

15. See also Constable et al. 2004; Martens and Verhoeven 2006.
16. Relevant here is the growing research on Human Computer Interaction; see, for example, Ames et al. 2010; Cao et al. 2010; Judge et al. 2010; Kirk et al. 2010.
17. See also Attias-Donfut et al. 2002; Cieraad 2006; Miller 2001; Maushart 2002; Walsh 2008; Goulbourne et al. 2010. This discussion is linked to the so-called 'emotional turn' in the social sciences and the growing literature on emotions and migration (Svašek and Skrbis 2007b). Our own work on the topic (Merla and Baldassar 2010a; Baldassar 2007a, 2008b) explores the relationship between rational economic and emotional caregiving motivations for migration.
18. See also Lin and Rogerson 1995; Joseph and Hallman 1985; Bonvalet and Ogg 2006a.
19. See Baldassar 2007a; Kilkey and Merla 2013; Merla 2012a.
20. For example, regional flows within the recently expanded/enlarged European Union (Kilkey et al. 2013a; Williams 2007; Erel 2012). See also Khoo et al. 2011 for European migration to Australia.
21. Kilkey and Merla (2013) refer to this as 'situating transnational families care-arrangements'.

1 Locating Transnational Care Circulation in Migration and Family Studies

Loretta Baldassar and Laura Merla

'... we need more research on the portability of care as a concept.'
(Huang, Thang and Toyota 2012a, 131)

As stated in the Introduction to this volume, we define care circulation as the reciprocal, multidirectional and asymmetrical exchange of care that fluctuates over the life course within transnational family networks subject to the political, economic, cultural and social contexts of both sending and receiving societies. The framework of care circulation we are advancing draws on broad definitions of both family and care, including beliefs and practices about caring embedded in relationships wider than the nuclear family, which in turn are shaped by the broader socio-structural contexts in which families operate transnationally. In proposing a broad conceptualisation of care, it is not our intention to downplay the gendered and political aspects of the uneven nature of care exchanges. Some family members—especially women—carry a far greater care burden than others, and not everyone receives care equally. The lens of circulation allows us to acknowledge and examine the ways in which all family members, both migrants and 'non'-migrants, participate in a variety of caregiving activities and exchanges over time. This apparently private and domestic set of caregiving activities is a fundamental feature of transnational family life, intimately connected to those dimensions assumed to be more public and formal, including economic, political and social endeavours. The increasing mobility and profound impact of new communication technologies on our ability to care across distance and to manage absence in family life makes an analysis of 'the portability of care' a fundamental topic of our contemporary lives.

Building on the Introduction, this chapter serves to locate the framework of care circulation in the broader body of research on migration, transnationalism and the family. We begin with a discussion of the synergies and variances between the frameworks of care circulation and care chains in an effort to draw together and examine the full range of transnational families. To date, those families that are involved in global care chains,

often referred to as transnational mothering or parenting, have been written about quite separately to those that are not, and vice versa. We argue that the lens of circulation is a useful framework for all types of transnational families. In section two, we examine the so-called 'mobility turn' in the social sciences and consider transnational approaches to migration in relation to families and the subsequent diversification of family forms. We argue that mobility has become an integral part of family life, and that this has both negative and positive consequences. In this context, we explore the somewhat controversial idea that the distance and absence that characterise transnational families should be conceptualised as regular features of contemporary family life. As already noted, it is not our intention to advocate transnational families as some kind of ideal form or to downplay the difficulties inherent in caring across distance. Rather, we wish to highlight the importance of understanding the impact of distance and absence on family life so that these family forms can be better supported. To provide a more detailed exploration of the framework, the third section of this chapter contextualises notions of 'circulation' in both migration and family studies research. We conclude with an overview of the practices and processes of 'transnational care' on which we draw and which we seek to expand through the lens of circulation. Throughout the chapter, we examine ways to define 'care circulation' and address the methodological and theoretical implications for further study.

CARE CIRCULATION AND CARE CHAINS: CONCEPTUALISING CAREGIVING IN TRANSNATIONAL FAMILIES AND GLOBAL ECONOMIES

This volume is certainly not the first to consider the movement of care. Through the framework of global care chains and its elaboration, the delivery of care has been identified as an important, although still relatively underexamined, type of goods and service that circulates in 'global scapes' (Appadurai 1991). Hochschild's (2000, 2005) and Parreñas's (2001, 2005a, 2005b) classic work on care chains and its further elaboration by Yeates (2009, 2012) is especially pertinent to our discussion of migration, families and care.

In its classical, early version, the care chains literature tended to conceptualise the mobilities of care as one-way traffic, flowing from the 'global south' to the 'north' along a chain of women that usually included a carer in the south looking after a child whose mother migrated to the north to look after the child of a woman who works full time. The chapters in Parts B and C of this volume deal with this classic care chain scenario. Following this understanding of care flows, the migration of mothers who leave their children behind involves a care deficit for both migrants and their families back home (Pyle 2006). The framework of global care chains contributed to

integrating research in the fields of globalisation, care and migration studies. Prior to this work, the literature on care had not taken internationalisation into consideration, and women from the south were largely excluded from the study of work-family balance issues (Leira and Saraceno 2006). The transnational mothering literature in particular provides an important contribution to our understanding of the global political economy by emphasising the commodification of care from a feminist, macro perspective. This literature is based on an analysis of the international transfer of 'motherly care' (understood as a linear process) performed by female domestic migrants from the global south, and it conceptualises transnational motherhood as an undesirable phenomenon that negatively affects parents, their children and the home community (Ehrenreich and Hochschild 2003a; Hochschild 2005; Parreñas 2001a, 2001b). This analysis has highlighted globally structured inequalities based on social divisions of class, race, ethnicity and gender. By showing the emotional costs of mother-child separation and the commodification of emotions (Hochschild 2000), the care chain literature has also brought emotional geographies into the realm of social inequalities (Yeates 2009).

This work has been critiqued for its focus on female domestic workers who were generally portrayed as helpless victims of the global economy (Ryan 2011). Studies of transnational mothering embedded in global care chains, in particular, tended to present a partial and static picture of transnational caregiving arrangements (Escriva and Skinner 2008). Little attention was paid to other types of migrants, such as the highly skilled, or to caring relations that involved other family members, such as the elderly or the extended family. Men and fathers were also generally excluded or portrayed as absent (Dreyer 2006). The involvement of these various actors has been more commonly discussed in the broader transnational families literature, which extends the study of transnational families and caregiving to all categories of migrants and not just those who are working in the formal and informal care sectors.¹ Recent research in the care chains tradition has started to address these critiques (see for instance Huang et al. 2012b; Erel 2012). Several authors have shown, in particular, that mother-child separation often corresponds to a particular phase in the migration and family cycle, and that migrating with children, leaving them behind and reuniting in the home or host country are particular strategies that family units adopt based on institutional and personal opportunities, resources and constraints in both the home and host societies.² These examples highlight the agency of transnational family members.

The conceptualisation of care flows as unidirectional is informed by, and supports, the idea that migration automatically jeopardises family solidarity and that caregiving requires geographical proximity (Morgan 1975; Joseph and Hallman 1985), an issue we discuss further below. This is exemplified in Isaksen, Devi and Hochschild's (2008) analysis of the consequences of mothers' migration on the 'socio-emotional commons' of the south. These

commons are characterised by 'a busy exchange of favors, large and small', which takes place in a community of kin, friends, neighbours and so on who exchange favours with one another (Isaksen et al. 2008, 414). Within transnational families, this translates as a brother looking after his parents, a migrant mother supporting the migration of her niece, grandparents taking care of the absent mother's children and so on. If we revisit these examples from a care circulation perspective, we might see that this brother, this migrant mother and these grandparents are actually participating in a circuit of mutual (though asymmetrical) support, in which care continues to flow and circulate within the family and in many directions. The authors argue instead that the migration of mothers over long periods of time 'attenuates, distorts, and sometimes ruptures the socio-emotional commons' (Isaksen et al. 2008, 418). This argument is based on the idea that physical co-presence in the form of daily face-to-face conversations, bodily contact, shared dinners and celebrations is essential for the maintenance of socio-emotional commons. Here co-presence is understood as strictly corporeal. The fact that migrants can, to various degrees, maintain a (sometimes daily) virtual presence in the life of their families via the use of communication technologies (e.g., Wilding 2006; Parreñas 2005b) is both underexplored and undervalued, as are the visits home to attend family events such as weddings (e.g., Fog Olwig 2002) or for caring purposes (e.g., Bacigalupe and Canara 2012). Although it is imperative to acknowledge how the practices and processes of transnational caregiving are embedded in the often unequal and unfavourable structures of opportunity that characterise migrant lives, this literature tends to portray virtual forms of connectedness as typically selective and fragmented and to assess them as invariably lacking and inadequate. Madianou and Miller's (2012) work offers a timely critique of this 'deficit model' of virtual communications through their detailed ethnographic account of effective virtual transnational exchanges. They argue that all relationships rely on mediated communication, reminding us that proximity does not necessarily ensure better quality family relationships.

The general lack of acknowledgement of both the extent and value of non-proximate forms of care in the care chains literature tends to reduce the mothers' participation in caring exchanges in the family to the sending of remittances, and to the view that informal family reciprocity 'comes closer to a market exchange' (Isaksen et al. 2008, 416). The conceptualisation of care flows between the north and the south as unidirectional is linked to the idea that migration involves the 'displacement' or 'diversion' (Parreñas 2003) of motherly love: Distance makes it impossible for migrant mothers to 'love' the children they left behind, and their love is diverted towards their affluent employers' children. This displacement of love leads Hochschild (2005, 35) to talk of a care drain, 'as women who normally care for the young, the old and the sick in their own poor countries move to care for the young, the old, and the sick in rich countries, whether as maids

and nannies or as day-care and nursing-home aides'. But care drain may not necessarily occur in all transnational families (Sørensen and Guarnizo 2007) and risks presenting an overly simplistic assessment of the complex and extended care negotiations and relationships involved. Even though the maintenance of family solidarity in transnational settings is undoubtedly a difficult and painful process, just as it commonly is in proximate family contexts, the purpose of adopting a care circulation perspective is precisely to show that migrants and their relatives are both receivers and providers of care (Ryan 2007), and that care continues to circulate within family networks over the migration, family and lifecycle (Le Gall 2005).

