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Dear Colleagues

Welcome to our Spring Newsletter for 2021.

The Research Network on Ageing in Europe delivered its 5th Midterm Conference in January. This was the first time the Midterm Conference has been delivered online, and it was a huge success. There were 150 participants from 25 countries, with 119 presentations delivered across 31 sessions. We were also delighted to host excellent keynote presentations, by Ruth Bartlett, Ricca Edmondson, Chris Gilleard, Shereen Hussein, Tine Rostgaard, and Päivi Topo.

I should like to thank the Network Board members for their contribution to the conference organisation, and especially Outi Jolanki and Jenni Spånnäri. Outi and Jenni were key organisers of the conference and deserve huge credit for coordinating such a successful event.

On behalf of the Network, I should also like to thank our partners, the University of Jyväskylä, and CoE AgeCare for joining us in the organisation and delivery of the conference. It is also important to recognise the excellent support provided by the administrative team/technical hosts, including event co-organisers Jenna Reunanen and Emilia Leinonen. This was a fruitful collaboration across the three organisations, and it was a pleasure to work with everyone involved.

Whether your participation at the conference was part of an ongoing association with the Network, or the first time you have joined one of our events, I hope that you found the conference stimulating and rewarding. And if you were unable to attend on this occasion, we hope to see you at one of our future conferences or workshops.
The next event for the Network is the 15th ESA Conference, being delivered in Barcelona from 31st August to 3rd September. This is being delivered under a hybrid mode, which means that all delegates will have the possibility to participate in the conference either online, or on-site in Barcelona. The Conference will include Ageing in Europe sessions, and joint sessions with other Research Networks - and we hope to see you there. (Please note: the call for abstracts for this event has now closed.)

In this newsletter, further to our Midterm Conference, we are pleased to present various perspectives on the event. These are kindly provided by Board members/organisers, Outi and Jenni; organiser/technical host, Emilia; and delegate, Bernard McDonald. Also in this newsletter, Ute Karl provides an overview of a new publication on social work and ageing; Katie Gambier-Ross offers insights into her PhD on people living with dementia and ‘going out’; Mihaela Nedelcu and Malika Wyss present a summary of findings from a research project on intergenerational solidarities in transnational families; and a further book overview is provided, of a publication on mobility and travel behaviour across the lifecourse. Thank you very much to all our contributors.

Our Summer Newsletter, due for release in June/July, will focus on PhD research. Please keep an eye on our social media and mailing list communications for details on this forthcoming edition of the newsletter: we shall be seeking submissions from current PhD students and early career researchers.

With best wishes,

Edward Tolhurst
Staffordshire University, UK
etolhurst@staffs.ac.uk
Outi Jolanki, the chair
Jenni Spännäri, the co-chair
of the Organising Committee

The ESA RN01 Ageing in Europe Midterm Conference took place as an online event on 20th-22nd January 2021. The board of the RN01 made early autumn 2019 the decision to organise the conference in Finland in collaboration with the University of Jyväskylä and the Centre of Excellence in Research on Ageing and Care (CoE AgeCare). The original plan was to organise a three-day event in Central-Finland, Jyväskylä, Finland. Besides the general ESA conference in Helsinki many years ago, Finland has not hosted ESA-RN01 events. As the Finnish board members, we felt that it was time to change it and welcome the midterm conference participators as our guests.
**Places, Spaces and Cultures of Ageing**

The topic ‘Places, spaces and cultures of ageing’ was chosen to highlight that the social position of older people and meanings of ageing and old age are linked to culture, society, living environment, and the community where one lives. In addition, lifetime social, financial and educational resources direct, if not dictate, the lifestyle and opportunities for living a full life at later ages. While we all grow old, the way we live the older age is very much dependent on external circumstances. Since ageing is both a global and local matter, research on ageing and old age need to adopt a multidisciplinary approach and address ageing and old age from various perspectives. With these thoughts in mind, we set to organise the midterm conference without knowing what would lie ahead.

