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Intergenerational Family Solidarity (IGFS) is important for social cohesion and challenged by migration. Scientific evidence on how migrants sustain IGFS is scarce. In 2016, 421,875 migrants from different Former Yugoslav Republics were residing in Austria, the majority coming from Bosnia and Herzegovina (162,021) and Serbia (137,057). Immigrants from these countries are predominantly economic migrants who came in the 1960s and refugees of the Balkan wars in the 1990s. A literature review showed that intergenerational solidarity in migrant families in Austria is hardly covered by previous research. No published studies explicitly dealing with this subject were found. To generate more understanding, three migrant women who migrated as refugees in the 1990s from Bosnia and Serbia were asked about their family structures, family life, and family solidarity through semi-structured in-depth interviews based on qualitative sociological method. Results show that although immigration has weakened IGFS in terms of frequency of contact, high normative solidarity prevails and results in feelings of guilt and non-met family responsibilities. Support of parents and relatives is sustained by sending money and goods to the home country.
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INTRODUCTION

Intergenerational family solidarity (IGFS) has gained increasing attention in the social arena as being an important element for sustaining social cohesion. A report from the OECD Ministerial Meeting on Social Policy states that "Intergenerational solidarity can be seen as a desirable value in itself [...] It is also a means to an end: a mechanism for supporting mutually beneficial exchanges, both monetary and non-monetary, between generations." (OECD, 2011, p. 1).

IGFS refers to the degree of closeness and support between different generations and has shown to be an important determinant of wellbeing especially in older age but throughout one's entire life course in general (Silverstein & Bengtson, 1991; Albert, Labs, & Trommsdorff, 2010). Studies have also shown that higher family solidarity contributes to better adjustment in situations of crisis or transition such as becoming widowed or experiencing immigration (Katz, 2009; Silverstein & Bengtson, 1991).

Intergenerational family solidarity can be described in six dimensions (Bengtson & Roberts, 2007): (1) structural solidarity (geographical distance that can constrain or enhance interaction between family members), (2) associational solidarity (frequency of social contact and shared activities between family members), (3) affectual solidarity (emotional closeness or distance between family members), (4) consensual solidarity (actual or perceived agreement in opinions, values, and lifestyles), (5) functional solidarity (practical and financial assistance and support between family members), and (6) normative solidarity (degree of obligation felt towards other family members).

Different dimensions of intergenerational solidarity seem to differ in importance in various European countries. For example, weaker normative solidarity is observed in welfare states with strong public support systems (Cooney & Dykstra, 2011).

Intergenerational family solidarity (IGFS) in the context of migration

Empirical findings suggest that several structural factors are likely to influence intergenerational family solidarity such as immigration history and geographical proximity (Albert, Ferring, & Michels, 2013; Matias, Andrade, Fontaine, Alves, & Martinez, 2008). A study on intergenerational support among migrant families with all family members residing in Europe points out that "intergenerational support is important throughout the individual life course and a major mechanism of cultural continuity". It contradicts a little bit what is written above
Immigration history is important (Albert et al., 2013) but then there is not much difference with the host population when it comes to support (Bordone & de Valk, 2016).

Focusing on families with some members living in the sending country and others in the country of origin, migration is of particular relevance in several aspects. To name a few, migration is often related to breaking up with family bonds: young and middle-aged adults migrate to get jobs and/or education and elderly family members and children stay in the home country. From an economic viewpoint, remittances from migrants paid to family members in their home countries are an important factor for sustaining family care structures. From the perspective of receiving countries, migrants play an important role in complementing the weakened maintenance of family solidarity of the host population: home care services heavily rely on migrant nurses, migrant nannies take care of children, and migrant housekeepers support the elderly in maintaining life at home without their adult children around them.

