. The respondents were drawn from a nationally representative random sample of noninstitutionalized adults aged 50 and older. In our analysis, we apply only the data from the Estonian dataset for respondents aged 50–63 who had at least one biological parent alive when responding to the Wave 5 SHARE survey. The peculiarity of the SHARE survey was that several individuals could be interviewed from the same household. In the case of giving help, only the first respondent of the household answered the questions. Moreover, we left out those families in which the parent and respondent lived in the same household. This meant that our final sample for studying intergenerational family solidarity in terms of keeping contacts and providing help or care was reduced to 419 individuals.

The final sample size for the present study was 419 individuals, out of which 65% were women and 35% men.

In accordance with the research questions formulated earlier in this paper, our main task was to describe the variations in intergenerational family solidarity across foreign-born and native-born groups of people of preretirement age and to clarify the impacts of their migration on these variations. Thus, our key independent variables were related to migration status. We distinguish between first-, 1.5- and second-generation migrants. For the purpose of this study, the second-generation migrant category covered individuals born in Estonia whose parents had both been foreign-born. Foreign-born individuals who immigrated to Estonia aged 0–16 were classified in our study as 1.5-generation migrants. Foreign-born individuals aged 17 and older were defined as first-generation migrants. All other respondents were categorized as individuals with nonmigrant (i.e., native) background.

The dependent variables were related to the dimensions of intergenerational family solidarity between preretirement-aged children and their parents, such as help-giving and the frequency of contacts with parents. The contact frequency was measured by the question “During the past 12 months, how often did you have any contact with your mother/father: personally, by phone, mail, email, or any other electronic means?” with a 7-point response scale (1 = *daily*; 2 = *several times a week*; 3 = *approximately once a week*; 4 = *approximately every 2 weeks*; 5 = *approximately once a month*; 6 = *less than once a month*; 7 = *never*). For the purpose of further analysis, the scale of contact frequency was recoded, the new variable had three categories: 1 = *daily*, 2 = *weekly*, 3 = *twice a month or less*. The survey included several questions about helping someone outside the household: whether the respondent had given help to anyone, and to whom she/he had given the help, and how frequently. The help-giving was measured by the questions “In the last 12 months, have you personally given personal care or practical household help to a family member living outside your household, a friend or a neighbor? Please exclude looking after grandchildren” (with a 2-point response scale, where 1 = *yes*, 2 = *no*), and “Which [other] family member from outside the household, friend or neighbor have you helped [most often] in the last 12 months?” with a possibility to name several family members, relatives, friends, acquaintances, etc., from a showcard. A dummy variable was created to indicate help-giving to parents (1 = *gives help*, 2 = *does not*), where “gives help” refers to a positive answer on the first question and mother or father named as an answer on the second question.

Based on previously discussed literature on intergenerational solidarity models, we chose the control variables that follow. First, we controlled for the respondents’ sex (1 = *female*, 2 = *male*) and their parents’ sex (1 = *only father*, 2 = *father and mother*, 3 = *only mother*) and age. We also controlled for the parental health situation, as measured on 5-point scale (1 = *excellent*; 2 = *very good*; 3 = *good*; 4 = *fair*; 5 = *poor*) based on the subjective evaluation of the respondents. Second, we con-

sidered the impact of proximity between respondents and their biological parents. Proximity was measured by answers to the question: “Where does your mother/father live?” on an 8-point scale (1 = *living in the same household*; 2 = *living in the same building*; 3 = *less than 1 km away*; 4 = *between 1 to 5 km away*; 5 = *between 5 to 25 km away*; 6 = *between 25 to 100 km away*; 7 = *between 100 to 500 km away*; 8 = *more than 500 km away*). This means that, because of the small size of Estonia, the latter distance might extend beyond the Estonian border. For the purpose of the analysis, the scale was recoded and original categories were merged together into four categories (1 = *up to 5 km away*; 2 = *between 5–25 km away*; 3 = *between 25 to 100 km away*; 4 = *more than 100 km away*).