The framework of circulation and the idea that caregiving is an 'entity' that circulates offers a different, but complementary, perspective to the care chains framework. As we have argued, the care chains literature is mainly based on the notion of the commodification of care—with the migrants selling their caregiving, which travels in one direction along a chain (usually from south to north) in exchange for money that travels in the other direction in the form of remittances.³ Within this framework, care is conceived as embodied in the migrant domestic worker—the care cannot travel without the migrant, which makes sense in a labour market perspective. Domestic workers cannot look after the dependent family members of their employers without being physically present. In this perspective, two items travel along the chain in opposite directions: the migrant and his or her embodied care, and the money he or she receives and sends back home. In this context, the materiality and corporeality of care are foregrounded. If we move from a labour market focus to a focus on the moral economies of the family, we can see that not only do embodied and commodified forms of care travel along the chain, but also other 'virtual' forms of care travel in both directions (Madianou and Miller 2012).⁴ In addition, care exchanges expand beyond the principle migration chain, foregrounded in the care chains perspective, and circulate between the various and extended members of the family. Thus, we argue that the idea of a 'chain' is not the most suitable way of portraying the mobilities of care from a family perspective. The 'chain' metaphor tends to limit these mobilities to back and forth movement between two nodes of a chain, where migrant and nonmigrant exchange various types of support, thus reinforcing the distinction between these two sets of actors, as well as putting the focus on dyadic relationships. Our fieldwork, as well as various valuable discussions with scholars from transnational and geographically proximate family studies (including the contributors to this book), suggest that the framework of 'circulation' is better able to highlight the fact that the mobilities of care are multidirectional, can take place simultaneously and diachronically and go beyond the migrant/nonmigrant chain of exchange.

In focusing on how care circulates throughout the extended network of family members, we are mindful that the notion of circulation may evoke the idea that care flows unencumbered and evenly between all family members

in some kind of 'care-soaked' scenario, and this is certainly not the case. This interpretation of the 'circulation' lens would limit its analytical value by assuming all members of the network had the same access to resources, that all their relationships were equal and that they each exchanged equivalent levels and types of care.⁵ As the case studies about Yasmina and Viviana presented in the Introduction to this book show, various types of care flow unevenly, both simultaneously and diachronically, between kin from various generations located in different places in the world. In order to highlight both the circulation of these care flows as well as their inherent inequalities, we define the caregiving exchanges between kin as 'asymmetrically reciprocal' drawing on Wellman's (1988, 102) theory of networks, which he defines as 'differing in content and intensity'.

In addition, the care a person has given to a particular family member at a certain point in time may be returned to him or her by another family member. For example, Yasmina exchanges various forms of support with her mother Carita, but this mobility of care—which might be conceptualised as a two-way flow between two nodes of a chain—is embedded in wider family relationships and circuits of care that involve her siblings, her children and her parsimonious aunt. It is these more extensive, although unequal and often fraught with tension family care exchanges, which become more visible through a 'care circulation' perspective. The 'circulation' of care does not mean that care automatically travels along a 'circle' that equally binds together all the members of a particular family network. The various circuits of care involving different family members may coexist within a particular family at certain points in time, and some relatives may never receive support from each other but may do so separately through the circulation of care in their broader family networks. For example, Viviana's Australian and UK-based grandchildren may never exchange support with each other, although this potential lays dormant in the family network. However, they each exchange support with their common grandmother who is involved in circuits of care that include her children and siblings. The latter also provide and receive practical and emotional support from both sets of cousins. Here we again invoke network analysis and Wellman's argument that 'all social behaviour is best analyzed by looking first at the ways in which networks allocate flows of scarce resources to system members'. This allocation is rarely even, including in the case of caregiving; as a result, the care exchanges between family members are asymmetrical in both the amount and kinds of flows: 'Such asymmetric ties crucially connect network members to each other, and, through the other's additional ties, indirectly connect them to larger social networks' (Wellman 1988, 40).

A strength of the circulation lens is that it brings into view all of the actors and activities of caregiving, both actual and ideal, regardless of place or country of residence, migrant or nonmigrant status, gender, generation, age, etcetera, and so captures all of the care action (including its absence when expected or longed for) that comprises transnational family

life. Therefore, it must be emphasised that the quality, quantity, direction, presence or absence of the circulation of care is highly variable, constantly negotiated and deeply influenced by factors both within and outside the family. While the care chains perspective tends to see the rich families of the north in care surplus and the poor families of the south in care deficit, setting up a dichotomy between caregiving and receiving (Kofman 2012), we apply the framework of care circulation to capture the asymmetries of care experienced by transnational families from various socioeconomic, educational, cultural, ethnic and religious backgrounds, and throughout each of these family networks, wherever members reside.

Comparing transnational caregiving in middle-class families with that of the care chains cases is treading on tricky conceptual ground. Several issues are pertinent here. The global care chains perspective tends to cast middle-class women of the north as subjugators of the care work of domestic migrant women workers, thus creating the care drain and deficit in the migrant women's families in the south. There is also a broader issue at play about the general resistance to analyses of the middle classes in the social sciences, given the taken-for-granted assumption of their relative significant wealth and access to resources (Miller 2010). The woman from the north and the woman from the south in the global care chain scenario are seen to represent completely different social positionalities. In terms of the experiences and practices of caregiving, they might be accorded comparable experiences at the emotional level, but not on many others. Without a doubt, there are important geopolitical and economic asymmetries in income and access to education, well-being and so on *between* these 'types' of women. There is also considerable diversity *within* these categories of women, in terms of power relations, ethnic hierarchies, citizenship and employment rights and so forth. Many women in the 'south' as well as in the 'north' carry significant care burdens that are not adequately met by either welfare provisions or paid help, or even a combination of the two, including for those women with significant purchasing power (Costa 2013; Saraceno 2010). It is important to also consider and compare the care circuits of these women from 'the north' if we are to more fully understand family care in a truly global context (see Chapter 12, this volume).⁶

Here we see useful synergies between the care circulation and the care chains approach in highlighting that care is a resource unevenly distributed and subject to a variety of inequalities, both within and between families. As the feminist literature has shown, families are hierarchical and asymmetrical social systems (Thorne and Yalom 1982), and the unequal, gendered division of labour is central to patriarchy (Delphy 1998; Connell 1987). The debate in the literature about the transformative potential of migration and transnational processes to reconfigure power relations, in particular of gender, is pertinent here.⁷ If care is understood as a type of resource in families governed by unequal power relations, then an examination of care circulation can provide a window on the types of inequalities fostered

within transnational family settings. Recognising that migrants continue to participate in family care circuits brings forward the need for policies that support this activity. As Merla and Degavre (2013) argue, European governments tend to consider migrants—and domestic workers in particular—as breadwinners discharged from family caring duties. Migrants who are employed in precarious and/or undeclared jobs in particular are excluded from de-familialisation policies, that is, policies aimed at helping adults 'uphold a socially acceptable standard of living, independently of family relationships, either through paid work or social security provisions' (Lister 1994, 32). These include measures designed to reduce the care burden of female citizens. However, these policies draw on a definition of 'family' as geographically proximate. Recognising migrants' transnational caring responsibilities calls for de-familialisation policies that are adapted to the specificities of balancing paid work in the 'north' with transnational family life. This also means 'facilitating access to the resources that determine family solidarity in situations of "non-proximate" care' (Merla and Degavre 2013, 113).

Framing the mobilities of care in terms of circulation addresses the need to bring to the fore some key differences between a family perspective and a political economy perspective, which are, we think, both relevant and complementary. The central notion of care in the care chains literature is commodification because of its treatment in the context of labour market exchange and the wider frame of political economy. In contrast, we are employing the notion of care as generalised, asymmetrical reciprocal exchange governed by the moral codes of family and kinship ties, that is, the moral economy. Clearly these are, on the one hand, quite different definitions of care, and, on the other hand, both types coexist. As Morgan (1996, 40) argues, 'households do not simply function on behalf of the wider economy and it is important to consider the ways in which the moral economy meets and interacts with the political economy in the business of family life located in and between households'. The interconnection between economic activities and intimate transactions are also highlighted in Zelizer's (2005b) notion of 'circuits of commerce', which include interpersonal care circuits and remittance circuits. These circuits are characterised by a distinctive set of social relations among specific individuals, which serve as a basis for shared economic activities, carry shared meanings and define a boundary between members and nonmembers of the circuit. This approach highlights that remittances not only serve the economic needs of transnational families, but they also establish specific connections between family members and convey powerful shared meanings, such as what it means to be a 'good' mother.

The case of migrant industrial districts and transnational family firms is another example of the links between migration, kinship and economic initiatives. In explaining the success of Chinese small businesses in Prato, Italy, despite significant tensions and hostilities from the local Italian

community, Dei Otrati (Forthcoming, 11) refers to a 'localised thickening of economic and social relations' that 'facilitates the circulation of information among these immigrants and reduces to a minimum transactions costs within and between firms'. This is because the economic relations are largely embedded in the kinship and social ties of communities, 'which enforces a bond of solidarity enforced by the group' (Dei Otrati Forthcoming, 11). In other words, the asymmetrical reciprocal obligations, including of family caregiving, that characterise this group provide the opportunities, structures and infrastructures to support successful business and economic initiatives: 'a form of integration in which economic efficiency is reached mainly thanks to relationships of reciprocity rather than of authority' (Dei Otrati Forthcoming, 11). These types of ethnic entrepreneurship, community-based migratory moves and economic activities are not covered by the care chains perspective, and yet we would argue that the exchange of care that is constitutive of family life forms a fundamental foundation and motivation for this mobility and economic activity. Thus, we are certainly not advocating replacing the care chains literature with the framework of circulation and its more generalised reciprocal form of care. Rather, we are suggesting that the circulation lens allows us to examine family and care exchange more broadly in the various types of economic activities, mobility and migration, absence and separation that occurs across a range of families. In so doing, we wish to highlight how the care circulation framework can be employed to reveal the points of connection and disjunction between the labour market and the family.