A COST Action on Intergenerational Family Solidarity across Europe (COST IS1311), supported by the EU Framework Programme Horizon 2020 and composed of an interdisciplinary network of experts from 28 European countries (2014–2018), points out the significance of the IGFS to the European society. The action at the same time points out the under-researched but important sub-topic of the effects of migration and immigrants (Symposium on Intergenerational Solidarity and Migration, 26. 05. 2016, Milan; Training School on Intergenerational Solidarity in a Diverse World, 04. – 08. 04. 2016, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences – University of Porto).

Notably, existing studies often survey experiences from the perspective of the elderly “left behind” by adult children. A study on migration and intergenerational solidarity for a rural area set in Madagascar shows that migration enhances solidarity between elderly parents and migrants: the elderly take care of grandchildren left behind at home, facilitate the migrant’s access to community networks, maintain the social position of the family, and migrants support their family left behind by sending remittances (Rakotonarivo, 2010). A quantitative survey with elderly parents (N = 305) in Lithuania examined the effects of adult children migration on association-al, affectual and functional dimensions of solidarity. The results showed some negative impact for associational and affectional solidarity, but these were somewhat compensated with the positive impact on functional solidarity in terms of financial support (Gedvilaišė-Kordušienė, 2015). A study from Thailand, exploring the social and economic consequences of the migration of
adult children to urban areas for rural parents through open-ended interviews with older-aged parents, suggests that migration of children to urban areas contributes positively to the material well-being of their elderly parents who remain in rural areas. This study further pinpoints that negative impacts of migration on social support, defined in terms of maintaining contact and visits, have been considerably attenuated by the advent of technological changes in communication like mobile phones and skype (Knodel & Saengtienchai, 2007). Another research also indicates that differences in IGFS values are observed between immigrant groups and generations with first generation immigrants placing higher values on family solidarity compared to second generation immigrants (Merz, Özeke-Kocabas, Oort, & Schuengel, 2009).

**Austria and migration**

Austria is a small, landlocked country in the very heart of Europe with a geographical territory of 83,878 km² and a total population of around 8.7 million inhabitants in 2016. Austria is characterized by a well-developed market economy and a comprehensive system of social security and welfare schemes with close ties to other EU economies, especially Germany’s. Similar to other OECD countries, its demographic development is that of an aging population with positive net migration being the only demographic driver for population growth.

The share of migrants in Austria in 2016 amounted to 14.6% with a considerable increase since 2014 (where the share was 12.5%) due to the refugee movements from Syria, Iraq and Afghanistan. 20% of the workforce have migrant background (Statistik Austria, 2016).

**Austria as an immigration country**


The initial phase is characterized by emerging immigration of mainly young single males driven by the labour market demands of a booming economy. Austria started to recruit labour migrants and set up recruitment agreements with Turkey (1964) and Yugoslavia (1966). The policy intention was to fill up the gaps in the labour market with the so called "guest workers" who were not considered to be part of the Austrian society but a temporary presence on the territory. It later turned out that this concept of just temporarily settling "guest workers" failed.
In the intermediate phase, there was a shift from male dominated immigration to family migration due to family reunification. This phase is marked by a considerable change in the economic situation after the first oil price shock in 1973 and the arrival of the baby-boom cohorts on the labour market which led to the end of labour shortage. Official recruitment was stopped completely and in 1976 the Aliens' Employment Act, determining the primacy of Austrian nationals on the labour market, became operative. Still, immigration was considered as being temporary.

The new stable phase is characterized by immigration as a constant phenomenon with both young males and females coming to Austria as economic migrants. In this phase, with the accession of Austria to the European Union (EU), EU internal migration becomes more important. The beginning of this phase is marked by the enforcement of the so-called Residence Law in 1993 aiming at regulating new immigration with annual quota and specific criteria that had to be met in order to gain a residence permit, for example, proof of means of subsistence and a place to stay.