Third, the education and the employment status of respondents were also controlled for. The effect of education was captured in a measure for years spent in education. Employment status was expressed as a dummy variable (1 = *not employed*; 2 = *employed*) based on a set of employment-related questions.

Using the measures indicated above, we described the main characteristics of respondents on the basis of their migrant/nonmigrant status. Second, multinomial logistic regression models were used to assess the degree of contact frequency and giving help to parents, with the aim of revealing the effects of the migrant background regarding intergenerational family solidarity.

Results

In our subsample of the Estonian SHARE dataset ($N = 419$) the share of individuals with a native background was approximately 67.5%; 12.9% were categorized as second-generation migrants; 9.5% as first-generation migrants; and 10% as 1.5-generation migrants (those foreign-born people who had immigrated to Estonia before reaching the age of 17).

The variables of proximity (Cramer’s $V = 0.24$, $p < .001$) and contact frequency (Cramer’s $V = 0.20$, $p < .001$) indicate that intergenerational family solidarity may significantly vary across migrant population groups. The second-generation and 1.5-generation migrants live closer to their parents and have more frequent contacts with them. In contrast, the first-generation migrants, who had immigrated to Estonia during adulthood, have less frequent contacts with parents, and the parents are most likely to live in their countries of origin. Regarding the help-giving, among first-generation migrants, the proportion of individuals who helped their parents is the smallest (Cramer’s $V = 0.15$, $p = .02$). The analysis revealed differences in years of completed education with respect to the migrant status $F(3, 415) = 3.86$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .03$ (see Table 1 for mean scores). The individuals with a native background and first-generation migrants have approximately 1 year longer educational paths compared to second-generation migrants and 1.5-generation migrants. The age differences across groups were not signifi-

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for the nonmigrant population, and the second-, 1.5- and first-generation migrants aged 50–63

	Nonmigrant (<i>n</i> = 283)		Second-generation (<i>n</i> = 54)		1.5-generation (0–16 years, <i>n</i> = 42)		First-generation (17 and older, <i>n</i> = 40)	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Age of respondent	56.8	3.1	56.3	3.3	56.8	3	57.9	2.9
Years of education	13.4	3.1	12.3	2.4	12.1	2.1	13.4	2.4
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Contact frequency								
Daily	83	29.3	25	46.3	21	50	12.5	
Weekly	149	52.7	20	37	12	28.6	17	42.5
Twice a month or less	51	18	9	16.7	9	21.4	18	45
Help-giving								
Yes	119	42	23	42.6	19	45.2	7	17.5
No	164	58	31	57.4	23	54.8	33	82.5
Proximity								
Up to 5 km away	82	29	25	46.3	20	47.6	5	12.5
Between 5 and 25 km away	74	26.1	17	31.5	9	21.4	1	2.5
Between 25 and 100 km away	63	22.3	6	11.1	7	16.7	4	10
More than 100 km away	64	22.6	6	11.1	6	14.3	30	75
Sex of parent(s) alive								
Father	26	9.2	6	11.1	2	4.8	9	22.5
Mother	36	78.1	42	77.8	37	88.1	29	72.5
Both	221	12.7	6	11.1	3	7.1	2	5
Sex of respondent								
Male	98	34.6	19	35.2	16	38.1	11	27.5
Female	185	65.4	25	64.8	26	61.9	29	72.5
Health of parent								
Good	74	26.1	9	17	7	16.7	2	5
Fair	135	47.8	27	50	21	50	23	57.5
Poor	74	26.1	18	34	14	33.3	15	37.5
Employment status								
Employed	212	74.9	40	74.1	28	66.7	24	60
Not in employment	71	25.1	14	25.9	14	33.3	16	40

cant ($F(3, 415) = 2.25, p = .08, \eta^2 = .02$), also there were no differences with respect to sex (Cramer's $V = 0.05, p = 0.77$), employment status (Cramer's $V = 0.11, p = 0.19$), and parental health (Cramer's $V = 0.12, p = 0.07$).