Thinking of the mobilities of care in terms of circulation rather than a chain is not just motivated by a desire to make the multidirectional 'nature' of care flow more visible. It also contributes to a project that seeks to expand the scope of study. Here, family is taken in a wide sense, as going beyond nuclear households. Our volume sits firmly in the growing tradition of work on 'transnationalism from below', with a focus on the more private and quotidian constructions of transnational social fields at the level of families, households and the domestic sphere (Gardner and Grillo 2002).⁸ This perspective highlights how family ties and obligations are integral to economic and political motivations in the decision-making process of both those who migrate and those who stay behind,⁹ also evident in motivations for return (Conway and Potter 2009) and retirement (Williams et al. 2000). Ackers and Dwyer (2002). These processes are still largely ignored in official conceptions of the family and of migration, and they continue to be reflective of traditional static notions of families and households as well as implicitly unidirectional understandings of mobility (Kofman 2004). The circulation perspective that we are proposing helps to widen the analysis of the mobility of care beyond mother-child relationships. By taking a broad definition of care that includes both embodied and virtual 'love' and by tracing its movement, we bring more care actors into the frame and recognise the role played by wider family networks.

The conceptualisations of 'care chains' and of 'care circulation' are not mutually exclusive. As recent developments in the care chains literature have shown, the analysis of care flows as a chain is not incompatible with the interpretation of care flows in terms of circulation. As Yeates (2009, 46) notes, the chain 'conveys the networks of connection within and across borders, and the forward and backward linkages between different actors within the network'. In studies on transnational mothering and transnational families, the notion of circulation has been suggested and glimpsed for specific sets of relationships. For instance, Herrera (2010, 68) notes that the involvement of Ecuadorian grandmothers in the education of left-behind grandchildren 'sometimes blurs the dichotomy of caregiver and receiver and may be better understood as 'circulation of care' in which two or three sides are being cared for and taking care of each other'. Similarly, Hung Thai (2012) identified 'circuits of gratitude' involving emotional and material exchanges between Vietnamese transnational couples and the transpacific matchmakers who arranged their marriages. In their special issue on 'rethinking the transnational mobilities of care in Asia', Huang et al. (2012a, 2012b, 132) argue that the global care chains perspective, which they define as 'the predominant paradigm in the literature on transnational mobilities for care', needs to be expanded and complicated further to encompass

more complex interactive relationship flows, where the boundary between the caregiver and the care receiver is more often blurred in a mutually dependent care relationship. Care does not only flow one way; the flows of care are bilateral and reciprocal. Despite this, what appears not to have changed is the strong feminisation of the care chain: caregivers still tend to be women.

The existence of forward and backward linkages along care chains has been highlighted in several studies of transnational mothering, and the broader transnational families literature also includes illustrations of multidirectional care flows, but so far none of them has explicitly conceptualised transnational caregiving in terms of circulation.¹⁰ This chapter and this book aim to begin to shore up this gap.

As discussed in the Introduction, Kofman (2012), in particular, has noted the limitations of the care chain perspective in dealing with broader contexts of care. She advocates engaging with the concepts of social reproduction and 'global householding'¹¹ in order to 'place care work within a wider landscape of activities and sites and to connect supposedly disparate circuits of migration, in particular labor, family, and education, which are usually analyzed separately but which are in fact interconnected' (Kofman 2012, 144). While her definition of care is much narrower than ours, focusing on the support of people who are unable to care for themselves, her contextualisation of caregiving within the range of activities

and institutions engaged in social reproduction makes her focus broader, though complementary. She sees the framework of global householding as a way of 'connecting the different processes and trajectories' of social reproduction, including care. Kofman (2012, 153) argues that a focus on global households—'an entity broader than the family and allowing for the formation of units not necessarily composed of relations through marriage or direct lineage'—would enable an analysis of 'the different forms, orientations, and directions of care' providing 'an approach that follows longitudinally and spatially the migrant so as to capture care giving and receiving . . . To this end, the use of the global householding framework, as the nexus of the life cycle and its diverse activities, including care, would be a concrete way of articulating the different circuits in the overall social reproduction of the household'. We believe a care circulation lens, with its focus on the practices and processes of the asymmetrically reciprocal exchanges of transnational caregiving, offers a productive way to map the actual and imagined connections between members of 'global households' across distance and time.

Another important aim of this book is to better understand distance and absence in family life. We propose that by applying a care circulation framework, we are better able to theorise absence and distance as common features of family life and so begin to see transnational families as family forms in their own right. This argument is the focus of the next section. At a time when mobility is intensifying and governments around the globe are increasingly targeting skilled migration in preference to family reunion (Hawthorne 2005), there is a growing need for social and migration policy as well as services and resources that facilitate reunion and connectedness. The transnational social sphere, while full of circulating people, ideas, goods and finances, remains relatively empty of transnational structures, infrastructures and support services to safeguard these people and their activities and relationships. Governments of developed economies are increasingly interested in facilitating knowledge transfer and trade links through their migrant diasporas (Williams 2007; Aguinias 2006). What tends to be overlooked in the relevant policy deliberations is how transnational family and caregiving relationships often provide the basis and context from which economic links are developed and maintained.

THE MOBILITY TURN: THEORISING DISTANCE AND ABSENCE AS PART OF FAMILY LIFE

Our discussion of care circulation is closely linked to developments in the conceptualisation and theorisation of migration and transnationalism.¹² The availability of increasingly affordable and safer modes of travel and communication across distance has fundamentally changed the process of migration. In contrast to the past, migratory moves today are more likely

to be characterised by regular and frequent communication and linkages between sending and receiving areas.

To draw on our own research for relatively representative examples, the two major waves of Italian labour migration to Australia in the 1920s and 1950s were characterised by a family economic strategy devised to safeguard the livelihoods of left-behind kin. The migrants would remit as much of their earnings as they could in the hope that they would one day repatriate to a better life back home (Baldassar 2001; Baldassar and Pesman 2005). Technology being what it was, they commonly communicated with their loved ones through the exchange of regular letters, occasional phone calls and rare visits. These same migrants today, along with a growing 'new wave' of arrivals from Italy, enjoy significantly more active and complex patterns of communication with loved ones back home, including SMS texts several times a day, frequent e-mails, phone and Skype calls, as well as regular visits, often once a year.¹³ Even far less wealthy migrants, including refugees, can reliably communicate with their distant kin weekly or monthly, although visits may be much rarer. Despite major obstacles to the maintenance of family solidarity across borders arising from a difficult insertion in the labour market, inadequate provision of leave options, restrictive visa regulations and inequalities in the access to, and use of, communication technologies, Salvadoran refugees who settled in Australia in the 1980s and early 1990s invest a lot of time, energy and money staying in touch with their ageing parents (mainly via telephone conversations) and fulfilling their filial duties notwithstanding the distance (Merla 2012a, 2012b; Merla 2011).

Put simply, in the past, migration was both conceived of, and experienced, as unidirectional—from home to host country—as well as finite or final, resulting in settlement and a new life in the host country. This view contributed to conceptualisations of the migrant's home and host societies as discrete, homogenous entities with little in common and few connections between them. Wimmer and Glick Schiller (2002) note how this seemingly unproblematic division of space tended to privilege the straight line theory of assimilation as the end result of migration and an either/or approach to home and host allegiances.¹⁴ If migration, a process inherently involving movement, was conceptualised as finite and unidirectional, with an emphasis on settlement and assimilation, it is hardly surprising that the dominant notions about households—and the families they contain—are conceived of as rooted in or bound by static, geographical domains (Moore 1988; Stacey 1998). As Hardill (2004, 378, 386) points out, 'The term "household" is in fact usually associated with a locus of residence, but for the transnational households . . . members of one household can be simultaneously located in the sending *and* receiving country', arguing that 'because of the complexity of lives today we need to revisit these terms'. The concept of 'global household', mentioned earlier, provides a pertinent example. The potency of assumptions about family and household occupying one locus of residence

is perhaps most common in family and gerontology studies, which tend to define all manner of family function as dependent on geographical proximity, and this is perhaps most evident in the case of caring (Leira and Saraceno 2006). In general, as is evident in the care chains literature described earlier, researchers have assumed that in order to care for each other effectively, family members must live in close proximity.¹⁵

The notions of transnational migration and transnational families are attempts at better capturing the increased communication and closer linkages between the sending and receiving societies. 'Transnationalism' in this context is defined as 'a social process in which migrants establish social fields that cross geographic, cultural, and political borders' (Glick Schiller et al. 1992, ix). The conceptual shift to a 'transnational' framework exemplifies what is currently described as the 'mobility turn' in the social sciences (Urry 2000; Sheller and Urry 2006). Much of this thinking is an attempt to accommodate processes associated with globalisation, facilitate the integration of an increasingly diverse citizenry in the body politic of nation-states and eschew assimilationist and exclusionist rhetorics (like Fortresses Europe) that have become all too common a feature of contemporary geopolitics (Furedi 2005). There is now a considerable body of research and theory that attempt to make sense of this increased mobility and connectedness,¹⁶ including concepts such as diaspora (Cohen 1997), ethnoscapas (Appadurai 1990, 1996), network society (Castells 1996), networked family (Urry 2002), mediated relationships (Madianou and Miller 2012) and, of course, global care chains. Also relevant is the recent interest in notions of cosmopolitanism (Beck and Sznaider 2010), which reflect attempts at developing a social science more attuned to mobility, including its methodological implications (Beck et al. 2006). Far from denying the importance of physical proximity and corporeal senses, this literature examines how people compensate for and overcome distance and separation. Urry (2003, 163) highlights, in particular, the role of visits and intermittent co-presence as 'essential for developing those relations of trust that persist during often lengthy periods of distance and even solitude'.¹⁷ A key point about the mobility turn in the social sciences is the attempt to highlight and examine how increased mobility and associated virtual forms of connectedness affect our lives, and not just the people who are actually mobile (Ostergaard-Nielsen 2003). The mobility turn is not just about those who move, but also about the connectedness despite mobility as well as the to and fro of that connectedness—its circularity.¹⁸

As we explain in the Introduction to this volume, the framework of circulation central to this book helps us to think of migration in terms of the family lifecycle as a dynamic set of processes across the life course, rather than a momentous event in time that damages family connectedness. While new technologies are effectively helping to shrink distance, we do not want to downplay the significant challenges and deeply heart-felt anxieties that characterise the realities of caring across distance. Without

denying the often extreme emotional and practical hardships that members of geographically dispersed families confront, in this volume, we wish to highlight the agency of family members in transnational processes of care in an effort to acknowledge transnational families as increasingly common family forms and to further question negative conceptualisations of these types of families. In summary, we are suggesting that transnational families should be theorised as family forms that generate both positive and negative experiences, as geographically proximate family forms do, and that mobility and distance need to be seen as common features of contemporary family life. The framework of circulation is a productive way to achieve this aim by mapping the processes and practices of transnational caring.