Apart from such features of labour migration, Austria has a history as a receiving country of refugees (Bauer, 2008). In 1956/57, 180,000 Hungarians fled to Austria and 162,000 Czechs and Slovaks from former Czechoslovakia came to Austria in 1968. The majority of those immigrated returned to their countries later. In 1980/81, 33,000 refugees from Poland arrived in Austria. The Balkan wars caused refugee movements to Austria in the 1990s. In 1991/92, about 13,000 displaced persons fled from Croatia to Austria. From 1992 onwards, 90,000 refugees came from Bosnia. In 1999, more than 5,000 refugees from the Kosovo conflict were accepted in Austria. Moreover, from 1972 onwards, non-European refugees were accepted on the basis of internationally agreed quotas.1

Review on studies in Austria

In Austria, evidence on migrant families and how they live together, their relationships and family structures are scarce.

A review of studies on intergenerational family solidarity in migrant families in Austria was conducted in February 2017. Twelve social sciences databases and ten health sciences databases (including SCOPUS and PubMed) available at the library service of the University of Vienna were searched with the combination of keywords "Intergenerational family solidarity", "Migrant"/"Immigrant", and "Austria". This combination of keywords did not yield any result. As a second step, a combination of the following keywords was used: "Migrant"/"Immigrant", "Austria", "caring", "aging", "family support", "fi-
financial support”. No articles were found with these combinations either.

Given these search results, experts in the field were asked to provide grey literature referring to the keywords listed above. The main findings from this grey literature relevant to intergenerational family solidarity in migrant families in Austria are presented in the following section.

A study commissioned by the Austrian Ministry for Labour, Social Affairs and Consumer Protection shows that the geographic distance as well as the frequency of contact between family members differs significantly between migrant families of different countries of origin (Halm Dienst, Radhuber, & Winter-Ebmer, 2013). The important functions of family in the migration and integration process as well as in everyday life in the destination country are pointed out in one study conducted at the University of Vienna (Reinprecht, 2009). The study concludes that migrant families put high values on solidarity and family and kinship ties and associated family tasks and obligations. Mutual support in terms of practical help – such as caregiving for elderly people within the family or helping each other with tasks in everyday life – is considered as an important performance indicator of solidarity (Reinprecht, 2009). This is partly reflected in the fact that the use of mobile and home care services by elderly migrants is lower than that of the Austrian elderly population (Reinprecht, 2016). It is also reflected in high expectations among elderly migrants towards their children as main caretakers. A survey shows that while less than 50% of Austrian respondents indicate that their child/children should take care of their health and be the main care provider, the share among people with migration background from Bosnia, Serbia, Poland, and Turkey is about 70%. A significant difference is also seen concerning opinions on who should bare the nursing cost: less than 5% of Austrians see the cost coverage as the duty of their children while around 25% of the migrant population think their children should be financially responsible. While 14% of native-Austrian respondents agree that their children should take over responsibilities for care, it amounted to 25% among respondents with a migration background (Mayerhofer-Sebera, 2016).

The qualitative study "Intercultural Lived-In World and Health of Turkish Women in Vienna" (Trummer, Novak-Zezula, & Cigirli, 2013) conducted at the Center for Health and Migration, Vienna (C-HM) in cooperation with Vienna University for Economics and Business, with a focus on the health and living conditions of Turkish families, revealed the importance of family solidarity among the Turkish migrant women. For the Turkish women, perceived responsibilities towards their
own family and their Turkish community function as guidance for acting and getting through their everyday lives in Austria as migrant women. On one hand, women feel comfort and satisfaction in obeying these norms which they acquired in their country of origin or have experienced with their family-in-laws they have married into. On the other hand, they also start questioning these norms after having experienced the “modern” way of life in Austria (Trummer et al., 2013).