Migration Status Affecting the Contact Frequency Between Children in Preretirement Age and Their Parents

For assessing the impacts of the migrant status on contact frequency of the respondents with their parents, we applied multinomial logistic regression analysis. We chose "weekly" as the reference category. Thus, we estimated the likelihood of being in contact daily or twice a month or less, compared to the likelihood of being in a contact weekly. In the first model (see Table 2, Model

1), the contact frequency is estimated by the respondent's sex, age, years of education, migrant and employment status, and sex and health of one's parent. These variables explain about 22% of the variance in contact frequency between preretirement aged children and their parents.

We also expected to see an impact of years of education and age of a child (children refer to participants in SHARE survey aged 50–63) on contact frequency with parents. The analysis, however, did not confirm this idea, although it does show that there is a slight tendency toward an association between years of education and probability of having contact with parents: Those individuals who stayed longer in education have less daily contacts with their parents. Employment also decreases chances of having frequent contacts with parents.

The model also replicates previously broadly discussed findings that the kin-keeping is generally gender biased. Our analysis confirmed that women have daily or weekly contacts

Table 2. Logistic models of the factors explaining contact frequency (unstandardized and standardized regression coefficients)

	Model 1								Model 2							
	Daily contact				Twice a month or less				Daily contact				Twice a month or less			
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	Wald	Exp(B)	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	Wald	Exp(B)	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	Wald	Exp(B)	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	Wald	Exp(B)
Years of education	-0.08	0.04	3.12	0.93+	-0.02	0.05	0.12	0.98	-0.03	0.05	0.40	0.97	-0.05	0.05	0.80	0.95
Age	0.01	0.04	0.14	1.01	0.06	0.05	1.89	1.07	0.03	0.04	0.41	1.03	0.07	0.05	2.44	1.08
Employment status																
Not in employment	0.08	.27	0.08	1.1	0.61	0.31	3.88	1.85*	0.18	0.30	0.36	1.2	0.59	0.32	3.41	1.8+
Migration status																
First-generation	-0.70	0.54	1.7	0.49	0.98	0.42	5.51	2.66*	-0.27	0.59	0.20	0.77	0.55	0.46	1.47	1.74
1.5-generation	1.07	0.40	7.2	2.9**	0.77	0.49	2.47	2.16	0.90	0.43	4.45	2.44*	0.77	0.50	2.36	2.16
Second-generation	0.82	0.34	5.8	2.28*	0.18	0.47	0.14	1.2	0.61	0.36	2.92	1.84+	0.38	0.48	0.61	1.46
Sex of respondent (child)																
Female	0.66	0.27	6.2	1.9*	-0.89	0.29	9.6	0.41**	0.79	0.28	8.11	2.21**	-0.99	0.30	11.01	0.37***
Parents alive																
Father	-0.53	0.47	1.27	0.59	1.16	0.41	7.83	3.18**	-0.51	0.50	1.08	0.60	1.21	0.43	7.97	3.34**
Mother and father	-0.97	0.40	6.03	0.38*	-0.96	0.57	2.9	0.38+	-1.13	0.42	7.27	0.32**	-0.74	0.57	1.67	0.48
Health of parent																
Good	0.33	0.34	0.97	1.40	-0.23	0.40	0.32	0.79	0.56	0.36	2.43	1.75	-0.36	0.41	0.77	0.69
Fair	0.08	0.28	0.08	1.08	-0.33	0.32	1.09	0.71	0.28	0.30	0.85	1.32	-0.45	0.33	1.84	0.64
Proximity																
Up to 5 km away									2.02	0.41	24.7	7.5***	-1.17	0.45	6.83	0.31**
Between 5–25 km away									1.08	0.42	6.7	2.94**	-0.86	0.42	4.20	0.42*
Between 25–100 km away									0.39	0.46	0.73	1.47	-0.66	0.40	2.74	0.51+
<i>N</i>	419								419							
χ^2	88.87***								148.2***							
<i>Df</i>	22								28							
Nagelkerke	.22								.34							

Note. *** $p \leq .001$, ** $p \leq .01$, * $p \leq .05$, + $p \leq .10$.