As we all know now, in early 2020, the Covid-19 pandemic made it very clear that control over our personal circumstances is not entirely in one’s own hands. Instead, it is affected by other people’s behaviour and it also depends on a society’s resources to tackle public health, societal and political challenges, and respond to crises like the Covid-19 pandemic. Suddenly the borders that had almost disappeared between places and spaces and nations reappeared. The Covid-19 pandemic also brought forcefully forward the meaning of age and age categories to the public discussion. We learned that older people are particularly vulnerable to the infection while children or young people are at much lesser risk. Nations differed in their responses to the pandemic. While some countries recommended or ordered quarantine to all people, some others, like Finland, recommended self-isolation for people over 70 and aged care facilities were closed from visitors. The aftermath of the pandemic remains to be seen, but it made painfully clear that places, spaces and cultures of ageing matter.

**Plans A, B, C and D – organising an event in turbulent times**

Initially, the conference was planned to be a regular, on-site and face-to-face event in August 2020. As the local organisers, we were thrilled to welcome all participants to Finland and plan city walks and other excursions in the beautiful autumnal lake scenery. Those plans were swapped for excursions in the snowy city and on the frozen lake when the pandemic did not show any signs of disappearing in spring 2020, forcing us to reschedule the event to January 2021. At this stage, we still hoped for an on-site or at least a hybrid event. Until the autumn, we kept alive our dream of hosting conference participants and keynotes. But then it became clear that even a hybrid event would not be safe enough.

It was extremely frustrating having to change the dates, postpone information delivery and keep the participants...
waiting for the final information. We are sorry for any inconveniences this might have added to the participants’ already shaken lives and schedules. In hindsight, as the pandemic is still prominent in March 2021, we are convinced that it was the right decision to postpone the conference and deliver it online.

**Can you really meet online?**

We are very proud to state that judging from the feedback we have received, the conference was a success. The conference had almost 150 participants from 25 different European countries and overseas, and 119 presentations in 31 paper sessions. We were delighted that almost all of those who originally registered were able to attend the conference and only a few had to cancel due to the changed dates or format. In general, presenters found their right conference rooms at the right time, and lively discussion was had in the paper sessions – even though many participants already suffered from virtual meeting fatigue.

We are particularly happy that all our six keynote speakers were able to participate in the conference despite all the changes. Not only were their talks inspiring and thought-provoking – they also demonstrated great bravery in taking up the task to be the RN01’s first online keynote speakers and showed a great deal of resilience in tackling inevitable technical issues.

From the very beginning, we wanted to make the online event to be a real meeting. We wanted to create a relaxed atmosphere and a safer space to have and solve the technical problems there was bound to happen in an event of this scale. We also wanted to emphasise self-compassion and self-care for all the participants, especially as we could not take responsibility for offering nourishing food and refreshing exercise between the sessions.

The online format had several other limitations, such as the lack of serendipity in meeting new people, not getting the feel of the shared space a conference creates, and restricted possibilities for spending idle time with colleagues from all over the world. But there were some positive sides, too. The event fee was significantly lower than it would have been with an on-site conference. This, alongside the online format not requiring travel, made it possible for some less privileged colleagues to attend. In addition, the carbon footprint of the conference was significantly lower than usual.
Many cooks – a better conference!

Having three organisations to support the conference, namely RN 01 Board, CoE AgeCare and the University of Jyväskylä, turned out to be a good decision. The tasks and costs were shared between several actors. In light of this experience, a hybrid conference with several organisers might be recommendable for future midterm conferences. There is no doubt that support from university administration and the use of the university premises is much more important in case of an on-site conference. Apart from administrative and financial issues, the collaboration between different actors seemed to broaden the number of potential participators and the range of disciplines presented.

We are grateful to the ESA and The Federation of Finnish Learned Societies (TSV) for their financial and technical support, which was essential to the conference’s execution. The virtual conference would not have run so smoothly without the help of several technical assistants. We thank warmly the students of the University of Jyväskylä who assisted the organisers, chairs and speakers during the conference. We thank warmly the keynote speakers for their insightful speeches, which were widely praised for their scrutinised social, political and cultural perspectives on ageing.

We also want to thank all participants for their presentations and contribution to discussions. Organising the conference in the middle of the pandemic was undoubtedly a challenging but interesting experience. We are very proud that we did not give up but managed to organise a memorable event during the pandemic.