AIM AND CONTEXT OF THE QUALITATIVE STUDY

The Center for Health and Migration, Vienna (http://www.c-hm.com) was established in 2010 and has the general aim to support a better understanding of social dynamics related to migration and well-being of diverse communities and societies. Intergenerational Family Solidarity and Migration is a priority topic within the Center’s research activities. In preparation for a new research strand on this topic in 2017, explorative interviews with few but selected informants were conducted. This preliminary study was funded by private donors. The aim was to create a first knowledge base on IGFS of immigrants in Austria who came as refugees in the course of the Balkan wars. The desired outcome was to get first insights into this topic that could generate a critical mass of information and open questions that could lead to funded research activities. Due to restricted funding and the explorative nature of the endeavour, the study was designed very small.

Methodology and practical design

Non-probability purposive sampling (Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2012) was used to select three interviewees for in-depth interviews. Inclusion criteria were: (1) female: as the interviewer was a woman, it was considered easier to build a trustful and open relationship for the interview if the interviewer and the interviewee were of the same sex; (2) has migrated to Austria as a refugee from Former Yugoslav Repub- lics in times of the Balkan war; and (3) who has relatives who live in the country of origin. Three immigrant women from Serbia and Bosnia and Herzegovina living in Austria were selected and interviewed between March 21st and April 2nd, 2017. Relevant demographic data was also collected during the interview.

The interviewees gave their informed consent for the interview and for the scientific use of its content. No remu- neration was made. Anonymity was guaranteed by the interviewer verbally. To ensure privacy and an intimate talk, the interviews were not audiotaped. The interviews were conducted in German. All interviewees had good command of the
German language and there were no language barriers limiting understanding the content of the interview. After each interview, the interviewer wrote a detailed report based on memos taken during the interview. Interview 1 lasted 105 minutes, interview 2 took 65 minutes and interview 3 lasted 50 minutes. The interviews took place in the interviewees’ homes.

The interviews started with a question concerning the interviewee’s definition of family and were then structured along the six dimensions of intergenerational solidarity as described by Bengtson and Roberts (2007): structural solidarity, associational solidarity, affectual solidarity, consensual solidarity, functional solidarity and normative solidarity. The analysis of results was done by assigning documented statements to the six categories of family solidarity. This was done by the three authors independently. Results were then compared and consensus on the final results was reached by all three authors.

RESULTS

Case 1: Milena

Milena is a 42-year-old woman from Mostar, Bosnia. She came to Austria at the age of 18 in 1993 together with her husband shortly after their marriage. The couple has two sons, 17 and 14 years old, both of them born in Vienna. Milena’s mother followed her daughter to Austria in 1995, also as a refugee. The five share an apartment. Milena’s aunt, uncle and cousins and their children live in Vienna, too. Her husband’s parents and his brother live in Bosnia. Austria was chosen as a country of destination as her uncle and his family have been living in Austria since the 1970s.

Case 2: Ana

Ana is a 51-year-old woman from Sarajevo, Bosnia. Together with her husband she came to Austria in 1995 as a refugee. Austria was chosen as a country of destination as friends from Bosnia had already been living in Austria. They have two sons, 20 and 16 years old, who were both born in Vienna. When Ana and her husband fled to Austria, their parents and the husband’s sister stayed in Bosnia. Both of their fathers died a few years ago. Her mother, her mother in law, an aunt and a cousin still live in Bosnia.

Case 3: Sanela

Sanela is a 41-year-old woman from a village close to Cacak, Serbia. She came to Austria in 1996 together with her husband, her sister and her sister’s family. Sanela and her husband have three daughters, 15, 13 and 10 years old, all of them born in
Austria. Sanela’s and her husband’s parents still live in Serbia. Austria as a destination country was chosen because of the geographical closeness to Serbia and because Sanela’s husband learned German at school.

**Definition of family**

When talking about family, all women focus on those family members with whom they share their apartments: their husbands, children, and in one case the woman’s mother. Core family is considered as those living together in one flat. Additionally, parents, parents-in-law, uncles, aunts and their cousins, regardless of their living in Austria or the countries of origin, are considered as part of the broader family. Ana includes friends in Vienna and Sarajevo into her "extended family".