Reference category for employment status (Model 1 and 2): employed
 Reference category for migration status (Model 1 and 2): nonmigrant status
 Reference category for sex (Model 1 and 2): male
 Reference category parent alive (Model 1 and 2): mother
 Reference category for health of parent (Model 1 and 2): poor
 Reference category for proximity (Model 2): more than 100 km away

with parents more frequently than men, and that the contacts are more frequent with mothers than with fathers. In the latter case, the contact frequency is more likely to be twice a month or even less if compared to those being in contact weekly. These findings support previous research on gender differences in intergenerational solidarity (Hank, 2007; Steinbach, 2013). We did not find any relationship between the health of a parent and contact frequency.

Analysis with the help of the Model 1 (see Table 2) revealed two patterns of contact frequency across different generations of migrants: People belonging to the first-generation group of migrants were more likely to have less frequent contact with their parents, compared to the native population, whereas second-generation and 1.5-generation migrant families' contacts are more frequent than among the families with the native background.

Model 1 (see Table 2) showed that contact frequency varies across migrant groups, and that this leads to the assumption that the effect of migrant status could at least partly be explained by the geographic proximity factor. In the next model (see Model 2 in Table 2), the proximity variable was added. By adding the proximity variable to the model, the explained variance of the model increased to 34% and the association with migration status lost its strength, thus indicating that proximity plays a significant role in explaining contact frequency between children and their parents. Sixty percent of the first-generation migrant respondents have parents who live more than 500 km away. Proceeding from the smallness of Estonia, this means that they live in a foreign country. The analysis demonstrated that the less frequent contacts with parents among first-generation migrants could be explained by the proximity factor. Taking into consideration the effect of proximity, the positive effect

Table 3. Logistic models of the factors explaining help-giving (unstandardized and standardized regression coefficients)

	Model 1: Gives help ^a				Model 2: Gives help ^a			
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	Wald	Exp(B)	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	Wald	Exp(B)
Years of education	0.05	0.04	1.64	1.05	0.07	0.04	4.56	1.1*
Age	-0.06	0.04	2.88	0.94+	-0.06	0.04	2.52	0.94
Employment status								
Not in employment	-0.29	0.26	1.27	0.75	-0.27	0.26	1.04	0.76
Migration status								
First-generation	-1.3	0.45	8.25	0.27**	-0.95	0.48	3.93	0.38*
1.5-generation	0.06	0.35	0.03	1.07	-0.04	0.36	0.01	0.96
Second-generation	0.01	0.32	0.00	1.00	-0.15	0.33	0.19	0.86
Sex of respondent (child)								
Female	0.62	0.23	7.18	1.85**	0.66	0.23	7.88	1.93**
Parents alive								
Father	-1.79	0.50	12.6	0.17***	-1.76	0.51	11.6	0.17***
Mother and father	-0.62	0.34	3.24	0.54+	-0.66	0.35	3.61	0.51+
Health								
Good	-0.97	0.32	9.52	0.38**	-0.95	0.32	8.73	0.39**
Fair	-0.50	0.25	4.00	0.60*	-0.47	0.26	3.32	0.62+
Proximity								
Up to 5 km away					1.10	0.32	11.47	3.0***
Between 5–25 km away					0.99	0.34	8.61	2.67**
Between 25–100 km away					0.36	0.35	1.05	1.44
<i>N</i>	419				419			
χ^2	52.87				68.1			
<i>Df</i>	11				14			
Nagelkerke	0.16				0.20			

Note. *** $p \leq .001$, ** $p \leq .01$, * $p \leq .05$, + $p \leq .10$. ^aThe reference category is “no help-giving.”