We wish all of you a safe spring and hope to see you again in the future ESA and RN01 Ageing in Europe conferences.
In January 2021, as organisers of a thematic session on ageing in Ireland, we had the pleasure of participating in the Midterm Conference of the Research Network on Ageing in Europe Network. The theme of the conference was Places, Spaces and Cultures of Ageing. Considering the major challenges posed by the Covid-19 pandemic, the seamless transfer of the conference from face-to-face and in person to an excellent online format was testament to the hard work of the conference organisers and their team.

Each day offered interesting and thought-provoking plenary sessions. On the first day Tine Rostgaard gave a fascinating address on ageing in the context of long-term care systems. She outlined the common drivers for reform in long term care and tendencies evident in current reform measures across Europe, and was hopeful that Covid-19 would act as a catalyst for policy development and change in long-term care provision. Sheerin Hussain explored geographical variations in global ageing, focusing on the Middle East and North African region. She examined global connectedness, including migration of people and ideas, and the impact this has on the experience of ageing in place or ‘out of place’ in the region. On the second day Ruth Bartlett spoke about social citizenship and the lives and care of people with dementia. She traced historical changes in the concept of citizenship, including more recent appreciation of
citizenship in ordinary and everyday spaces and places, and demonstrated how spatial dynamics can operate to exclude people with dementia. Ruth is a strong advocate for the intersection of citizenship, disability and dementia studies in future research on dementia. Päivi Topo complemented this paper with a presentation on older adults’ role in the implementation of national ageing policy programmes in Finland. She described how ageist stereotypes mean that older people are still perceived mainly as objects of action who need help and support, rather than as real actors. As a result, old age policies and services do not meet the needs of older people, foster social engagement, or reflect the heterogeneity of older people and the diversity of their situations and resources available to them. In the final plenary, Chris Gilleard in a wide-ranging and provocative paper recognised that social gerontology had played its part in ‘puncturing fourth ageism’, but argued that it now needs to chart the expansion of the third age, and how people and society are making the most of later life. In the same session Ricca Edmondson presented a paper on the age-old tradition of wisdom, and made a strong case for the use of wisdom as a lens through which the sociology of ageing can develop deeper insights into the lives of older people and what is important to them.

In addition to the plenary sessions, there were many opportunities in the parallel sessions to learn about a diverse range of research. Over 100 papers related to ageing, place and culture were presented. For example, Kristi Allain explored how older Canadian men understand their bodies through their participation in the seemingly risky sport of ice hockey. Shahnaj Begum presented research on rural environments in the Enontekiö region of northern Finland, which revealed the key age-friendly elements of such an environment. Our own thematic session on the experience of ageing in Ireland, presented recent research on three significant aspects of this experience: how older people make sense of disability; intergenerational adult friendship and the construction of older age identity; and the impact of person-place relations on personal identity and perception of age-friendliness. As in the keynote addresses, many of the sessional papers explored how different aspects of the experience of ageing are influenced by the unique social, cultural, and geographical contexts in which people live.

All in all, the extensive conference programme guaranteed that delegates had a busy and interesting three days, attempting to ‘attend’ as many presentations as possible on a broad range of topics. Our own session, was a valuable and enjoyable experience, with an engaged audience, lively discussion, friendly and professional support from Sari our technical host, and follow-up connections after the conference with interested attendees. Following our positive online experience in Jyväskylä, we are now looking forward to participating in the 15th ESA ‘hybrid’ conference in Barcelona later this year!
When the corona situation got to the point, where there was no other option than to make ESA Ageing in Europe conference a virtual one, as organisers we admit – we were a bit worried. Yes, we had experience on Zoom meetings but not on this scale as we were expecting over 150 participants from different parts and time zones of the world. In the end, everything went actually better than we expected despite of few hiccups, which turned into learning points for the future virtual conferences. Next, I will pinpoint some of the lessons we learned.

The most important thing in organising a virtual conference is to treat the Zoom-rooms as if they were real rooms. You need to have someone who opens the door, takes care that everyone’s presentation works and is there to help delegates if a technical problem occurs. Virtual environment highlights the importance of technical assistants, not only in providing access to the rooms, but also in securing that everything goes as smoothly and safely as possible. We had a wonderful technical team of six students whose friendliness, openness and meticulousness really made it possible to follow through the whole conference with paper sessions, coffee breaks and keynote speeches. Like Jenna, one of the local organisers and the technical host of the keynote sessions, writes:
A lot goes on behind the scenes even though everything seems to work beautifully from the participants’ point-of-view. Many things happen simultaneously and working with three different devices at the same time became a very familiar thing during those three days (just had to remember to keep your mic muted!). One could say that being able to multitask is one of the most important aspects of the organiser.