The chapters in this volume all point to the general and robust scepticism (Zentgraf and Chinchilla 2012) about how effectively transnational families can discharge their caregiving obligations and how they can adequately care for and about each other, that is, how well they can actually 'do family', especially those families that are separated over long periods of time. Of particular concern is the potential for negative impact or harm that might be caused to family members by long periods of separation. Not surprisingly, the spotlight most often falls on those cases where mothers are separated from young children.¹⁹ Transnational mothering challenges a central and deeply held dominant Western notion about the bond between a mother and child being biological rather than cultural (Bowlby 1969) and the associated implications this has for mother and children to be both emotionally and physically close (Chavkin and Maher 2010, Banfi and Bocagni 2011; Lutz and Palenga-Möllbeck 2012). All the chapters in this volume show how families and their members respond to and manage the considerable constraints they face in doing family, particularly parenting, transnationally. What they also emphasise and critique is the prevailing dominant Western notions about what constitutes 'normal' and 'healthy' family relationships (see in particular Chapters 3, 6 and 7, this volume). The notion of 'family' covers a multitude of senses of relatedness and connections (Sørensen and Guarnizo 2007, 161),²⁰ both within Western societies and across the globe. This richness is hidden from view in the dominant Western imaginary that identifies family with nuclear households bound up in notions of proximity and intimacy. As Sørensen and Guarnizo (2007) note, migration studies' tendency to identify the family with the domestic group has led researchers to assume that separation automatically leads to family disintegration, particularly when mothers leave husbands and children behind. The notions of transnationalism and transnational families have gone some way to highlight the existence of families maintained across distance. However, they are implicitly and overtly judged against the Western normative myth of proximate families. The ideal of proximity and intimacy for healthy parent-child relations leads to the consequent assumption that distance is a negative, major impediment to the delivery of caregiving.

This volume critically examines the implicit assumption that effective family caregiving requires intimacy and proximity. It is instructive to consider the argument about the relative absence of anxiety related to physical separation in the African compared with the Western case (Goody 1982). Levine (1976) argues that Westerners crave intimacy in social relations, and its absence generates anxiety. Elsewhere, Baldassar (2008a, 2008b) has discussed how older Italians desire a close relationship with their families, especially children and grandchildren, such that their perceptions about their health and well-being have been found to be associated with how close by their children are felt to be.²¹ In contrast, Trajano (2009, 525) argues that because of the set of imperatives that define migration in Cape Verdean society, families experience separation as less painful and disruptive than in the West:

These economic, political and cultural characteristics, which act as driving forces for emigration, represent the Cape Verdean expression of . . . the structural obstacles of the African cultural *ecumene*. Their regular and long-lasting existence in Cape Verdean society generates unbearable tensions that would tear the social fabric were it not for the ethos that emphasizes a lack of anxiety in regard to physical separation between those who stay and those who leave, and the maintenance of a strong feeling of relatedness, acting as a bridge for the physical distance, by means of continuity of material obligations.

Madianou and Miller (2012, 10) refer to 'anthropological accounts of many regions, such as the Caribbean, where the nuclear co-present family has never been the norm'. Fog Olwig's chapter on Caribbean transnational families (Chapter 6, this volume) shows that, 'From the perspective of people from the lower strata of Caribbean society, migration and care are . . . intimately linked and should be interpreted as a way of doing family relations in a mobile world of unequal social and economic opportunities'. Similarly, Agunias (2006, 17) describes the Caribbean as a pertinent example of 're-migration as a livelihood strategy to increase and diversify the income of the whole family . . . a complex, reciprocal flow rather than permanent one-way movements characterize Caribbean international migration'. He refers to Segal (1996, 25), who, like Fog Olwig, argues that Caribbean migration 'should be understood as a form of extended kinship over space and time with frequent rather than one-time movements' (Agunias 2006, 17).²²

Thus, the way transnational family members experience absence from loved ones is much more dependent on the quality of their relationships, and the socially constructed meanings of mobility, than on the actual distance that separates them. Even the meaning of distance is specific to sociocultural contexts and influenced by the structural factors that frame mobility. For example, in the study by Baldassar et al. (2007), the New Zealanders did not define themselves as migrants, partly as a consequence

of the unrestricted and relatively inexpensive border crossing to and from Australia. Most felt they were not living that far away from their homeland, despite the seven-hour flight and approximately five-hour time difference that actually separated them from loved ones back home. What these contributions show is that 'being together' may go well beyond daily proximity. Rather 'being together' as well as 'doing family' can be maintained by fulfilling a series of duties and mediations, even from afar. This points to the importance of including transnational families in our understanding of common family forms.

As we argue in the Introduction, members of transnational families increasingly and 'routinely' live their lives 'together across distance' and have developed practices to deal with the challenges posed by absence and separation. This means that we need to revisit normative understandings of migration and the conceptualisation of human mobility more broadly. In conceptualisations of caregiving, 'the' family and the nation-state tend to be defined within an interpretive frame that presumes sedentarism and physical co-presence as the norm and migration and mobility as, therefore, disruptive. As already noted, in gerontological studies, caregiving tends to be defined rigidly as personal or hands-on care delivered to dependent persons who cannot care for themselves (Ennuyer 2001), and thus cannot be provided except in contexts of physical proximity. The precondition of physical proximity for caregiving is inherently linked to the notion of 'the' family as a private geographic domain represented by a household. The standard, institutional model of the family, featuring a white, middle-class, heterosexual couple with two children, represents family members as bonded together by physical co-presence and bounded by the confines of the privately owned land and house that contains them (Morgan 2011b). In these conceptualisations, the structure of the family is viewed as a microcosm and primary reproducer of the patriarchal nation-state, a central concept in political science.

This approach to caregiving, families and states mirrors the way nations and communities were, until the advent of transnational migration studies, largely theorised as inherently connected to a geographical place. They are each defined and punctuated by various types of boundaries, including borders on maps, perimeters on plans and kinship groups on civil registry certificates. Within these fields, migration is primarily viewed as a process that literally and symbolically breaks away from the norm of sedentarism and therefore results in divided state loyalties, fractured families and an inability to fulfil obligations to care. The movement out of homeland states, and in particular the resulting distance between family members, is seen to rupture and inhibit continued connections to people and place. Not surprisingly, then, transnational family forms are by nature deeply suspicious and flawed. Ironically, many migratory moves are motivated by the need to provide for the family and care for its members. Over a century of migration studies reveals that these moves are also more likely to result in

multiple identities and national belongings.²³ Further, recent research on transnational families shows that migration can result in expanded family networks of care as the use of new technologies gives rise to more frequent and complex, multidirectional communication flows between members, including across the generations (Madrianou and Miller 2012; Nedelcu 2012). Perspectives of social life that are framed through a focus on social groups and processes, and therefore approach mobility as, potentially at least, a sociocultural norm,²⁴ lead to a methodological focus on the individual biography and life course of the people who move to consider how movement impacts on the static structures of the life world, rather than the reverse. In addition to work on transnational families, recent approaches in the sociology of the family, such as the 'family practices' approach (Morgan 2011a, 2011b) or the 'configurational approach' (Widmer and Jallinoja 2008) propose alternative frameworks that move beyond a focus on static, normative constructions of the nuclear family and stress the historical and spatial fluidity of kin relations.

While the families in this volume can all be defined as transnational, a growing number of related family forms approximate transnational families in the spatial and geographical spread and complexity of contemporary family living arrangements, regardless of their socioeconomic status. These families are affected by various forms of mobility, which, while not exactly migrations, result in the absences of family members (Hardill 2004). These family members are to a certain extent 'living apart together' (LAT), a term that applies to people who 'define themselves as a couple and (...) perceive that their close surrounding personal network does so as well' (Levin 2004, 226–227) but do not share a home, even if they work and live in the same town.²⁵ Short- and long-distance 'LATs' comprise a variety of couple relationships, including young couples who may study in different places and retired people who are emotionally attached to their house and do not want to leave it. According to Levin (2004), the decline in marriages; changes in labour markets, (which make it more difficult to find a job when relocating); search for gender equality in intimate relationships; and increased frequency of travel and accessibility of communication technologies all account for the increase and growing awareness of this type of living arrangement. Another example of this family formation (also discussed by Levin 2004) is evident in the so-called multi-local families that result from rising divorce rates and the recognition in many countries of shared custody as a reference model that result in growing numbers of recomposed families.²⁶ Members in these families, most particularly children, belong to more than one family household (Marquet 2009). Their various blended and/or stepfamilies live in separate households, which are often located at a distance, across a suburb, a town, a city or even countries. These children routinely spend time in 'separated, yet connected' (Smart and Neale 1999, 67) households depending on the particular custody arrangements, such as weekly or weekend exchange arrangements.