Reference category for employment status (Model 1 and 2): employed

Reference category for migration status (Model 1 and 2): nonmigrant status

Reference category for sex (Model 1 and 2): male

Reference category parent alive (Model 1 and 2): mother

Reference category for health of parent (Model 1 and 2): poor

Reference category for proximity (Model 2): more than 100 km away

of belonging to the 1.5 and second-generation migrant families remains unchanged.

To summarize, estimates from the models discussed show that proximity between parents and their children has a significant effect on frequency of contacts and show weakened intergenerational solidarity among first-generation migrants and their parents. In cases where family members live in different countries and/or are separated from each other by longer distances, intergenerational solidarity in terms of functional support is inhibited. The 1.5- and second-generation migrants remain close together geographically, and this could explain the more relations of solidarity among family members and stronger commitments to family-centered support. These assumptions will be examined in more detail in the next part of the analysis.

Migration Status Affecting the Subject's Help-Giving to Parents

In the models (see Table 3) processed by multinomial logistic regression method “not giving help to parent” was applied as the reference category. The results revealed from the Model 1 indicate that better health of a parent decreases the odds of help-giving. Compared to mothers, the fathers have lower odds of getting help from their children and women are 1.8 times more likely to give help compared to men. Among the three categories of migrants only the first-generation migrants, who had moved to Estonia in their adult age, had lower odds of helping their parents compared to the nonmigrants.

In Model 2 (see Table 3) we controlled for whether the help

giving could be explained by geographic proximity. By adding the proximity variable to the model, where the reference category was “parent lives more than 100 km away,” the explained variance of the model improved from 0.16 to 0.20, which is a significant change. Thus, we conclude that help-giving is directly related to proximity: Children who live closer to their parents are more likely to help their parents compared to those who live more than 100 km away. However, even when proximity is taken into account, the first-generation migrants still have a lower likelihood of helping their parents compared to the other groups.

As with the frequency of contacts, the likelihood of intergenerational help-giving in the direction from children to their parents could be best explained by geographical proximity – not by migration status as such. Helping parents is demand-driven and depends on the health condition of those in a potential need. There are no significant differences in giving help to parents between 1.5- and first-generation migrants and native-born respondents. Although theoretically there might be more the intergenerational relations of solidarity in these groups, this was not confirmed by the analysis of the children-parents dyads.

Conclusion

In this paper we looked for the answers to two main questions: Are there any differences in intergenerational family solidarity patterns between foreign-born and native-born people of pre-retirement age in Estonia? And how significant are the differences within the older migrant group? We conclude that the intergenerational solidarity model of Bengtson and Roberts (1991), in which geographical proximity is one of the most important variables influencing the contacts between family members and functional solidarity, proved to be true. Migrant status as such could not be considered as a significant risk factor for weakened intergenerational solidarity, at least in the context of Estonia. However, living apart (more than 100 km away) could serve as a serious obstacle for both native- and foreign-born people to providing help to other family members. Therefore, it is more correct to talk about the effect of mobility within and between the countries. The finding from our analysis could be interpreted as indirect evidence for the fact that parents of mobile children who decided to stay in the launching country rely more heavily on institutional help and/or on their informal communication and support networks instead of expecting cross-border contact and care provision from their children (Kasearu & Kutsar, 2010). Our findings may serve as evidence for the assumption that family members divided by large distances have other relatives and nonrelatives embedded into their informal networks.

In the case of mobility involving two generations (parents moving together with children or children born to families on the move) 50% of second generation migrant parent-child dy-