Multitasking was indeed a big part of the conference. One of my responsibilities was to be a backup for all technical hosts, which meant that I had to stay alert and check that every room works at the start of each session. Although organised virtually, it seems that for organisers the need for running around the conference venue never stops. Only this time the ‘running’ part consisted of lot of clicking, messaging and emailing. For instance, for some reason, one room didn’t work without a password, which meant that one of our technical host needed to answer a bunch of calls and emails (big thanks to Anna for the job well done!) This happened even though we had two rehearsals with technical hosts and they had their own rehearsals before the conference. The lesson learned: anything can go wrong, so be prepared for everything.
Of course, we all miss the normal life with face-to-face conferences, but virtual conferences can still offer something for the future: inclusion. Like our technical host, Sari, writes:

*It was exciting to be part of the technical team and meet researchers from around the world. It appeared to be a nice way of having presentations on Zoom especially when people turned their cameras on to ask questions, which reminded of an actual live conference. This is one way to include more people, who cannot be present in person at the conference.*

To sum up, when organising a virtual conference, one should (at least):

- invest a lot of time and effort for the technical aspects before the conference: rehearsals with the technical hosts, conference team and also with the keynote speakers is really important
- have a technical host for each room so that every room has a designated host (‘technical host 1’ hosts ‘room 1’)  
- have a backup technical host  
- treat the conference like a ‘normal’ conference: have coffee breaks, rooms, videos on when commenting and presenting, be inclusive  
- have the whole conference team in the same physical venue, if possible
This time in the book-corner, we have something different from usual. For the first time in our Newsletter, we present a book published in German. An overview of this new publication is presented by the co-editor Ute Karl.

**Handbuch Soziale Arbeit und Alter**
**(Handbook on Social Work and Ageing)**
Kirsten Aner and Ute Karl (Eds.), 2nd Edition

By: Ute Karl, Protestant University of Applied Sciences, Ludwigsburg, Germany
U.Karl@eh-ludwigsburg.de

When I was asked to write a review of our recently published 2nd edition of the German *Handbook on Social Work and Ageing* for the *Newsletter of the ESA Research Network on Ageing in Europe*, I was hesitant. How could this handbook, written in German, be of interest to non-German-speaking scholars of ageing and/or social work? This question brought me to ask what kind of handbooks already exist concerning this topic for an English-speaking audience?

So, I started with an overview of what types of handbooks related to this topic could be found on an international level, i.e.
written in English. First of all, I have not found any similar handbooks published so far on an international level. There are different (international) handbooks, of course, on social work, ageing and the intersection of age, health and social work. I also found edited collections on social work and ageing on a national level. The three different types of handbooks tackle aspects of our handbook but do not cover the wide range of themes, nor do they follow a similar rationale or systematics. I think that there are good reasons for this situation: first, the development of social work services and practices is very much connected with the historical formation of social work and its legal frames in a specific national context (despite all international, supranational and transnational influences, relations and programmes). Second, and connected with this, social work practices and their relevancy to various fields, ranging from health care, to educational and cultural activities, to volunteering, differ with respect to national and local contexts. Third, their history in different regions and countries in Europe, and in fact beyond, is interconnected but also differs among regions. This becomes even more obvious when looking at the consequences and prolonged shadows of World War II or of the former socialist regimes on a political, societal, family and personal-psychological level in regard to ageing.

Against this backdrop, I think that there are two points in this book that could be inspiring for international scholars of ageing: firstly, the rationale and systematics might encourage scholars to produce similar handbooks in their own language or national context; and secondly, there are subjects and discussions systematised in our handbook that might feed into an international handbook on social work and ageing which is—if I see it correctly—still awaiting publication in the future. So, with this review of our handbook, I would like to inspire intellectual exchange and ideas for further work on an international level.