Another increasingly common multi-local family form found in many cities around the world today involves the commuter who travels to work and lives in one city during the week and returns to his or her home in another city on weekends. This experience is so common in Italy that these workers are referred to as *i pendolari* because, like a pendulum, they swing between cities on a weekly basis. In a growing literature on these 'commuter' families, members are also described as 'living apart together' (Hardill 2002; Smith 2001). We might also include fly-in, fly-out work arrangements, increasingly common in places where mining is a significant component of the economy (Taylor and Simmonds 2009). In Western Australia, for example, it is usual for mine employees to work and live on-site in a remote mining centre, flying back to their families in the capital city of Perth for one in every four weeks (Storey 2001). Comparable arrangements of this type include professionals and managers who might visit company offices and clients around the world, involving several extended work trips a year (Amit 2007). Doyle and Nathan (2001) argue that cross-border work is being similarly transformed to involve shorter stays, giving rise to new types of workers including international commuters, virtual expatriates, frequent flyers and short-term travellers who could also be considered transnational.

There is a corresponding increase in the diversity of transnational family forms. Perhaps most prominent in the migration literature are the seasonal or temporary workers who travel on short-term labour contracts of several months or illegally to fill labour shortages, like the thousands of Mexican and Caribbean seasonal farm workers who move each year to Canada during planting and harvesting seasons through the Canadian Seasonal Agricultural Worker Program (Basok 2000; Cohen 1987). Here, of course, the growing numbers of so-called domestic migrants who have dramatically and profoundly feminised the traditionally male south-north labour flows are centrally important and have given rise to the influential care chains thesis that we discuss in some detail above. Wehner (1999) describes these types of labour and domestic migrants as 'working-class cosmopolitans' to highlight their everyday lived engagement with cultural difference in ways that are often far more challenging than is experienced by the elites, who tend to share more class similarities than cultural differences with their colleagues.

The relatively much more affluent but equally highly mobile migrants include expatriate workers who might be based in an overseas office on a posting of several years during their career.²⁷ Shimoda (2012) argues that the host country nationals who work in these multinational and expatriate offices can be considered 'local' transnationals. While they do not cross geographical borders, they do cross cultural and organisational borders when they enter their foreign-owned and managed workplace. Ackers (2004) has shown that in the European context, this mainly male-led migration tends to place female spouses in 'a highly vulnerable and dependent position'

due to their difficult access to employment and work-related social rights.²⁸ Finally, there are the largely long-term (or permanent) migrants who might live for decades in the host country only to return to their homeland on visits or for retirement. These include labour migrants and refugees as well as more wealthy professionals and elites. All socioeconomic classes of families are represented in this volume, and this diversity is particularly evident in the chapters in Part D, which present some of the variety of family forms and structures among the aspirational and middle classes. Hardill (2004, 376), for example, refers to transnational commuter-couples who live 'with one foot in two places—places that span national boundaries bringing two societies within one social field (Kivisto, 2001:566)'. What have been called Astronaut families with parachute children are a particular case of mobile families and refer to families where one or both parents live and work in one country and the children (and sometimes one parent) live in another country (Pe-Pua et al. 1998; Vertovec 1999; Waters 2002). These parachute children might grow up to join the growing ranks of international students who sojourn abroad to complete a university degree, yet another example of increasing mobility in our lives (Amit 2007) (see also Chapter 11, this volume).

While we do not deal with all of these family forms in this volume, we feel it is important to recognise their relevance to this discussion, to further emphasise the point that family life everywhere is increasingly affected by mobilities of varying types and degrees and the ever more common experience of caring across distance. It is also worth considering whether similar patterns of caregiving to transnational families are evident in families who live within the same country. This is particularly relevant to relatively large countries like Australia and the United States, where family members can be separated across even greater distances than families spread across different countries within Europe. But even in cases where families live relatively close by each other, the general time pressures of busy lives often mitigate against taking advantage of proximity, as do factors such as the inevitable tensions and frictions within family relationships. Baldassar et al. (2007), in their study of the Australian context, found that many people commented that they would probably *not* be in any greater contact with their family 'back home' even if they still lived there and that living so far away made 'being together' more special and meaningful than it appeared to be for their proximate kin.²⁹ Similarly, Madianou and Miller (2011, 148) acknowledge the potential 'benefits' of distance in helping to sustain healthy family relationships. Their careful and detailed analysis of transnational mothering by Filipina migrants is replete with 'examples of absence that exacerbates conflict with parents and equally rich with examples of absence that helps resolve conflicts with parents'. While it must be noted that they are dealing mostly with adolescent children, their critique is an important contribution to dominant ideas about this phenomenon. Arguably, then, in all families, including both proximate and distant forms, members must

maintain a sense of family-hood despite absences (even across relatively short distances), and caregiving circulates over space and time.

CIRCULATION IN MIGRATION AND FAMILY STUDIES

The framework of circulation is not new to migration studies, originally conceived to refer to seasonal labourers who moved between their homes in one country and their places of work in another country with such regularity that they were described as *circulating* between both places (Prothero and Chapman 1985). In the contemporary global context of significantly increased mobility, the notion of circulation is being revisited (Agnias 2006). Demographers such as Graeme Hugo (2005, 2009) point out that migration is rarely linear because most migrants eventually repatriate.

This careful attention to mobility has led to a reassessment of migrations of the past, which, while not characterised by the more regular to-and-fro mobility of today, show clear evidence of a degree of circularity (King and Christou 2012). In the case of the century of massive Italian emigration, what initially looked like a 'haemorrhage of humanity' with the apparent exodus between 1861 and 1965 of more than twenty-five million people (a number equivalent to almost half of the total population of contemporary Italy) has been reviewed in light of the significant rate of repatriations. Some twenty million people might have emigrated from Italy between 1861 and 1941, but the net loss of population over this period was only 7.7 million (approximately 39 percent) (Sori 1979, 19). The rate of repatriation was highest from the northern regions; for example, in the 1960s, almost eight and a half thousand men and women from the Veneto arrived in Australia, but in the same decade, just over six thousand (about 70 percent) were recorded as returning to Italy (Thompson 1980, 23; Baldassar and Pesman 2005). It is important to note that, until recently,³⁰ the collection of migration statistics was very much informed by a unilinear approach to mobility as returns and re-migrations went unidentified and return visits were completely overlooked (Baldassar 2001; Hugo 2012, Forthcoming). Price (1963, 10) notes that the official statistics for Australia 'simply record the total number of entries and exits, irrespective of whether the persons concerned are making their first or fifth entry or exit'. Di Leonardo (1984, 49) has shown the same is true for the United States, while the majority of Italian emigrants left intending to return, 'The evidence suggests that large numbers were counted as new emigrants and immigrants, by the Italian and American governments, as they left a second, third, or more times in their periodic returns and remigrations'.

Traditionally, the movement of migrants back to their homelands has been defined as return migration. Gmelch (1980) points out, 'As early as 1885, Ravenstein (1885, 64) noted the principle of return migration in his renowned list of migration laws: "Each main current of migration produces

a compensating counter-current". However, a focus on the physical migratory movement of the individual risks missing the complex and ongoing processes of connectedness over time, and Ravenstein's famous law could be interpreted as referring to more than just the flows of people. Hugo (2009) makes a similar point in his evaluation of this research. For him, return migration is an old phenomenon that is being transformed through globalisation. One of the 'new' elements Hugo refers to is 'a more extensive pattern of *circular* interaction' between home and host settings. This *circular interaction* is a reference to the significantly greater degrees of 'frequency and intimacy that [were] unthinkable until recently' (Hugo 2009, 213):

In short, return migration needs to be considered as part of a wider process of transnationalism involving regular electronic interaction, frequent visiting and regular reinforcing of intentions to eventually return. (Hugo 2009, 214)

There is a degree of conceptual 'slippage' in the literature regarding exactly which movements the term circulation refers to. Most often, the notion of circulation is used to refer to the increased mobility of individuals.³¹ However, as in the quote from Hugo cited above, circulation is also a useful term to refer to the 'patterns of circular interaction', which would include not just people but all the elements that create interaction and connectedness between people across distance. Caglar (2001, 607), for example, in discussing the conceptual value of a transnational approach, argues that it represents 'a new analytic optic which makes visible the increasing intensity and scope of *circular* flows of persons, goods, information and symbols triggered by international labour migration' (italics added).

An area of migration research in which the notion of circulation is increasingly debated is in relation to professional migration, and in particular concerns about 'brain drain' and the emigration of skilled young people (Harvey 2008; Tung 2008). This mobility of young graduates and other talent is not just affecting developing economies like those in India and Asia, but also developed ones experiencing economic crisis like Ireland, Italy and Spain. The mobility of highly skilled workers including doctors, nurses, engineers and IT specialists have been at the heart of this concern. Recent research is beginning to show, however, that these professionals often repatriate to their home countries after a period of time away (Conway and Potter 2009), and thus the notion of brain circulation has been advanced as a more appropriate term to describe this phenomenon (Saxenian 2005; Hugo 2009). Similar findings have been reported for *some* domestic and labour migrants who increase their skills and competencies during their time abroad, which they are able to capitalise on upon their return home (Agnias 2006).³² Given the increased mobility that defines our contemporary lives, as well as the effective communication technologies that keep us connected, migration does not necessarily result in a loss

of skills from the sending societies. Greater rates of repatriation and visits occur, during which 'feedback effects' may take place, in particular the so-called tacit knowledge of technology transfer, where migrants share information, know-how and instruction on the use of new technologies (Keller 2004). In addition, we might argue that these migrants can circulate their new-found knowledge and skills—their 'brain power'—through their personal, family and work networks and exchanges such that where they are located geographically is largely irrelevant.