Bengtson & Roberts’ six categories of IGFS (2007) were highly applicable in our study. More homogeneity than heterogeneity was observed. Thus, the following part summarises the findings according to these six categories.

**Structural and associational solidarity**

Geographical distance has impact on the frequency of coming together as a family and constrains personal face-to-face interaction with the family in the country of origin. Due to the distance of about 750 to 900 kilometres, it takes about nine hours to travel by car. Going by plane is considered unaffordable especially when flying together with the whole family. Travelling from airports to home towns by local transport is considered inconvenient too. However, they visit their relatives as often as possible, especially during Christmas, Easter and summer holidays. To make sure that they can spend as much time as possible with the family, they make sure that all family holidays are planned accordingly and they give up visiting other destinations although they might appreciate to see different places.

"Travelling to our family in Mostar is always exhausting. But we regularly go there for holidays (...) We always spend our summer holidays at the seaside [author’s comment: in Croatia, together with the family members who live in Mostar. We don’t choose another country for holidays.” (Milena).

The long distance makes short visits difficult to arrange. Such short visits therefore are made not for spending time together with the family but only when considered really necessary. Sometimes the women feel obliged to go to their parent’s home to help them and manage critical situations. In these cases, the children are left with the fathers at home in Vienna: “I sometimes drive home for the weekend or a few days, but only in case there is a severe health problem; and not as a family, only one adult at a time” (Ana). Doing so caus-
es a lot of organisational work as the interviewees also feel obliged to pre-cook for their families, organise after-school care and ensure that their children are well prepared for exams. Not fulfilling these expected roles as a mother causes a feeling of guilt.

While the women do everything to ensure time together with their relatives in their countries of origin, their children increasingly lose interest in accompanying their parents for family visits in their countries of origin. Ana’s children spent all their summer holidays with their grandparents when they were younger. Having grown up, they don’t want to do so anymore and don’t engage in shared activities: “They only stay in the house and play computer games on their tablets. They are bored” (Ana).

Similar concern is raised also by women who regularly meet their family members living in Austria. While birthdays and holidays are considered as welcome occasions for meeting and celebrating with extended family members, this close and frequent family contact is considered less welcome for their children who are more interested in meeting their friends from school. “We meet nearly every weekend. I enjoy this. Our kids say: ‘Please, not again.’” (Milena).

The women expressed their uncertainty about their children’s refusal of close family contact. “I can’t say: is it because they lose their close relationship to the family or is it just a sign of puberty?” (Ana).

The main communication channels with relatives in the country of origin are telephone and Skype. The latter is used several times a week to keep in touch. One interviewee says that her husband talks to his parents via Skype every week. She tells her children to talk to their grandparents and tell them about school and hobbies on these occasions.

**Affectual solidarity**

All three interviewees stress close relationship with their relatives regardless of them living in Vienna or in the countries of origin. “We stick together; family comes first” (Milena). Specific family members are mentioned in this context such as the husband. The shared experience of escaping war and building a new life in another country creates a special bond: “We have been through so much together, and we still laugh” (Milena). For Sanela, her sister is especially important. They spend every weekend together, they talk on the phone every day and celebrate every single family party together. All women report that they feel a very strong obligation to stay in close contact with their relatives. At the same time, they stress that they enjoy doing so and that they appreciate the close relationships.
Consensual solidarity

To stick together, to be there for one another, mutual support, and to care for each other are core values that the interviewees say they share with their families in Vienna and in their countries of origin. If there are differences, it is about issues that are not considered of core importance, "we quarrel, but only about trivialities" (Milena).

Protecting each other’s feelings is another core value considered to be important in the families. Milena gives the example of how the issue of war and fleeing their home country is dealt with within her family. When talking about their experiences, "certain aspects" (Milena) such as personal experiences, fears and uncertainties are not touched upon in order not to burden the children. Children respond to this protective approach by showing empathy. Milena expresses the feeling that in return her children behave well and obey the rules in order to protect their parents from being concerned. "We talk with them about our experiences of fleeing the country, but not about the causes. Our kids behave well; they know how difficult everything was for us".