In Germany, in regard to ageing and old age, there is no comparable specific law as there is for child and youth welfare. Ageing and old age is a transversal topic existing in diverse fields of social work, and social work for and with older people takes place in different contexts. Within gerontological contexts, social work is one profession that works together with other professions, e.g. in contexts of health and care. Therefore, a handbook on social work and ageing must cover a broad range of themes, approaches in practice and research, and interdisciplinary studies. Thus, our handbook brings together contributions from different disciplines, research areas and takes into account different practical fields and relevant topics.
given the interdisciplinarity of ageing studies. It addresses researchers, students, social workers, volunteers and politicians concerned with ageing and old age as well as the broader public interested in ageing.

The handbook comprises four sections with contributions written by 76 recognised scholars:

The **first section** is committed to social work with older people. It is divided into three subdivisions: the first brings together different aspects of the frame conditions of social work with respect to history, policy, politics and also the education and training of professionals in Germany. It also gives insights into the national contexts of Switzerland and Austria. The second subdivision is dedicated to different fields of social work with older people, ranging from leisure activities, activities related to the arts and learning. Special focus is put on social work in different fields of health and care, ranging from, for example, preventive and rehabilitative social work to social work in geriatrics, to social work in different care settings (inpatient, mobile care services and palliative care). Subdivision three discusses different special and cross-cutting topics in social work with older people such as intergenerational relationships in social counselling, volunteering, diversity and intersectionality, case and care management, advocacy as an ethical stance and philosophical debates of Bildung.

The **second section** draws attention in its first subdivision to social security law and its historical development, along with other legal aspects in Germany. It also focuses on the question of how the former become relevant in old age. These contributions offer an overview and simultaneously discuss the implications of the different legal strands. The second subdivision focuses on aspects of life situations (Lebenslagen), their changes over time and concerning life course (i.e. income and assets, living conditions, social networks, health and disease, education, gender, homosexuality and disabilities).

Subdivision three examines different topics concerning life in old age, such as poverty, ageing in rural areas, ageing of older immigrants and refugees and includes theoretical and empirical contributions on techniques, leisure, partnership and sexuality, violence against and delinquency of older people, dementia, dying and death, suicide and a contribution on how an infancy after World War II impacts old age from a psychological stance. This broad range of contributions goes beyond the national context and transgress the focus on social work—in spite of being important for it—and addresses scholars with different scientific backgrounds in ageing studies.
The third section is about social constructions of ageing from different scientific backgrounds (sociological, historical, psychological, juridical, political and from cultural studies), which makes it of interest from an interdisciplinary and international point of view.

The interdisciplinarity of ageing studies is also represented by the contributions of the fourth section that brings together different approaches and aspects of gerontological research, both on a national and comparative international level. This section concludes with a chapter on participatory research.

Looking at this systematics, it becomes evident that the endeavour of this handbook was to give a compilation of, on the one hand, broad and deep insights into the history, social policy, politics, and the different legal frames that are relevant for social work on a national level, and at the same time—and this is of interest for a similar handbook on an international level—to sketch the contributions of social work as a profession in different gerontological working fields and to cover the broad range of topics and discussions involving international and interdisciplinary research that are relevant for social work with and for ageing and older people.

Having given these brief insights into the systematics of our handbook, scholars of ageing and/or social work might use it as a source of inspiration to bring forward an interdisciplinary and international discussion on social work and ageing or even the publication of an international handbook on social work and ageing.

*Handbuch Soziale Arbeit und Alter, 2nd Edition*

*(Handbook on Social Work and Ageing)*

Edited by Kirsten Aner and Ute Karl, Springer, 2020

In researching ageing, we skew our understanding of the phenomenon if we over-focus on oldness as such: it leaves (older) people hollowed out of all that matters to them or to us. In order to see lifetimes as varied and dynamic - as surely we try to do - we have to recognise as much as we can of what is going on within them. To this end it can be salutary to approach lifecourses from a new angle: more is going on in them than just getting older. Perhaps especially at this moment, the theme of mobility is salient. It may be what many of us, just at this moment, long for most.