To reiterate this point, circulation in the migration literature is most often a reference to the circular movement of people, 'a system of multiple, recurrent spatial movements of individuals, while the characteristic of multiplicity is as significant as the spatial movement and the system itself' (Illés and Kincses 2012, 198). But the people, while they circulate more often than ever before, actually move less often than their 'circulation activity' (what Hugo calls 'circular interaction'). In this way, 'brain circulation' might refer to the way knowledge can be transferred across distance between people regardless of where they reside. This idea of brain circulation led us to consider the notion of care circulation. Rather than focusing on the care workers, migrants or people who move, we asked, what would be the contribution to scholarship if we considered the circulation of care? The circulation of care, governed by cultural notions of obligation and generalised asymmetrical reciprocity, can occur in all families, wherever their members might reside, however distant or proximate, and whatever their socioeconomic class circumstances. The framework of circulation thus allows us to trace the care that circulates, such that the locus and mobility of the people involved, while equally important in terms of the multiple factors that influence care circulation, are not the primary focus of analysis. Of course, this is not to suggest that the circulation of care is similar in all the variety of family forms and social classes, nor that it is an easy and painless process.

The notion of circulation is also not new to family studies. We noted earlier how the circulation of care is often implied in research on care chains and transnational families but that it has not been formally examined. Similarly, the idea that care circulates within family networks is familiar to the socio-anthropology of proximate families and intergenerational solidarities, even if the term 'circulation' has been used largely descriptively and without being fully conceptualised. Key contributions in the field, including the classic work by Finch (1989b), have shown that caregiving in the form of goods and services flows—circulates—within family networks horizontally (between members of a similar generation) and vertically (across generations) both upwards and downwards over the family cycle.³³ Arias-Donfut (2000, 663, 664) talks of the 'circulation of exchanges' within family networks, as well as 'circular fluxes' of transfers between the generations.

The term 'circulation' in family studies has been particularly employed in relation to caregiving, or support, conceived as a form of gift-giving, following the seminal work of Mauss (1923) on the gift relationship, in

which he argued that gift exchange is one of the bonds that cohere societies (see for instance, Bloch and Buisson 1994). According to Godbout and Charbonneau (1996, 61), the combination of the various forms of family support that circulate around children, homes, material support and money—as well as emotional and moral support—make the circulation of gifts complex and multiconnected and prevent individual members from closely tracking what is given and what is received in the long term. The authors see the circulation of gifts, which include care and support, as essential for the reproduction of kinship groups over the generations, and in particular for the intergenerational transmission of material and symbolic heritage (such as financial assets, family values and family principles). This focus on gift and 'generalised reciprocity' goes together with acknowledging the importance of reciprocal obligation and debt in family interactions. The anthropologist Levi Strauss (1969) developed ideas about gift exchange into a structural theory of group alliance, in which he argued that patterns of giving, receiving and repaying, as individuals and groups, reflect the deepest structures of societies. This is echoed in many case studies in this volume, which provide interesting data on the relationship between macro (state), meso (community) and micro (family and individual) factors and their impact on the circulation of care. This also involves understanding how particular mixes of private and public support arising from the articulation between families, states, markets and community organisations (conceptualised by some researchers as forming the points of a 'care diamond'; see Evers et al. 1994)³⁴ impact on transnational caregiving and receiving. Of particular interest here is the role of cultural notions of caregiving and obligation and how these are shaped by, as well as shape in turn, the policies, structures and infrastructures of family and support services.

Our book questions dominant constructions of 'families' and 'households' in research on transnational families by pointing to the diversity of family configurations and sense of connectedness. This is in line with Finch's (2007, 67) argument that:

as a result of changed patterns of living there are now fewer and fewer people who can answer the question 'Who constitutes my family?' simply by pointing to a domestic group, or even by enumerating kin ties. Amongst those who cannot are people who live within 'chosen' families involving same sex partnerships and close friendships defined as family (Weeks et al., 2001); children and adults where there has been a divorce and where family membership has become multi-local, stretched across different households (Smart and Neale, 1999); and families where there has been a history of migration leading to transnational kin relationships, where families are stretched across continents, let alone across households.

While our analysis of care circulation features the social construction of 'the family' (albeit in its transnational form), we are also cognisant of the

'limits of the family construct' and how the notion of 'family' occupies an arguably privileged and hegemonic position within the sociology of relationships (Abel 2013). As mentioned earlier, it is imperative to take into account all of the important care-related social relationships in people's lives (Rose-neil and Budgeon 2004). This involves debunking the notion of a single and uniform type of family form and structure (Bernardes 1986, 597). While the primacy of the kin network is clearly evident in the case studies in this volume, this is not to say that non-kin friendships and even the loose ties of associates (Amit 2007) do not play an important and integral role in social relationships and the exchange of care. As studies of British families show (Williams 2004), people work hard to sustain commitments to the persons (kin and non-kin) that matter to them. The notion of care circulation is based on the recognition of the diversity of 'families' within and across cultures, and thus invites us to move beyond heteronormative, static notions of the family to include all the actors of the care network—that is, kin and non-kin participants in transnational care flows.

In this volume, the framework of circulation is used to refer not only to the physical migratory movement of individuals between places, but to the other elements, in particular caregiving, that define their 'global' connectedness, including their links between family members in different places. People stay put for most of the time or for extended periods, but their labour and the fruits of their labour in the form of goods and services (money, gifts, letters, information), including caregiving, continue to 'move', and this circulation of elements that they propel defines, creates and sustains their transnational social spheres, transnational selves and transnational lives as well as their transnational family membership. The idea that caregiving involves the exchange of goods and services is central to the notion of 'transnational care' on which we build in order to propose a shift towards 'circulation'. Before concluding our discussion of this framework, we feel it is important to provide a brief overview of some of the ways people actually circulate care across distance and national borders; these activities comprise the practices and processes of transnational caregiving.

THE CIRCULATION OF TRANSNATIONAL CARE

In this section, we draw on our own research to show how various types of care can be circulated in transnational settings to varying degrees and subject to a variety of factors. The notion of 'transnational care', as defined by Baldassar, Baldock and Wilding (2007), draws on Finch's (1989a) five-dimensional definition of care as economic, accommodation, personal, practical, emotional and moral. In transnational settings, personal (or 'hands-on') care can only be exchanged directly during visits, when people are physically co-present. Consequently, visits, and having the time, money and travel documents (including passports and visas) required to undertake

them, are an important part of caring across distance. Financial support is arguably the oldest form of transnational care evident in the long history of remittances, which have traditionally been seen as the main motivation and justification for migration in the classical migration literature.³⁵ The exchange of financial support may take the form of cash remittances or other goods and services, including food and clothing, gifts and paying household and other bills. Practical care in transnational settings usually takes the form of exchanging advice and information, running errands and assisting with tasks, all of which may be provided both during visits as well as across distance, and these can involve extensive, regular and frequent communication, as in the case of transnational parenthood. Emotional and moral support is, arguably, the bedrock of all relationships and can be expressed in both proximate and distant contexts as well as through all other forms of care.³⁶

The circulation of care across distance involves the social uses of communication technologies, including sending letters and messages by post, fax, e-mail and SMS texts; talking over the phone or the Internet (e.g., on Skype); and, more recently, staying in touch through social networking sites like Facebook and Twitter.³⁷ Access to technologies, including communication, travel, postal and international banking services, as well as their reliability and affordability and the knowledge and ability to use them, are becoming increasingly important factors in the practice of transnational caregiving. Here the importance of relations to the material world, of both technologies and 'non-human actors', is brought to the fore. Gille (2012) refers to this as 'methodological materialism', that is, the need to connect 'the social with the material'. Access to other types of resources is also essential, such as finances, time and social capital.³⁸ These factors account for and shape the asymmetries and inequalities, both within and between transnational families, in the capacity to circulate care. As Merla (2012a, 2) argues, 'access to, and use of, these capabilities is strongly influenced by both home- and host-country formal institutional and informal policies' and is shaped by gender, class and ethnic hierarchies (see also Chapter 5, this volume).

In their typology of the ways in which support is provided in transnational families, Kilkey and Merla (2013) include its direct provision in geographically proximate settings, the coordination of support and/or its direct provision through virtual communication from a distance as well as the delegation of the provision of support to others. They argue that it is important to acknowledge that a family member who delegates caregiving to a third person or institution does not automatically step out of circuits of care but may still be 'caring about' (Fisher and Tronto 1990) the person in need of support, stay informed of the level and quality of care provided and be ready to 'step in' when needed. In fact, caregiving in transnational contexts challenges the neat analytical distinction between 'caring for' (personal caregiving) and 'caring about' (emotional support), a distinction

that is often difficult to sustain at the practical level (Leira and Saraceno 2006, 14).³⁹ For example, it is difficult to argue that emotional care is less necessary than personal care, and that it is not in itself a type of 'caring for', particularly in transnational contexts where there are limited opportunities for other forms of caregiving.

Transnational caregiving activity and its circulation waxes and wanes over the individual and family life course and migration process, and members may be 'inactive' in some periods and 'reactivated' in others (Grillo 2007). Bonvalet and Ogg (2006b, 51) see the reactivation of care exchanges in times of crisis as a sign that family solidarity is sometimes 'dormant'. There are also families in which care does not circulate, for example, when migrants purposely cease contact with kin to escape violence and abuse or to evade their caregiving obligations. This 'break' in family connectedness may be temporary and may change over the life course. Economically vulnerable family members in particular, including refugees, migrants without legal status and those with inadequate or unreliable incomes, might break ties when demands for transnational support are too onerous but reactivate them when they are better able to provide support.⁴⁰ Merla's (2011) study of Savaldoran refugees and economic migrants' transnational family networks shows that men and women's participation in the circulation of financial support varies over the life course depending on their legal status and position in the labour market. The inability to send remittances may lead them to invest in the circulation of other types of support, such as emotional and practical care.