ads as well as those who had migrated before or during their teenage years live up to 5 km away from each other, compared to only 37% of the native population. Children in preretirement age continue to live closer to their parents, and family members stay in closer touch (even after controlling for proximity). This phenomenon could be explained by the outcomes of the integration/assimilation processes of non-Estonian migrant population in Estonia. More specifically, Russian-speaking migrants and their descendants are concentrated mostly in the urban settlements of four counties – Ida-Viru, Harju, Tartu and Pärnu (Statistics Estonia. Native and Foreign-Origin Population, n. d.). Close proximity and more frequent contacts in migrant families could also be explained by the sociocultural characteristics. Qualitative evidence indicates that, in general, the family culture of the middle generation migrants (corresponds to older migrants category in our study) was influenced by the cultural space of the Soviet Union and by the humanistic and collectivist values, such as sociability, solidarity, attentiveness to other people, responsibility, diligence, etc., passed on by the generation of their parents (Järva, 2004, p. 30). In its turn, according to Järva (*ibid.*, pp. 31–32) the family culture of the middle generation as articulated in relationships with their children was characterized by further humanization of values, sociocentrism, solidarity and altruism in interpersonal relations, tight personal relations within family, and prerequisites toward formation of the egalitarian family type. Our assumption is that more frequent contacts between older migrants and their parents (compared to native Estonians) can be explained by cultural aspects. The question for further research remains as to how the system of cultural values and transmission of values across generations determine the practices of the intergenerational family solidarity and quality of relationships in different sociocultural contexts.

For us, it was surprising that, despite the rapid development of information and communications technologies that make regular transnational contacts possible at relatively low cost, actual proximity still largely matters. This regularity could be related to a digital divide – lack of digital skills – and to a high degree of adaptation to the situation of living apart and having only rare contacts. An indication of good emotional adaptation to the situation of family mobility is the fact that, in general, there were almost no differences in subjective perceptions of lack of companionship or feeling lonely between respondents with different migration statuses and among those living at differing distances from their parents.

Returning to the question of differences in solidarity patterns between foreign-born and native-born populations, our research suggests that gender differences are significant in both groups and across different categories of migrants. For us this is not surprising as there is a large corpus of evidence showing women’s engagement in maintaining kin-relations – and men’s being deprived from help and emotional support (Hank, 2007; Steinbach, 2013).

We found that the poor health of a parent increases the odds

of their children helping them. However, our analysis does not allow for a comprehensive investigation of transnational family strategies in cases where informal and/or institutional support networks do not work, i.e., when children, other relatives, non-relatives, the local community nor the state are able to support older people in difficult situations (for example, poor health conditions). In these cases families may consider reunification as a solution for disrupted family solidarity. There are different options for family reunification in older age, among them the most probable being a return migration to the country of descent or emigration of family members to the host country. According to Statistics Estonia (Statistics Estonia, Migration, n. d.), approximately 7,000 people aged 50 and above emigrated from Estonia from 2004–2014 (constituting less than roughly 0.5% of population in this age group). Among older emigrés approximately 17% moved to Russia or Ukraine. There is also statistical evidence (ibid.) on the return migration of older adults to Estonia. Altogether approximately 5,600 people aged 50 and above immigrated into Estonia from 2004–2014, including approximately 1,800 individuals who were born in Estonia (300 of whom were aged 65+) and approximately 2,100 individuals (half of them aged 65+) who were born in Russia or Ukraine. The picture of return migration from Estonia and to Estonia alongside the data on immigration of older people to Estonia in the last decade led us to an assumption that there are special cases of migration in older age that are not covered explicitly by the SHARE dataset and are therefore also excluded from our analysis. There is qualitative evidence of migration triggered by functional family solidarity, including the need to give or receive care rather than economic incentives (Baldassar, 2007). Thus, a decision to move could be one of the strategies for families divided by long distances, whose members cannot rely on other sources of support and care. Theoretically, family reunification may be constrained by both institutional factors (i.e., migration regulations) and individual factors (i.e., lack of resources, motivation, or will; perceived difficulties of (re)integration into another society).

Based on our study and following Warnes and Williams' (2006, p. 1274) suggestion to widen "a partial glimpse' of the processes and outcomes of the intersection of aging and migration," we advocate for special attention in both research and policy to addressing the needs of families divided by long distances within and between countries, with a special focus on men.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported by grant from the Estonian Research Council "Care Policies and Family Care from Intergenerational Perspective in Estonia: The 'Crowding' Hypotheses Revisited" (PUT499), for the years 2014–2016.