But mobility is far from a merely individual matter. In their introductory and concluding chapters to this book, Henrike Rau and Joachim Scheiner explore what lifetime mobility studies
entail. Lifetimes, in this approach, have little to do simply with age as such. They are closely connected with ‘social roles, responsibilities and statuses’ (p.5), with changes and intersections between some leading to cascades of others. Socially-influenced biographical ‘milestones’ tend to provoke changes in routines and practices. Even continuities in mobility arise from trends and directions that are woven into socio-political and economic predicaments. Rightly, Rau and Scheiner critique the notion that lifecourse mobility patterns arise predominantly from ‘choices’. Moreover, interrogating (apparent) decisions in this realm can cast light on how other changes take place in people’s lives. Life-cycle stages, daily contacts, and types or purposes of activity all contribute, for example, to travel-time allocation, often made not only for one’s own benefit but for that of others - in contexts that develop over lifetimes.

Inevitably, much of this book interrogates the different facets of road travel and, in particular, car-ownership during people’s lifetimes. Its multiple connections with gender are a case in point. Specifically, here, how does car allocation alter over their life courses between couples who share a car? But contemporary societies are not homogenously car-oriented. How do young people’s approaches to daily mobilities in the context of car-sharing fluctuate at various life-stages? In contrast, what happens during periods of ‘carlessness’ in different periods of the life course?

Examining such questions as how car ownership may wax, wane and change character over the life course, the authors in this collection specifically address intersections between theoretical and methodological questions. Many of the authors assembled here are dedicated, too, to combining qualitative and quantitative methods, and discuss their interaction with sophistication. Carefully titrated biographical, panel, modelling and survey methods, with different degrees of participant engagement, allow us to explore what mobility means to people at different life stages, or what changing functions it may have in family, work, and leisure life. Sometimes cars, for instance, can be key transmitters of sociality between generations, as when parents driving teenagers to school find this the only occasion when their offspring converse with them in a relaxed fashion. Or what about driving older relations on trips to the countryside: what function does this have in family and personal life?

Cars, needless to say, are spurned by many, not least among cyclists. Yet some attitudes may surprise us, such as those of the Californian children who regard cycling askance as a result of parental over-dedication to it. The movement of e-bike users and non-cyclists come into the overall picture, too. But it seems that childhood experiences can have different impacts on behaviour in the sphere of mobility across generations. Mobility practices may be related to experiences of housing and residence far in the past, in ways that work out differently
for generations born at different stages since the mid-twentieth century. Lastly, new ‘coworking spaces’ have their own connections with mobility biographies. This is a phenomenon we have read much about in the media during recent months, and it returns us to the pandemic again...

**Mobility and Travel Behaviour Across the Life Course: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches**

*Edited by Joachim Scheiner and Henrike Rau*

*Edwadr Elgar*

Open Access version of Chapter 1 available at:

With current projections of population ageing, the number of people living with dementia globally is expected to increase from approximately 46.8 million in 2015 to 131.5 million in 2050 (Prince et al., 2015). Current level of formal and residential care will be unable to sustain this and therefore, most of the world’s population of people living with dementia will be living in their own homes (Alzheimer’s Society, 2014). Going outdoors is an important part of living well with dementia. However, concerns regarding risk and harm often lead to preventative measures such as restricting outdoor movements, which can negatively affect a person’s quality of life. Thus, it is imperative that we explore how to maintain the delicate balance between supporting an individual’s right to freedom and independence with ensuring their safety. This research aims to find out more about the experience of ‘going out’ and being at risk of going missing from people with dementia and their
families and to explore how this affects their sense of identity, control and purpose.

Whist there is some existing research evidence on the experience of missing people (Stevenson, Parr, Woolnough, & Fyfe, 2013), this work excluded people with dementia. To date, literature in this field tends to focus on the ‘management of wandering behaviour’ (Cipriani, Lucetti, Nuti, & Danti, 2014), the impact of dementia on spatial navigation (Pai & Jacobs, 2004) or investigations of the effectiveness of tracking technologies (Robinson et al., 2006). I chose to use the term ‘going out’ to encompass a broad range of experiences and to avoid pejorative terminology such as wandering or elopement. Little is known about how people with dementia engage in the everyday practice of ‘going out’, how they relocate themselves if lost and how they interact with and navigate their environment. It is imperative to explore the issue in partnership with people with dementia to ensure that their views are central to our exploration of this issue. A deeper understanding of the experience from the perspective of people living with dementia can help us to better support them, their families as well as search agencies when someone is missing or thought to be at risk of missing. My PhD research aimed to address these gaps by examining the experiences of ‘going out’ for people with dementia and their families.