The time and financial commitment involved in the exchange of transnational caregiving is an important consideration that influences not only the individual involved, but his or her local family as well. Putting time and money, particularly if these are scarce resources, into maintaining relationships with family overseas often means less time and money for local needs; therefore, having other household members willing to support transnational care is a significant variable (Wilding and Baldassar 2009). As Merla (2012a, 11) argues, 'Extended family networks . . . play a major role in helping migrants to overcome obstacles to transnational caregiving'. If, how and when support is exchanged is not a straightforward or simple process. Baldassar, Baldock and Wilding (2007) identify a dialectic at play that comprises capacity, obligation and negotiated commitments. Capacity to care is relevant in all settings, whether involving mobility or not, and refers to the physical (and mental) ability, opportunity and resources required to engage in caregiving. The notion of 'negotiated commitments' derives from Finch and Mason's (1991, 1993) classic work in which they discuss the notion of 'normative obligation'. Like the norm of reciprocity, normative obligation to give care is based on notions of duty and responsibility, supposedly at the core of family relations and frequently defined by policymakers as part of the moral fabric of society to which everyone should adhere. In practice, however, the actual support given to family members is not

always the outcome of the 'proper thing to do' morally but of 'working it out' through the negotiation of commitments. These are the long histories of relationships and the circulation of care and support that cumulatively inform each decision to provide or withhold a certain form of care required by a particular person at a specific time—histories that are influenced by a series of factors, including power relations, gender inequalities, birth order and economic status.

Not surprisingly, much of the circulation of care activity in transnational families and the management of separation and absence of kin concern emotions and emotional lives.⁴¹ There has been increasing interest in the social science of emotions, including in migration studies (Svašek 2008). Researching the emotional dimension of transnational relationships raises directly the issues discussed earlier about the cultural meanings and constructions of family roles and obligations in the contexts of distance and being apart (Merla 2010). Along with the reciprocal obligations to exchange care between family members, Baldassar (2008a) argues that the emotions of longing for and missing people and places appear to be an integral (though not an essential) feature of the kin work (di Leonardo 1984) and emotional labour (Duncombe and Marsden 1993) needed to maintain transnational relationships. She highlights how the activities of transnational communication and personal exchange are collectively described as 'keeping in touch' and 'staying in contact'. These phrases betray the central purpose of such practices as 'standing in for' physical presence, touch and contact. In addition to the labour and commitment involved in raising and saving money for remittances, the time and effort required to bridge the distance and create a sense of shared presence is not insignificant, as one research participant explained at length:

I must tell you about distance . . . it's what I don't like about it . . . but distances estranges a little bit. Distance estranges . . . [You have to work at maintaining the relationship. . . . You have to listen to your feelings, you have to care, that is, you must care . . . You maintain the relationship by visiting, letters, phone calls, but first of all it is very important to keep them in your mind, caring for them all the time and not only when you phone or write to them. . . . This is made easier by having the photos around the house which help you to keep alive your memories.

A sense of shared 'presence' can be constructed in four main ways—virtually (through various communication technologies), by proxy (through objects and people whose physical presence embodies the spirit of the longed-for absent person or place), physically (during visits) and through imagined co-presence (Baldassar 2008a). The feelings of obligation, absence and loss, and the subsequent actions they motivate in people to try to create a sense of shared presence with their distant family members, comprise the activities and experiences that involve people imagining transnational family life

into being. In this way, new communication technologies are pushing the limits of the lived experience of co-presence and have the potential to redefine our ideas about embodiment and the corporeal dimension of social relationships. While direct hands-on personal care, such as bathing and feeding, requires physical proximity, ongoing research is needed to better understand how technologies like Skype and the ability to be virtually co-present can compensate (or not) for corporeal absence. A key finding of our combined research in this regard is that the increased capacity to 'stay connected' offered by new communication technologies and/or relatively safe and affordable travel options actually increases the sense of obligation to engage in transnational communication and visits (Baldassar et al. 2007; Wilding 2007; Merla 2010). Far from replacing the need for physical co-presence, the exchange of virtual forms of communication may in fact increase it (Baldassar 2007a, 2007b).

Research on the communication practices of transnational families indicates that people will make use of whatever technologies are available to them to circulate care.⁴² Our research suggests that, when available, new technologies are rapidly incorporated into family practices and a variety of modes of communication are used for different purposes. Baldassar et al. (2007) found, for example, that while everyday activities and concerns are regularly discussed in e-mails and phone calls, difficult and delicate news and information might be reserved for a written letter. Study areas such as Human Computer Interaction and ICT are developing a new lexicon to deal with the social impacts of the practices and processes of technology, including terms like 'scaffolding' (Ames et al. 2010), which refers to the support that one person gives to another to help make use of communication technology. We observed that children provide considerable assistance to their parents or grandparents in their use of new communication technologies such as Skype (Baldassar 2008a; Merla 2012b). Studies in 'media richness theory' describe how communication may escalate to a richer medium when the current one is not adequate. For example, family members may exchange an SMS to set up a Skype call, which may segue into a phone call and then be followed up with the sending of a gift. Similarly, Madianou and Miller (2012) show how polymedia—defined as a new communicative environment created by the emergence of Internet- and mobile phone-based platforms—have become an integral part of the way family relationships are experienced and enacted. For this reason, the social uses of technology have become a key feature of migration and family studies, and the chapters that comprise this volume offer a wealth of examples.

The intensity of care circulation varies over time. The Baldassar et al. (2007) study on transnational caregiving identified two main patterns of caregiving across distance—routine and crisis.⁴³ Crisis care involved responding to exceptional circumstances like the birth of a new baby, a serious and debilitating illness and death and dying. These lifecycle crises often involved a rapid reorganization of activities to permit an immediate

and often extended visit to provide hands-on personal care as well as moral and emotional support. In moments of crisis, the importance of what people defined as simply 'being there' highlights the way physical co-presence is valued over other forms of 'staying in touch' through virtual technologies. In crisis situations, family members would rally together and increase all types of caregiving. In contrast, routine care defined the more regular exchange of care characterised by weekly phone or Skype calls and regular e-mails. These routine exchanges often developed into patterns of communication and included a mixed set of modes of communication—for example, daily SMS texts, phone or Skype calls every Sunday, long newsw e-mails periodically, and gifts for birthdays and special occasions. The particularities of age, gender and type of relationship impacted on these patterns as well as access to technology and the time and money to use them.

Our research findings suggest that the actual mechanical workings of these new technologies has increased the direct role and engagement of both men and younger generations in transnational family care exchanges because of their general tendency to be more familiar and proficient at using them. While the 'kin work' (Di Leonardo 1984) involved in keeping in touch with transnational family members was the preserve of women, particularly mothers and daughters, who wrote the letters and made the phone calls, we found in our samples that today it is not uncommon for fathers and sons, as well as grandchildren and cousins, to be directly involved in setting up the e-mail and Skype systems, coordinating and managing their use and maintaining their upkeep (Baldassar 2011; Merla 2012a, 2012b).⁴⁴ For example, Viviana, who we presented in the Introduction to this volume, asks her various local grandchildren to visit her so they can set up the Skype call to her daughters in the UK and Australia. Similarly, Viviana's distant grandchildren are regularly requested to assist with the technology of the call at the other end. In this way, the various cousins become involved in transnational communication exchanges that often lead to other forms and modes of contact, including exchanges on e-mail, Facebook and other social media sites. Here we see evidence of greatly expanded and intensified networks of communication and contact, including of the circulation of caregiving, than were possible before these technologies were widely available. This increased transnational family connectedness through the social use of new technologies belies the traditional association of migration with loss of ties and reduced capacities to exchange care.

CONCLUSION

We have discussed how transnational families are in some ways similar to geographically proximate families, in that kin ties are constituted and maintained through the asymmetrical reciprocal exchange of caregiving. Yet transnational families are also impacted by distance and separation in

specific ways. Distance makes the need to maintain family ties more pressing—and, therefore, more visible (Bryceson and Vuorela 2002a). The negotiation of transnational family togetherness in daily life requires particular skills and resources to transform physical absence into proximity through virtual communication. This is also true for multi-local families and not just transnational ones. What is particular about transnational families is that their members must deal with the opportunities and constraints of (at least) two national institutional settings, as well as transnational and international contexts. Highlighting the agency of transnational family members requires an analysis of the ways in which structural contexts frame the options and choices of migrants and their relatives, and how they 'respond to, resist, adapt to and/or bend the laws, rules and procedures emanating from specific policies' (Herrera 2010, 55) in order to keep their family ties alive.⁴⁵

An elderly Irish woman from our study once commented that in the past when people migrated to Australia, family members would hold a wake; the departure was such a significant loss that it represented a kind of social death. Our research suggests that these days, migration is characterised by the increased use of new communication technologies that can help to ensure migrants remain very much a living part of family life. This anecdote is in many ways emblematic of the entire project of this volume; that the implications and impact of the act of migration—and mobility more generally—on family life has profoundly changed. The advent of new technologies means that care can be more readily exchanged across distance and continue to circulate through reciprocal (though asymmetrical) exchanges that consolidate and substantiate family and friendship ties. By concentrating on the transnational social fields and the various forms of co-presence created by the exchange of communication and caregiving between transnational family members, we are better able to examine these particular family forms more objectively.

In this volume, we suggest that one way to moderate the dominating role that notions of distance and separation have had on our understanding of transnational family life is to highlight the asymmetrical reciprocity and inherent circularity of both migration and transnational family processes. Transnational family exchanges, particularly those relating to caregiving, are defined by their flows back and forth and often in multiple directions. The chapters that follow trace the way care circulates around expanded transnational family networks to highlight the participation—and absence of participation—of various family members and not just those who have been traditionally more visible. While male migrants dominated the migration frame and women dominated the family studies framework, the involvement of extended family members, including the grandparent and younger generations, is highlighted through the care circulation lens. Furthermore, the lens of circulation is equally relevant to the poorer labour migrant families of the classical care chains literature as well as the relative elites of student, skilled and professional migration. While the scale, mode

and degree may change, all transnational families are engaged in the reciprocal exchange of care that circulates among them. In the contributions that comprise Part B of this volume, the authors address the critical questions of gender, ethnic, generational and class differences and inequalities affecting the shape, intensity and quality of participation of all the actors involved in—or excluded from—care circuits.