Declaration of Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare that no conflicts of interest exist.

References

- Baldassar, L. (2007). Transnational families and aged care: the mobility of care and the migrancy of aging. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 33, 275–297. doi 10.1080/13691830601154252
- Barrett, A., & Mosca, I. (2013). Social isolation, loneliness and return migration: evidence from older Irish adults. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 39, 1659–1677. doi 10.1080/1369183X.2013.833694
- Bengtson, V. L., & Roberts, R. E. L. (1991). Intergenerational solidarity in aging families: An example of formal theory construction. *Journal of Marriage & Family*, 53, 856–870.
- Börsch-Supan, A., Brandt, M., Hunkler, C., Kneip, T., Korbmacher, J., Malter, F., . . . Zuber, S. (2013). Data Resource Profile: The Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe (SHARE). *International Journal of Epidemiology*. doi 10.1093/ije/dyt088
- Börsch-Supan A., Brandt, M., Litwin, H., & Weber, G. (Eds.). (2013). *Active aging and solidarity between generations in Europe: First results from SHARE after the economic crisis*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. E. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory for research in the sociology of education* (pp. 241–258). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Boyle, P. J., Kulu, H., Cooke, T. J., Gayle, V., & Mulder, C. (2008). Moving and union dissolution. *Demography*, 45, 209–222.
- Brannen, J. (2003). Toward a typology of intergenerational relations: continuities and change in families. *Sociological Research Online*, 8(2). Retrieved from <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/8/2/brannen.html>
- Buckley, C. (1995). The myth of managed migration: migration control and market in the Soviet period. *Slavic Review*, 54, 896–916.
- Cooke, T. J. (2008). Migration in a family way. *Population, Space and Place*, 14, 255–265.
- Eurostat. (2011). *Migrants in Europe. A statistical portrait of the first and second generation*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/3217494/5727749/KS-31-10-539-EN.PDF/bcf27a60-7016-4fec-98c5-e8488491e bbd>
- Friedman, J. (2005). Diasporization, globalization, and cosmopolitan discourse. In A. Levy & A. Weingrod (Eds.), *Homelands and diasporas: Holy lands and other places* (pp. 140–165). Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Hank, K. (2007). Proximity and contacts between older parents and their children: A European comparison. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 69, 157–173.
- Helemäe, J., & Saar, E. (2012). Estonia – Highly unequal but classless? *Studies of Transition States and Societies*, 4(2), 49–58.
- Kasearu, K., & Kutsar, D. (2010). Informal support networks in a changing society: Are family-based networks being "crowded out"? *Studies of Transition States and Societies*, 2(1), 56–73.
- Kutsar, D., & Kärner, A. (2010). Exploration of societal transitions in Estonia from the threshold concepts perspective of teaching and learning. In J. H. F. Meyer, R. Land, & C. Baillie (Eds.), *Threshold concepts and transformational learning: Educational futures rethinking theory and practice* (vol. 42, pp. 383–398). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Kutsar D., Trumm A., & Oja, U. (1998). New democracy: boundaries and resources for development. In S. MacPherson & Hoi-Kwok Wong (Eds.), *Social development and societies in transition* (pp. 248–264). Aldershot: Ashgate.