Methodology and emerging findings

In my thesis, I focus on the value of having a flexible research approach that is inclusive for people living with dementia and the value of using movement to understand the concept of place and everyday practice. Drawing on an interpretive critical approach, my PhD this research focuses on the everyday lives and the decisions that people make in relation to ‘going out’. I engaged with people living with dementia and their carer partners separately and in dyads. I used multiple methods of interaction to generate data including group discussions, walk-alongs and traditional interviews collecting field notes throughout. I engaged with over 40 participants across Scotland in a seven month period. When conducting walk-alongs, I engaged with participants on 3-5 occasions to develop rapport and a relationship of trust. Group discussions explored people’s experiences and their understanding of complex issues such as agency, control, the right to independence and safety. These were also sites where people would engage in peer support by sharing strategies with each other. Walk-alongs allowed for contextually relevant cues. Walking alongside participants offered an opportunity to communicate their experiences via the embodied act of moving in the environment. A focus on the body allowed for insights into how participants interacted with their locality and how they used
strategies and landmarks to locate themselves. Care partners interviews gave insight into how balancing a person’s right to freedom and independence with keeping them safe was a relational act.

Initial findings suggest that it is important to be aware of the fluctuating ability and differences in the presentation of dementia in each individual and how that might impact of their ability to go out. Generally, people are resilient and adopt a range of coping strategies but changes in the environment can impair their ability to navigate even familiar places. Overall, ‘going out’ is an everyday practice that people living with dementia engage in to (a) maintain a sense of self in relation to place and (b) maintain a sense of self in relations to other people. This supports that PLWD are active agents in the risk management process and that every lives can be understood via the lens of embodiment and emplacement.
Dissemination and Impact

Working on this project highlighted that there are clusters of related research happening across the world yet there was no platform for these findings to be shared and utilized on the ground. Since the issue of keeping PLWD safe and preventing missing episodes is a multiagency area where practice is often ahead of research, best practice is constantly evolving. Thus, in collaboration with researchers from University of Waterloo, Canada, I co-founded the International Consortium for Dementia and Wayfinding (ICDW). This platform is intended to be a global resource for anyone who has an interest in this area. It is a platform for knowledge exchange and mobilisation. During the summer of 2020, we hosted an online webinar series (freely available on YouTube here) and we are in the process of developing educational resources for police and search and rescue agencies.

Acknowledgement: This PhD studentship is funded by the Alzheimer’s Society, UK.
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This newsletter item summarizes findings from the research project: “Intergenerational solidarities in transnational families. An approach through the care arrangements of the Zero Generation, these foreigner grandparents involved in raising their grandchildren in Switzerland” funded by the Swiss National Foundation Grant 100017_162645 (2015-2018).

Recent scholarship on transnational families and ageing migrants highlighted different patterns of transnational grandparenting, in which are involved migrant and non-migrant, mobile and non-mobile elderly (Nedelcu and Wyss 2020). Conducted between 2015 and 2018 at the University of Neuchâtel, this study has investigated childcare arrangements involving the Zero-Generation (G0), i.e. migrants’ parents who engage in back-and-forth mobilities to care for their grandchildren living in Switzerland.

Research design

By taking into account discriminatory conditions related to the Swiss migration regime, we have comparatively observed and
analyzed G0 grandparenting practices within transnational families of different origins, from the EU (Italy, France, Germany and Romania) and non-EU countries (Brazil, Algeria and Morocco). We have conducted 56 qualitative semi-structured interviews in total, of which 34 with adult migrants having at least one child of pre-school age, and 22 with grandparents. A majority of the interviews concerned dyads formed by an adult migrant and his/her parent, the selection of the adult migrant to be interviewed being oriented by the presence of his/her parent in Switzerland at the time of the interview. The adult migrant interviewees were mostly women, aged from 28 to 42 years old, with 1 to 5 children aged from a few months to 18. Interviewed grandparents were in general grandmothers, aged from 52 to 73 years, mostly retired and having other family members, including children and grandchildren, in the country of origin or elsewhere in the world.

Transnational grandparenting: a gendered practice

Not surprisingly, our study has documented that G0 grandparenting is gendered, involving most often matrilineal grandmothers. Moreover, in the less common situation when a grandfather is taking on an active role within the transnational family, he is usually doing so in couple and by sharing tasks with his wife. Then, grandmothers provide physical childcare, cook the meal, and clean the house; while grandfathers are involved in other kind of domestic tasks (e.g. gardening), help with school work, and accompany grandchildren in extra-school outdoor activities.