A good education for children and their success in work are mentioned as common values no matter where family members live. The children shall have the best education possible. The importance of this value can be seen in the considerable share of the family income that is spent for extra private lessons.

Although women differ from their parents in certain aspects such as lifestyle or occupational status, a common understanding about how family life should be lived is expressed. Interviewees talk about everyday life in their actual family and their family of origin and observe many similarities: how a family gathering is organised or how the different roles of family members and routines are assigned and carried out. "We actually live in the same way within our core family as our parents did when we were small." (Sanela).

Functional solidarity

Practical support is important in the interviewees' families. One main issue is child care.

The grandmother, who lives together with her daughter and family in one apartment, is taking care of the children while her daughter is working. Ana’s mother stayed with her daughter in Vienna for three months to support her after the birth of her sons. In the following years, she visited her for two to three weeks a year and supported her with the household and child care. Her father never accompanied his wife. He stayed at home, caring for the house and the garden in
Sarajevo. Sanela often takes care of her nephew and niece as her sister who also lives in Vienna has fallen severely ill.

Providing and organising care for parents who live in their home countries is challenging for all interviewees. "People from my parents’ generation are traditionally cared for by the family. Nowadays, many old people are alone. Maybe one of their children is still living there. If so, those adult children who live for example in Austria send money to support this sibling and the parents. In case there are no adult children living at home and parents are in need of care, children pay for nursing home care." (Milena). Not being able to care for elderly parents themselves burdens the women. All three report that they feel sad, helpless and guilty.

One of the most difficult situations experienced by Ana was not being able to stay with her parents back home when her father fell severely ill. All family members were overstrained with emotional as well as organisational issues and were overwhelmed with the feeling of uncertainties at the time when he was dying. A cousin took over the responsibilities for taking care of her father for one year and a half.

Family members living in Vienna support each other such as by helping to renovate apartments, lending vans or watering flowers. Visits in countries of origin are also used to support relatives with tasks such as small repair or gardening work.

Women state that financial support was an issue especially in the 1990s when their parents financially supported them and their husbands to migrate to Austria. Later on, the women supported their parents by sending money to buy goods such as construction materials or home furniture. They also brought such goods over from Austria which were not available or very expensive in the Yugoslav successor states at that time.

"In the beginning we delivered more gifts or purchase orders than today. We were often the delivery service for lots of things that were so expensive there" (Ana).

Meanwhile, family members in Austria as well as in Serbia and Bosnia make their own living. "We all get along with our respective incomes – nobody needs the other one’s money" (Milena).

**Normative solidarity**

Responses concerning feelings about how family members should treat each other vary between the interviewees. When talking about the support of parents for their adult children, the women state that looking after grandchildren, helping in case of financial difficulties and adjusting their own lives if their children need their help is difficult or even impossible if parents live in another country.
When talking about giving support to their parents in case they need practical or financial support, the women express their feeling of responsibility, noting that "this is true for me, but my own children don’t have to support me in the future. The system in Austria is different." (Milena). Ana sees an obligation to support parents if they are having financial difficulties, "but only as long as my own children are not affected by restrictions" (Ana).

The strong feeling of responsibility for supporting their parents puts a burden on the women, especially when the parents are in need of care but possibilities to provide it personally are limited.

Ana reports that after having had Skype contact she always has a guilty conscience because "you end the call and they have to go through everything alone". (Sanela)

The feeling of guilt towards her parents and also towards her cousin, who cared for her father for a year and a half of serious illness, is expressed by Ana: "you live in rich Austria, go there only for vacation, with gifts, used children's clothes, toys... you buy yourself out of troubles that you know you should be taking care of yourself." (Ana).