For the purpose of this book, we limit our analysis to the family, but in order to be fully developed, the circulation framework will need to include other actors of global care circuits, such as wider communities in home and host societies. Research that examines the role of families and caregiving, broadly defined, in the processes of settlement and integration as well as the maintenance and development of homeland cultures and traditions offer productive sites of analysis. In line with Margaret Archer's (2000, 2006) compelling argument that 'we are what we care for',⁴⁶ we locate the 'portability of care' and its circulation in asymmetrical and reciprocal exchanges between people, wherever they live, at the centre of our research endeavour. The lens of circulation helps us to better understand the impact of distance and absence on our lived experiences and our conceptualisation of these. It also helps to highlight the arbitrariness of distinctions between what are often considered the more public and formal dimensions of culture and society, such as paid employment and civic life, and those defined as private and intimate, such as family caregiving.

NOTES

1. See, for instance, Bryceson and Vuorela 2002b; Goulbourne et al. 2010; Olwig 2007; Zontini and Reynolds 2007; Baldassar et al. 2007; Bolzman et al. 2008; Le Gall 2009; Mazzucato and Schans 2011; Merla 2012a, 2012b; Razy and Baby-Collin 2011.
2. See, for instance, Andall 1999; Esparragoza 2003; Hondagneu-Sotelo and Avila 1997; Mazzucato and Schans, 2011.
3. Hochschild (2005) evocatively refers to this as the exchange of love for gold.
4. See also Merla 2011; Baldassar 2008b.
5. We also draw this critique from Wellman (1988, 20), who makes a similar point about the misinterpretation of network analysis: 'Many have limited the power of the [network analysis] approach by treating all units as if they had the same resources, all ties as if they were symmetrical, and the contents of all ties as if they were equivalent'.
6. For example, the representation of women in the north as gaining career and paid work advantage from the employment of domestics is arguably overly simplistic. Southern European women, in particular, are often blocked out of the labour market with limited prospects for career advancement that is not necessarily improved by the increasingly common presence of domestic women workers within their families (Campari 2012; Saraceno 2010). Furthermore, many domestic migrant women are from the middle classes in their countries of origin, and some of them, as argued by Morokvasic (2004), employ transnational mobility as a tool to maintain their middle-

- class lifestyle through the improved pay they get from domestic work abroad compared with middle-class work at home. See also Flavell et al. (2007) for a discussion of the need for a more nuanced understanding of elites and migration.
7. See, for example, Abrego 2009; Dreby 2006; Parreñas 2005a, 2005b; Mahler and Pessar 2001; Pessar and Mahler 2003.
 8. See also Fog Olwig 2002; Smith 2001; Baldassar and Gabaccia 2011. Along a similar thread and drawing on Werbner's notion of the diasporic public sphere, Baldassar and Gabaccia (2011) examine the idea of a diasporic domestic sphere.
 9. As shown by Shain 2007; Goulbourne et al. 2010; Baldassar 2007a; Merla and Baldassar 2010a.
 10. Relevant examples in studies of transnational mothering include Hondagneu-Sotelo and Avila 1997; Parreñas 2005*, 2005b; Ryan 2011. For studies of transnational families, see, for instance, Hondagneu-Sotelo and Avila 1997; Parreñas 2005a, 2005b; Ryan 2011.
 11. See Douglass 2006; Peterson 2010; Safri and Graham 2010.
 12. See, for instance, Glick Schiller, Basch and Szanton-Blanc 1992; Vertovec 2001, 2009; Fog Olwig 2002, 2007; Bauböck and Faist 2010; Holmes 2006; Levitt and Glick Schiller 2007; Portes, Guarnizo and Landolt 1999; Abrego 2009; Parreñas 2001a, 2001b, 2005a, 2005b; Dreby 2006; Boccagni 2012b.
 13. See Baldassar 2011; Baldassar et al. 2012.
 14. See also Alba and Waters 2011.
 15. See, for example, Rossi and Rossi 1990; Lin and Rogers 1995; Joseph and Hallman 1985; Bonvalet and Ogg 2006a.
 16. See, for example, Rouse 1991; Glick Schiller and Fouron 2001; Papastergiadis 2000; Boccagni 2012b.
 17. See also Mason 2004; Baldassar 2001.
 18. It is interesting to consider whether the notion of circularity offers something different than the notion of transnationalism, or at least it is important to reflect on the framework of circulation in the context of recent theorisation of transnationalism. The notion of circulation seems to have much the same meaning as transnationalism, insofar as both terms offer a more useful frame to complicate the notion of permanent unidirectional migration. It should be added that circulation and transnational processes in families are not new. Throughout history, there have been many and varied forms, including the medieval custom of apprenticeship, the longstanding practice in certain countries of sending young children to boarding school, the migration of wet nurses and artisans (Sarasa 2001), the separation from their families of members of religious orders (Yeates 2009) and so on. Rather, the scale of these processes has been radically transformed. Both terms clearly represent overlapping and complementary sets of processes. As already argued, circulation tends to refer to the movement of people. Circularity has been employed in the literature to define the migration type, as in the circular migration of relatively short annual or seasonal migratory moves, although now we better understand how even longer 'circuits' of migration spanning lifetimes also often end in return and are therefore also 'circular'. Transnationalism, as discussed in the literature, more specifically relates to the 'social field' in which the circulatory migrant moves, and refers in particular, to the way this social field is stretched across space and time, constructed and 'inhabited' by people who are separated by distance (Basch et al. 1994). The notion of circularity might be best understood as one dimension of transnationalism, referring more specifically to the people as well as the objects, ideas and shared imaginings/meanings that move or flow across these transnational social fields, including of care. In addition, 'circulation' can occur within national borders and so encompasses local families as well, whereas transnational specifically refers to families separated by national borders. Hence, the analysis of care circulation can include both the proximate and transnational family relationships in which both migrants and nonmigrants participate.
 19. See, for example, Carling et al. 2012; Hochschild 2005; Hondagneu-Sotelo and Avila 1997; Parreñas 2005; Hays 1998.
 20. Sørensen and Guarnizo 2007; draw on Theborn 2004.
 21. This link between physical presence and well-being is evident in the case of Italian migrants in Australia reported by MacKinnon and Neill (1996, 74), who describe an obviously unwell elderly woman who was surrounded by her family when her doctor enquired after her health; she replied, 'Of course I am well, my whole family is here'.
 22. See also Elizabeth Thomas-Hope 2002; Byron 1999.
 23. See, for instance, Ahmed et al. 2003; Rutherford 1990; Lash and Friedman 1992; Lavie and Swedenburg 1996; Portes and Rumbaut 2001.
 24. Relevant examples in the context of this discussion include research on nomadism and the practice of transhumance.
 25. See also Caradec 1996; Trost 1998; Holmes 2004; Nowicka 2007.
 26. It is important to acknowledge that in many countries, it is still difficult for men to get custody of their children.
 27. See, for example, Kurotani 2007; Martin 2007; Walsh 2006, 2008; Coles 2008.
 28. See also Boyle et al. 2003.
 29. See, in particular, Chapter 6.
 30. Since 1998, the Department of Immigration and Citizenship in Australia has given every person moving to and from the country a number, so it is possible to examine repeat movements of individuals.
 31. For example, Hardill (2004, 378) refers to research that reports 'a rise in the circulatory movements of British citizens moving cross border on relatively short-term assignments before returning to the UK or transferring to another location'. See also Hardill and MacDonald (1998). Retirement migration (Williams et al. 2000) is another example, as are the growing numbers of so-called commuter families mentioned earlier.
 32. However, this is certainly not the case for all domestic and labour migrants; see Kapur 2001 and Kapur, Devash and McHale, 2005.
 33. See also Attias-Donfut 2000; Attias-Donfut et al. 2002; Coenen-Huber et al. 1994; Finch and Mason 1993; Godbout and Charbonneau 1996.
 34. See also Jensen 2003; Razavi 2007; Kofman and Raghuram 2009.
 35. For one of the earliest studies of transnational family lives, see Thomas and Znaniecki 1974.
 36. It is important to note that care can also be performed as an obligation or duty, both paid and unpaid, including between family members, without a sense of concern or emotional attachment. For an overview of this issue in the care literature, see Leira and Saraceno 2006.
 37. There are also examples of distant kin 'babysitting' children by 'keeping an eye on them on Skype'.
 38. Merla and Baldassar 2011; Merla 2012a; Kilkey and Merla 2013.
 39. See also Baldassar et al. 2007.
 40. See Baldassar et al. 2007; Baldassar 2008b, for a discussion of this dynamic in the case of Afghan refugees in Australia.
 41. See, for instance, Merla and Baldassar 2010a.
 42. Baldassar et al. 2007; Madianou and Miller 2012; Wilding 2006.

43. A point also made by studies of geographically proximate families such as Bonalet and Ogg 2006b.
44. Although in the Salvadoran case, the use of new communication technologies was still limited (Merla 2012a, 2012b).
45. See also Baldassar and Merla 2011; Kilkey and Merla 2013; Merla 2012a, 2012b.
46. Research by Meda (2012), for example, uses a relational sociology (Donati 2012) framework to examine the intersections between what might be called different 'care projects' and their role in identity formation in transnational family and migration contexts, including care of origins (homeland) and differences (e.g., gender and generations) as well as care of distance (culture) and the care of the ties between them (transnational bonds). See also Rossi and Bramanti (2012) and Rossi et al (2010).

Part B

Care Circulation

Theoretical and Empirical Considerations

INTRODUCTION

Understand the relative importance of transnational and complex care projects while also of the two parts of the nation of bonding. Moving literature on transnationalism is a household of partake of co-residence with a household including a who may be respect, the attention to a close periods other. If complex flow figuration. A second which expect sense of future