A typology of Zero-Generation childcare arrangements within migrant families in Switzerland

By considering the timing of grandparents’ visits and the meaning of the support they provide to their descendants, we have put in light six different types of G0-childcare arrangements (see Wyss and Nedelcu 2018):

1. *Intergenerational sharing and transmission* corresponds to grandparents’ visits for seeing the grandchildren, sharing joyful moments and activities with them, while passing on cultural features from the country of origin;
2. *Urgency troubleshooting* occurs when a child suddenly falls ill, and immediate and generally short-term grandparents’ assistance is required as the parents are at work;
3. *Scheduled troubleshooting* is a response to anticipated additional need of informal childcare, in particular during (pre)school holidays;
4. **Celebrating childbirth** is a ritual visit when grandparents come to see and welcome the newborn, congratulate the parents, and celebrate together the event;

5. **Mothering the mother** implies that the migrant woman’s mother, for several weeks after childbirth, takes care of her daughter, is in charge of domestic tasks and looks after eldest grandchildren, allowing the mother to rest and dedicate her attention to the newborn;

6. **Substituting mother at home** is an arrangement in which G0-grandmothers take on quasi-permanently most childcare and domestic tasks in the daily running of the household, thus allowing their migrant daughters to fully engage in their professional career.

**Various factors shaping Zero-Generation childcare arrangements**

In the Swiss context, the need to rely on informal childcare resources, and in particular on grandparents’ help, is triggered by insufficient formal childcare facilities to support working mothers. In the case of migrant families, the possibility to mobilize G0 grandparents depends on different factors, and it is in particular limited by migration policies. In fact, the grandparents’ visits’ frequency and duration depend on the Swiss migration regime (Wyss 2020). While European nationals benefit from free circulation and can mobilize whenever childcare needs occur, strict visa requirements considerably narrow the spectrum of possible childcare arrangements for non-European grandparents. For instance, urgency troubleshooting childcare solutions are impossible for Algerian and Moroccan families, because of the complexity and slowness of visa procedures. Brazilian grandparents can more easily fulfill short stay G0-childcare arrangements as they can enter in Switzerland as a tourist without a visa. Confronted with the constraints of restrictive migration and family reunification policies, non-EU grandparents cannot involve in long-term arrangements, with only few exceptions observed in situations where migrants’ parents are taking the risk of becoming irregular migrants.

Yet, G0-childcare arrangements result from a complex intertwining of structural, cultural, familial and individual factors (Wyss and Nedelcu 2020). Thus, in the case of EU G0 grandparents, their facility to move intersects with the willingness to support. Helping in urgency situations or as a planned solution will then depend on the quality of intergenerational relationships, shared visions about child education, as well as individual preferences. In the same vein, existing cultural differences will explain why the birth of a child implies a short ritual visit in the case of EU grandparents, in
contrast with prolonged stays of the non-UE grandmothers who reproduce in a migratory context the traditional practices of family support in the postpartum period.

**G0-grandparents: an important resource for migrant families, ignored by policymakers**

Despite structural constraints, migrant families in Switzerland are able to put in place G0-childcare arrangements. Yet, while obviously G0-grandparents play an important role for the migrant families’ wellbeing and the professional integration of migrant women, Swiss care and migration regimes still disregard this transnational resource. Based on the findings of this research, we argue that the Zero Generation phenomenon points to an urgent need to conceive childcare as a policy area with transnational outreach, on the one hand; and to acknowledge the contribution of migrants’ parents as care providers through more favorable family reunification policies, on the other hand.

---
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Network

We are an association of researchers who are interested in ageing. We aim to facilitate contacts and collaboration among these researchers, and to provide them with up-to-date information. To reach these goals, we organize conferences and workshops, produce a newsletter, and maintain an email list. Because we are part of the European Sociological Association (ESA), many of our members work in sociology. However, we also have members who work in, for example, social policy or psychology.

Visit our homepage, where you can find information on all of our activities. If you have any questions or you want to contribute to the Newsletter, do not hesitate to CONTACT US!
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