In summary, all three women that were interviewed report being in close contact with family members in their countries of origin both through Skype or telephone and in person when visiting the relatives for holidays several times a year. Practical and financial support is exchanged regularly within all families, although financial support is decreasing as the situation of family members both in Austria and in the country of origin has improved over the years. Organising care for children and elderly family members is an issue for all interviewees. Strategies to deal with this need and obligation vary among the interviewees depending on the perceived level of care needed and the availability of other relatives' support. All three women see cohesion as a core value in their families.

Cohesion is experienced as a pleasure but also as a cause for feelings of obligation and guilt.

Differences in family values such as children’s loss of interest in family visits both in the country of origin and in Austria is interpreted not as a loss of solidarity but rather as a sign of puberty. All respondents say that adult children are responsible for their parents when they are in need of support.

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDIES

The results of this small study are in line with available evidence from other studies. It shows that immigration has an impact on structural solidarity. Although to some extent mitigated by the advance in modern communication technologies such as Skype and mobile phones, geographical distance
has a negative impact on associational solidarity as social contacts and shared activities are restrained. Affectual solidarity is high among all family members including those who live in the migrants’ home country. Functional solidarity in terms of support of parents and relatives is sustained by sending money and goods to the home country. A strong feeling of normative solidarity prevails and results in feelings of guilt and unmet family responsibilities.

This study provides a glimpse into the perceptions of intergenerational family solidarity experienced by migrant families in Austria. Our study suggests that migration indeed poses additional challenges to sustain family solidarity in various aspects. It also indicates that migrant families develop various coping strategies to mitigate such challenges by: taking over responsibilities of caring for the elderly family members, bridging the geographical gap between parents, grandparents and children, and consciously sustaining core family values.

In future related studies, it is recommended that a larger and a diverse sample of migrant families be included in order to draw generalizable conclusions that can be utilised in actual policy making. This also resonates with the research challenges outlined in the European COST Action on Intergenerational Family Solidarity across Europe (INTERFASOL).

LIMITATIONS
Due to limited resources, only three cases could be included in the study. Thus the findings are highly explorative and can only be used as bases for generating possible hypotheses and future research questions and ideas.
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Međugeneracijska obiteljska solidarnost imigranata iz dviju država sljednica bivše Jugoslavije koji žive u Austriji

Ursula TRUMMER, Sonja NOVAK-ZEZULA
Centar za zdravlje i migracije, Beč

Međugeneracijska obiteljska solidarnost (IGFS) važna je za socijalnu koheziju i ugrožena je migracijom. Malobrojni su znanstveni dokazi o tome kako migranti održavaju međugeneracijsku obiteljsku solidarnost. U Austriji je 2016. boravilo 421 875 migranata iz bivših jugoslovenskih republika, od kojih je većina došla iz Bosne i Hercegovine (162 021) i Srbije (137 057). Migrami iz tih zemalja uglavnom su ekonomski migranti koji su se iselili u šezdesetim godinama dvadesetoga stoljeća i izbjeglice iz balkanskih ratova 1990-ih. Pregled literature pokazao je da
Prethodnih istraživanja međugeneracijske solidarnosti u obiteljima migranata u Austriji gotovo nema. Nisu pronađene objavljene studije koje se izravno bave ovom temom. Kako bi se produbilo razumijevanje ove problematike, tri žene koje su 1990. godine izbjegle iz Bosne i Srbije ispitane su o obiteljskim strukturama, obiteljskom životu i obiteljskoj solidarnosti polustrukturnim dubinskim intervjuima koji se temelje na kvalitativnoj sociološkoj metodi. Rezultati pokazuju da premda iseljavanje slabi međugeneracijsku obiteljsku solidarnost u smislu učestalosti kontakata, prevladava visoka normativna solidarnost i rezultira osjećajima krivnje i neispunjenim obiteljskim obvezama. Podrška roditeljima i rodbini iskazuje se slanjem novca i robe u domovinu.
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