- Järva, I. (2004). *Polvkondlikud muutused Eestimaa vene perekondade kasvatuses: sotsiokultuuriline käsitlus* [Educational changes in three generations of Russian families living in Estonia: Sociocultural approach]. Tallinn Pedagogical University Dissertations on Social Sciences. Tallinn: TPU kirjastus.
- Laidmäe, V.-I., Hansson, L., Tulva, T., Lausvee, E., & Kasepalu, Ü. (2010). Multigeneration family in Estonia: Multiple roles and the stress of living together with elderly people. *The Internet Journal of Geriatrics and Gerontology*, 5(2). Retrieved from <http://www.ispub.com/journal/the-internet-journal-of-geriatrics-and-gerontology/volume-7-issue-1/1684704201quality-of-life-of-elderly-in-estonia.html>
- Lauristin, M. (2011). Introduction. Human development during the period of transition: The challenges faced by the Baltic states. In *The Estonian Human Development Report 2010/2011* (pp. 18–22). Tallinn: Eesti Koostöö Kogu. Retrieved from http://kogu.ee/public/eia2011/eia_eng_2011.pdf
- Lauristin, M., Kaal, E., Kirss, L., Kriger, T., Masso, A., Nurmela, K., ... Vihalemm, P. (2011). *Integratsiooni monitooring 2011* [Integration monitoring 2011]. Tallinn: Kultuuriministeerium.
- Leinsalu, M., Vägerö, D., & Kunst, A. E. (2004). Increasing ethnic differences in mortality in Estonia after the collapse of the Soviet Union. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 58, 583–589.
- Malter, F., & Börsch-Supan, A. (Eds.). (2013). *SHARE wave 4: Innovations & methodology*. Munich: MEA, Max Planck Institute for Social Law and Social Policy.
- Malter, F., & Börsch-Supan, A. (Eds.). (2015). *SHARE wave 5: Innovations & methodology*. Munich: MEA, Max Planck Institute for Social Law and Social Policy.
- Mulder, C. H. (2007). The family context and residential choice: A challenge for new research. *Population, Space and Place*, 13, 265–278.
- Mulder, C., & Cooke, T. J. (2009). Family ties and residential location. *Population, Space and Place*, 15, 299–304. doi 10.1002/psp.556
- Narchal, R. (2012). Migration loneliness and Emily links: A case narrative. *International Journal of Social, Behavioral, Educational, Economic and Management Engineering*, 6(4), 68–74. Retrieved from <http://waset.org/publication/Migration-Loneliness-and-Family-Links:-A-Case-Narrative/12348>
- Nimmerfeldt, G. (2011). *Identificational integration: Conceptualisation and operationalization on the example of the second generation Russian in Estonia*. Tallinn: Tallinn University. Retrieved from http://e-ait.tlulib.ee/67/1/nimmerfeldt_gerli1.pdf
- Pettai, V., & Hallik, K. (2002). Understanding processes of ethnic control: Segmentation, dependency and co-optation in post-communist Estonia. *Nations and Nationalism*, 8, 505–529.
- Ponizovsky, A., & Ritsner, M. (1998). Patterns of loneliness in an immigrant population. *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, 45, 408–414. doi 10.1016/j.comppsy.2004.03.011
- Sewell, W. F. (1992). A theory of structure: Duality, agency, and transformation. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 98(1), 1–29.
- Statistics Estonia. (n.d.). *Native and foreign-origin population*. Retrieved from http://pub.stat.ee/px-web.2001/l_Databas/Population_census/PHC2011/10Native_immigrant_population/02Native_and_foreign_origin/02Native_and_foreign_origin.asp
- Statistics Estonia. (n.d.). *Migration*. Retrieved from http://pub.stat.ee/px-web.2001/l_Databas/Population/03Vital_events/14Migration/14Migration.asp
- Steinbach, A. (2013). Family structure and parent-child contact: A comparison of native and migrant families. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 75, 1114–1129.
- Warnes, A. M., & Williams, A. (2006). Older migrants in Europe: A new focus for migration studies. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 32, 1257–1281. doi 10.1080/13691830600927617
- Wu, J., Kasearu, K., Värnik, A., Tooding, L.-M., & Trommsdorff, G. (2015). Associations between quality of relationship and life satisfaction of older mothers in Estonia, Germany, Russia and China. *Ageing and Society*. Available on CJO2015. doi 10.1017/S0144686X15000355

Manuscript received: 14.11.2015

Manuscript accepted after revision: 11.03.2016

Tatjana Kiilo

Institute of Social Studies
University of Tartu
Ülikooli 18
50090, Tartu
Estonia
tatjana.kiilo@ut.ee